

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 10 May 2017

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

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

### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PITYARILLA (PARK 19) IN THE SOUTH-EAST PARK LANDS**

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:02):** I move:

That the 565<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Enhancement to Pityarilla (Park 19) in the South-East Park Lands, be noted.

Pityarilla, or Park 19, is located within the south Parklands, bounded by Glen Osmond Road, Unley Road, Greenhill Road and Hutt Street. It currently contains a children's playground and community courts for basketball and tennis, as well as playing fields and open space. The intent of this project is to redevelop the area into an attractive space for families to use, with the scope of works including an upgrade to the existing Marshmallow Park playground, a nature play area, community courts, a community plaza, a fenced dog park, irrigated lawn and garden areas, new lighting, amenities block and public artworks, and the rehabilitation of the creek line.

A shared use promenade linking the Rugby Street-Porter Street bikeway through Unley and Mitcham to the Frome Street Bikeway will also be incorporated. There will be facilities for food trucks, and it is envisaged that community events will be held in the plaza area. The state government has provided the City of Adelaide with a \$4.5 million grant towards the works. The council will be responsible for undertaking the works, with a project control group consisting of representatives from the council and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure's Office for Design and Architecture overseeing the project implementation.

Consultation has occurred with the adjacent council, the City of Unley, and other stakeholders. A community engagement day was held in October last year to canvass the thoughts and ideas of the general community. Work on the project is due to commence in June with completion by the end of this year. The aim is to have facilities available to the community for use by next summer.

This is an exciting project that should provide a much-needed active space for families, especially those living in the city and the inner suburbs. This project is particularly important given the increasing amount of infill that is occurring in these areas. I wish to thank my fellow committee members for considering this project—the members for Colton, Torrens, Finniss and Unley—as well as committee staff for their assistance in reviewing the project. Given this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:05):** I indicate that the opposition supported this project. I have nothing further to add to the comments made by the member for Elder.

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:05):** Thank you to the member for Finniss for his supporting words. There was bipartisan support from the committee. It is absolutely a worthwhile project, and I recommend it to the house.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT PIRIE REGIONAL SPORTS PRECINCT**

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:06):** I move:

That the 566<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Port Pirie Regional Sports Precinct, be noted.

This project will see the co-location of many sports facilities in Port Pirie around an upgraded Memorial Oval, the adjacent Pirie West Oval and the swimming centre. Currently, the sporting facilities in Port Pirie are spread over a number of ovals and venues. Many of these facilities are aged, some do not meet the needs of the community, and many are in urgent need of upgrade and repair to meet building and sporting code requirements. The cost to the council and the clubs of maintaining all these facilities is onerous and there is a need for newer, more modern facilities to ensure the ongoing interest and engagement of the community in local sport.

The proposal to rationalise the playing venues and provide significantly upgraded facilities has met with both community support and support from the local sporting clubs. With funding assistance from the state and federal governments, the Port Pirie Regional Council is proposing to consolidate a number of facilities into one location and provide new, modern facilities for football, cricket, soccer and baseball, as well as upgrading and expanding the swimming centre to incorporate additional indoor pools, gymnastics facilities and squash courts.

In order to accommodate the sports precinct, the existing Memorial Oval will be realigned to incorporate Pirie West Oval and extend the oval onto adjacent council-owned land. The Minister for Education and Child Development, owner of the Pirie West Oval, is supportive of the project, and the necessary negotiations have occurred to allow the council to proceed with the project.

Other works in the redevelopment for the Memorial Oval include the creation of a turf cricket pitch, main soccer pitch and a baseball diamond; upgrading the oval surface drainage and irrigation systems; and installing new floodlighting and scoreboard in addition to new goalposts and fencing. Also, a new two-storey sports pavilion and function centre for over 200 people will be constructed. This will include two canteens, two umpiring/referee rooms (interchangeable), and four change and strapping rooms. The existing grandstand will also be upgraded to replace the current asbestos roof. All roadways will be sealed and the car park will be upgraded.

Upgrades are also occurring to the swimming centre to create a new indoor recreation centre. Works include the creation of a new gymnastics facility, three squash courts, a multi-use program room, a new canteen, new change room facilities and office space. In addition, a new indoor learn-to-swim pool, lagoon pool and a toddler pool will be constructed. This project comes with many benefits, including providing local employment in the region, the potential to grow tourism and other social and economic benefits.

This is a jointly funded \$20 million project between Port Pirie Regional Council and the state and federal governments, with the state and federal governments providing \$5 million each. The council is responsible for the remainder of the funding and will undertake some of the required works in house. The ongoing operating costs will also be the responsibility of the council. The council will be overseeing the project, with works to be completed by the end of 2018. Indeed, it is an exciting project and very welcomed by the local community. Having grown up in that area not far away from Port Pirie in the country in the Mid North, I know that it will be really well used.

I thank my fellow committee members for considering this important regional project, namely, the members for Colton, Torrens, Finniss and Unley, and also the committee staff for their assistance with reviewing the project. I also thank those who came to present to the committee on this multidimensional project. Given this and, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:10):** The member for Elder has covered a lot of the project, but some matters arose during the hearing. I was a little surprised that netball is not incorporated. When we met at the Port Augusta complex last year, it was very interesting to me that the netball and tennis courts were all part and parcel of the project.

It was indicated that there was substantial pressure on the Port Augusta council over the continuing maintenance, etc., of the project and its financial viability. I asked that at the Port Pirie project and they seemed reasonably comfortable. It would appear that the netball side of it in Port Pirie is down the road a bit and that the facilities there are not that old, which I think is a pity because I find, even in my electorate, that netball seems to run separately to football. In parts of my electorate,

actually, netball is much bigger than football by virtue of numbers and it is a critical part of the community.

We got some answers to some of those questions. I was concerned about the financial viability of the Port Pirie complex into the future. However, they seem pretty comfortable with where they are at. It will be a good project for the area. We have family by marriage around that area, in Redhill and down towards Lake View. They expressed to me that they thought it would be good for the region, so we did not have much hesitation in being supportive of it.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:12):** I rise as a neighbouring MP to add my support to this project. We certainly know in Port Augusta, which I represent, the enormous value that the development of our new sporting complex has had. Following on from the comments of the member for Finnis, there are certainly enormous benefits in combining football and netball in winter. That happens in most of country South Australia.

While the clubs in Port Augusta are not combined, the netball league did decide to move from its traditional home on Railway Parade and join with the traditional home of football, being Central Oval in Port Augusta. That may still happen one day in Port Pirie and, if that were to happen, it would be a good thing, but that is for local people to decide.

There is often a lot of discussion about investment in these sorts of facilities and how broad a community benefit there is. I have a strong view that there is a very broad community benefit. The argument against it is often, 'What would people who do not participate in sport get out of it?' My view is that these are facilities that are not only for sport. These are facilities that can be used for a very wide range of community events, including trade fairs and conventions.

In fact, the very first public event that was held at the newly developed Central Oval facilities in Port Augusta was an ageing expo. That event was well attended and very positive and really had nothing to do with sport. The other thing, of course, is that it does not matter whether a person is male or female, Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal, a tremendous sports person or just somebody who just does it for a bit of fun and recreation, a very young person or quite a senior person because anybody can benefit from the sporting facilities.

They can benefit by being spectators. They can benefit because, maybe if they are not doing it, their husband or wife, son or daughter, grandson or granddaughter might well be benefiting from these new facilities. For me, it is not only about sport. These are very important community assets and I am very pleased for the Port Pirie Regional Council and for all the people in the broader Port Pirie district that this project will go ahead.

I am also pleased that it continues to cement the broader Upper Spencer Gulf as a tremendous place to participate locally or for people to come from other parts of the state to participate in sporting and other events. For example, Global Maintenance Upper Spencer Gulf holds a mining and resources forum in Upper Spencer Gulf every year, which is very strongly attended by people from even farther afield than South Australia. So, these facilities can be used for that sort of thing.

I would like to finish by saying that the money invested in these facilities needs to be very carefully thought through. The Port Augusta City Council decided to invest. I was very closely involved in enabling Port Augusta City Council to get support from the state government back in around 2009 and the federal government chipped in money. There was \$5 million from each of those two governments, but the Port Augusta City Council has contributed significantly more than either the state or the federal government.

I know that the Port Pirie Regional Council will have done its sums very carefully and will pursue this in a very responsible fashion. As I have said a couple of times, I strongly support Port Pirie having this facility for its benefit, the benefit of the broader community and Upper Spencer Gulf in general. However, it is important to say that these projects can and should only proceed when they can be afforded and without placing an unfair burden on ratepayers. Even ratepayers who will actively participate and directly benefit from the project must not have an unfair burden placed on them through council expenditure.

I say again that I have no doubt that the Port Pirie Regional Council will have done its sums appropriately. I know that the Port Augusta council is under a great deal of financial pressure. The newly developed Central Oval project has contributed to that but is not actually the reason. Let me finish by saying that I am very supportive of this proposal going ahead in Port Pirie, as I was in Port Augusta. However, please let no-one ever forget that the benefits of a project like this must be very carefully compared to the costs that go with it. Of course, all councils must incur these costs in a way that means that they do not force unfair rate increases upon their ratepayers.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (11:19):** I rise to speak in support of the Public Works Committee and the project for the multi-use sports facility at Port Pirie. As most people know, I was able to secure \$5 million from the state government back in 2014. The federal government also contributed \$5 million towards this project through the National Stronger Regions Fund. This project has been going on since 2014. At this stage, the council has started some of the project and they have demolished some of the outbuildings.

They have reinvigorated or reinforced the oval itself by changing it completely. They are going to have what I consider to be one of the best oval grounds and facilities in regional South Australia. They are going to have similar grass and so forth to the Adelaide Oval and, with the drainage problems there, hopefully they will be able to overcome that issue. The council at this stage has not accepted a full tender. I know for a fact, as the member for Stuart has indicated, that councils need to be very aware and very responsible when they do these projects.

We also have to ensure that the councils themselves maintain the ongoing costs of these facilities. I know our council, the Port Pirie Regional Council, have been consulting with all the sporting groups there. They also have not finalised a tender at this particular point. I know they are trying to do every due diligence to make certain that the long-term viability of this project is going to be sustainable. A facility of this nature, as with the one at Port Augusta, will allow the community to have better facilities for sporting events, etc., there.

I would like to point out an issue happening in Port Pirie: we have a gymnastics regional training academy, which has over 300 young students under the guidance of Garry and Lee-ann Nayda and other teachers. These young kids have won some state championships recently. They have won national championships. It is a regional academy, and one of the things that I want to be able to ensure, as do other members in this house, is that our young kids have the best training facilities and opportunities in regional South Australia so that they do not have to go to Adelaide to train to be national competitors and so forth.

This gymnastics academy is growing all the time. It has had an invitational academy championship recently, when over 2,000 people came into the community and 550 entrants came into Port Pirie. I want to make certain that with this project those sorts of sports are accommodated, that they can have the best training facilities for the young kids, both male and female, and also be able to hold country championships in these facilities. Our communities, as with Port Augusta and with other regional areas, need to get more and more sporting events because that is new money. It is also an economic boost opportunity and acts as a tourism attraction, and those people will go away with great memories of the community.

If I may digress a bit, I have seen some of the opportunities created by the Copper Coast council, and I think they are doing a fantastic job. I certainly support this facility. I congratulate the Port Pirie Regional Council on what they are doing, and I hope they are ensuring that they have done their complete due diligence. I would also like to thank the federal government for their contribution to this, and the members of the Public Works Committee for putting this project before this house.

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:23):** Thank you to all those who spoke in support of this really incredible project, which will open Port Pirie up to be a real sporting hub in that area. Thanks to the member for Finnis, the member for Stuart and the member for Frome in his role as the Minister for Regional Development. I recommend this project to the house.

Motion carried.

**ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: ISSUES FACED BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN  
PRIMARY PRODUCERS IN RETAIL SUPPLY**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:23):** I move:

That the 94<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled 'Inquiry into issues faced by South Australian Primary Producers in retail supply', be noted.

In November last year, the Economic and Finance Committee, on a motion from the member for Light and supported unanimously—if my memory serves me correctly—by the committee, resolved to inquire into and report on options for enhancing and supporting South Australian primary producers in competitively supplying local retailers.

The purpose of this inquiry is to ensure the future of local processing and manufacturing in the agricultural, horticultural and viticultural sectors in this state. It is related to and grew out of, in a sense, and certainly is a complement to, our most recent inquiry into the labour hire industry. We heard significant evidence of abuse in the labour hire industry, a lot of it associated with primary producers. We made it clear in one of our recommendations that end beneficiaries of these industries should bear some of the responsibility for the labour hire practices of their source suppliers.

As noted by the Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA, South Australia's agriculture, food, wine and forestry industries account for \$21 billion in exports annually. Given the significance of our state's reliance on primary industries and the vital role local primary producers play in South Australia's economic and social development, the committee has employed an unusual and unique two-limbed approach for this inquiry. This approach serves the purpose of examining the current issues affecting the state's primary producers and enables those affected to steer the committee towards specific areas of interest.

Therefore, in stage 1, the committee sought submissions from interested parties to focus on the issues which require investigation. This issues paper concludes phase 1 of the committee's inquiry process as it summarises the key issues faced by primary producers. The issues paper also contains further details about the inquiry, relevant background information, recent developments made to support primary producers and the effect these developments may have on our primary producing stakeholders.

As part of this initial phase, the committee received 13 written submissions from interested parties. These are now publicly available on the committee's website. These parties included the state's Small Business Commissioner, the ACCC, industry groups, a research institute and individuals. These submissions outlined many relevant issues affecting primary producers in this state, and the committee will first focus on the imbalance of power that exists between local primary producers and retailers in supply chains. This will involve an investigation on the occurrence and effect of unfair contractual dealings, including the existence of lock-in and exclusive contracts between producers and retailers, as well as an analysis of how primary producers can have a better negotiating position through initiatives such as cooperatives and mutuals.

Secondly, the committee will investigate the barriers preventing producers from entering larger supply chains. This will require an analysis of how producers may meet the expectations of larger retailers, including in the areas of availability, quality and pricing requirements. The committee also proposes to investigate how centralised markets may help this process. On this point, the committee also notes that the whole community benefits when consumers purchase local produce; therefore, the inquiry will also focus on whether these benefits are communicated effectively to the public. In doing so, the committee seeks to recognise the impact of programs and campaigns such as I Choose SA and Pick a Local, Pick SA.

The committee also proposes to seek ways in which transparency can be improved in the relevant supply chains. In doing so, the committee will explore how production costs may be reduced or passed along the supply chains and whether there should be minimum prices imposed for certain produce. The committee notes encouraging developments and current investigations aimed at giving a fairer go to producers at a federal level and proposes to review these recent changes to ensure the adequate protection of South Australian primary producers. In doing so, the committee will specifically focus on the potential shortcomings of the federal codes of conduct, namely the

horticulture and grocery codes of conduct, to determine whether any action is required at a South Australian state level.

In transitioning to phase 2 of this inquiry, the committee now seeks additional comments and evidence from interested parties in response to the issues summarised in this issues paper. The committee will hold public hearings and invite interested stakeholders to provide oral evidence. As part of this second phase, the committee also plans to undertake some regional trips, including the Barossa Valley. This inquiry and its unique two-limbed approach gives a valuable opportunity for stakeholders to highlight their issues and concerns about the current structure and operation of our state's agricultural, horticultural and viticultural supply chains. It facilitates an important dialogue amongst interested stakeholders, aggrieved parties and the parliament through the committee.

On behalf of the members of the committee, I express my gratitude to those stakeholders who have provided submissions. I thank the member for Light, who has had a continuing interest in this area. I know he is a strong advocate for the local primary producers in his community. I thank our executive officer, Lisa Baxter, for all her hard work and our research officer for this project, Peta Spyrou, who has done an excellent job putting together the issues paper. With that, I commend the report to the house.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:29):** I rise to speak on the 94<sup>th</sup> report of the Economic and Finance Committee and congratulate it on the work done so far. It does not sound like the task is finished yet. Listening to the member for Little Para, it seems that the inquiry will be ongoing, and in fact is transitioning to phase 2, including some regional trips which I congratulate the committee on. I guess the Barossa Valley is still regional, although it might be outer suburban these days.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr TRELOAR:** Believe me, I know about regional. I think the fact that the committee has been prepared to look into the future of local processing jobs, in particular, and how those workers are treated, first and foremost, as well as the opportunities they have within the agricultural sector is important.

As a former primary producer and one who still has an interest in the production of grains, wool and meat, it is probably fair to say that every so often we, as an industry, like to talk about value-adding opportunities within our sector. It is an issue that is very easy to talk about and it is one that makes us feel very warm and fuzzy inside, but in fact it is very difficult to achieve. I am not exactly sure why that is. It is probably easier to achieve in both horticulture and viticulture than it is in broad scale agriculture but, in the end, we are competing in a world market.

The member for Little Para quite rightly pointed out that if local purchasers are prepared to buy local produce then that contains the supply chain and keeps the costs down, but the reality is that the world of agriculture does not always work like that. In fact, commodities are traded worldwide. What primary producers have done is become far better at producing, and it is about how we manage that product from there on. I do believe that here in South Australia, if you can find opportunities and take opportunities to manufacture and process locally, and put product onto the world market in an improved form, an enhanced form, then our primary producers are better off and we also grow that processing sector.

My thanks go to the member for Light for providing the impetus for this report. I know that within his electorate he has many of those opportunities in front of him. I commend the report.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:32):** I would like to speak briefly to this report, which is, if you like, an issues paper and designed to end phase 1 of this process. However, it is a very important report because it outlines the initial response we have received from the industry in relation to issues that are of concern to its members. That is very important. It is very easy for us in this place to think we know what industries need and what we need to look into, but the parameters for this inquiry have been established by the people directly involved in that industry.

This report is the result of discussions I had with a number of people in my region. I had discussions with people in the viticulture industry who talked about their capacity to sell their product to larger retailers and, basically, their capacity to actually make a profit on their product from the retailers, when the retailers have enormous market power and literally set the prices in that industry.

That was certainly true of the viticulturists, particularly for the smaller producers in the wine industry in my area.

It is also true for people in horticulture. I had a particular market gardener who came to see me and who spoke about the issues he had. I will be careful how I phrase this because one of the things that people in the industry are concerned about is that if they are seen to criticise a retailer there are not many options—if you upset one retailer you only have one left—so they are very hesitant about going public with their concerns.

This particular retailer grows a particular product, and this product has a particular time to be grown. So when contracts are being changed once the seed is in the ground, it means either the producer has to reduce their prices to sell the product off or just allow it to die off not make any profit at all. So, one of the issues is market power in the industry. It is an issue that has been addressed by a number of inquiries, but I do not think we have nailed it down.

We did to some extent in this parliament briefly address the issue of market power. We had a couple of inquiries by the same committee; one looked at franchising law and one looked at farm machinery. Both inquiries led to the Small Business Commissioner Bill—and I will not go into the history of that—which got through parliament and is operating very well.

Under that bill, which was taken through the parliament by the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, there is a head power to create codes of practice. I think that head power is very powerful and very reasonable and one that may be used by a whole range of industries, not only in franchising but in farming. I know it has been used in the motor vehicle industry, etc., and that is something that we may explore. Certainly, the Small Business Commissioner in his initial submission to this inquiry made it very clear that it is an issue that we need to look at and how it may be used to address some of the market power in this industry.

The issue of unfair contracts has also been addressed, in part, by the commonwealth. I also understand the commonwealth is currently looking at legislation which has, if you like, in essence, a chain of responsibility when looking at franchising law. I support that federal government legislation. It is an excellent proposal, and I know that a number of small business industry organisations support it. I also note that the Franchise Council of Australia, in their usual form, oppose it. I have never known the Franchise Council of Australia to support any reform in that industry that takes power away from the major players or franchisors.

*Mr Griffiths interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** The member for Goyder looks at me and says nothing has changed in the sense that we actually—

**Mr Griffiths:** I didn't say that. I reflected upon the discussions—

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Yes, which we had some years ago.

**Mr Griffiths:** Yes.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** That's right, and the Franchise Council of Australia were quite opposed to those changes, too. It was the work we did in this place which also led to some moves in some other states, including Western Australia—and I cannot remember the member's electorate, but his surname is Abetz. I cannot remember his first name, but he was the brother of Senator Abetz who led the charge in Western Australia.

**Mr Whetstone:** Peter.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Peter. Unfortunately, he is not there anymore because he recently lost his seat. It was the action of the states that led to the federal government of the day—and subsequent governments, both Labor and Liberal—making that change. When it comes to franchising the reform, unfortunately both parties have been a bit reluctant to do the right thing at a national level, but what we did there led to changes.

This new round of changes proposed by the government is supported by small business. We support it, but it is opposed by the Franchise Council of Australia whose current spokesperson, I understand, is former Liberal business minister Billson. It is interesting that he was the minister when

he introduced the last reforms and that now he is working for the FCA he opposes these reforms. But that is life, and that happens on both sides of politics—if I am correct in what I heard this morning on the radio from the banking association.

This is a very important inquiry. There is unfinished business from some previous inquiries, and I think the member for Goyder may have been involved in those as well. This is the inquiry we talked about that looked at the supply chain and whether we needed to look at the effectiveness of the supply chain from farm gate to ports.

*Mr Griffiths interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** It must have been some other member.

*Mr Griffiths interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Okay. That was the inquiry that looked at whether the Essential Services Commission of SA should look into better understanding the supply chain. I certainly think that is worth looking at. Unfortunately, the industry has a number of areas where there are very few players, which means that a lot of the market power is held by a small number of people who influence this industry disproportionately. In the end, the people who seem to get the least money out of the industry are the people who grow the stuff, the producers themselves, so we need to look at that.

As I mentioned, there have been a number of changes to the federal codes of conduct recently, and we need to see whether they are working as effectively as they say. I would like to stress that it is very important that in the next phase of this inquiry we get as much feedback on the issues paper itself from people involved in the industry at any level and that we encourage people also to speak to the committee.

In the end, the committee is a bit like a court: it is only as good as the report, or the decision is only as good as the evidence before it. So, I would strongly urge people to make submissions on the issues paper, but also, if the opportunity arises, to make submissions orally to us. I would like to thank all those people so far who have made submissions and the people involved, and I strongly recommend the report to the house.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:40):** In closing, I want to again thank the member for Light for bringing this to the committee, and for pushing along so hard with it, and I also thank all the other members of the committee for their continuing support for this project. Again, I want to thank the staff for an excellent issues paper. It is an interesting approach we have taken this time, and I think it is a really good approach because it allows the people affected by this issue to direct the inquiry so that we get a really good result for them. I want to thank everybody who has made a contribution, including the member for Flinders, and I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: STATE GOVERNMENT OFFICE IN PORT ADELAIDE**

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:41):** I move:

That the 567<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee, entitled 'Workplace fit out at the state government office in Port Adelaide', be noted.

Following an expression of interest, the government has entered into an agreement with EPC Pacific Propriety Limited regarding the construction of a five-storey building in Port Adelaide. The agreement includes the sale of the land at Lot 107 Nile Street, Port Adelaide, by the government to the developer, the private construction and ownership of the new building by the developer and a 15-year lease for the office accommodation and car parks by the government.

The aim of this project is to stimulate and improve activity in the Port Adelaide area by encouraging and supporting its economic and social development. The government is actively participating in the renewal of Port Adelaide by leveraging its ongoing requirement for office accommodation. The government will locate 500 employees to the area in support of the revitalisation strategy for Port Adelaide.

The building itself will incorporate approximately 6,000 square metres of office space over the ground floor and levels 3 to 5; eight secure car parks on the ground floor, with an additional



142 car parks over levels 1 and 2; 40 secure bicycle parks, change facilities, lockers and amenities; and approximately 380 square metres of retail space on the ground floor. The government has committed to leasing the office accommodation and the 150 car park spaces.

The fit-out works for the office accommodation will be integrated into the construction, which will reduce the costs and time frames often experienced with office fit-outs due to reworks and realignment of key infrastructure. As such, the fit-out will be completed by the end of April 2018 in time for the building to be handed over by the developer to the government for occupation in May. The cost of the fit-out has been provided to the committee in confidence, as the contract for this work is still to be tendered and there is concern that the release of this information may affect the bids received for the work.

I would like to thank my fellow committee members for considering the project and for the bipartisan support—the members for Colton, Torrens, Finniss and Unley—and also committee staff for their assistance and those who came to present to the committee. Given this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:43):** This was somewhat of an interesting project that came before the Public Works Committee. This government does not seem to be able to get it right at Port Adelaide. When I was a lad going to boarding school, I used to travel on the *Troubridge*, which used to come in and up to port, and it was full of hustle and bustle. There was shipping everywhere and people everywhere and the place was abuzz.

Along came containerisation and the wharves disappeared at a great rate, and then Kevin Foley, Mike Rann and Co. decided that they were going to reinvent Port Adelaide and shut down shipyards like Searles. They were going to put in all this housing around the port, around Birkenhead Bridge and south of that, but that struggled.

The government just does not seem to know what to do with Port Adelaide. They do not seem to be able to get it right. You cannot reinvent something that cannot be reinvented, quite frankly. This project in itself is going to create some interesting scenarios because, in essence, they want to shift hundreds of public servants out of the city to Port Adelaide. I am not quite sure what the public servants are going to think about that.

I suspect that if they live in the city or the surrounding suburbs close to the city, and they use public transport (or whatever other means) to get into the city and they are here in five or 10 minutes, they are not going to take it all that graciously when they are told that they have to move to Port Adelaide to work. I think that is going to be something of a debacle for them. That is yet to unfold, of course. The actual concrete, bricks and steel, etc., that go into the project are all fine, and the fit-out is highly expensive and will look great, but they have to get the people down there to work.

What sorts of incentives are they going to provide to public servants to move to Port Adelaide? It would be very hard to find out from this government—they are not very transparent, quite frankly—but, in due course, it will open. It will have people running around, beavering away doing what they have to do, but it raises the bigger issue of how on earth they are going to reinvigorate Port Adelaide. To my way of thinking, Port Adelaide people, people from Lefevre Peninsula and that area, are traditionally proud people. They are working people, but they have had their heart ripped out by losing what they had at Port Adelaide, in my view, which is all very sad. Some would say that that is progress, and that may well be the case as well.

Of course we supported this project. We were not going to reject it and put in a minority report. We asked many questions on it and, by and large, we got answers, but I think what the parliament needs to do is watch over this project over the next couple of years. I will not be here, of course, in another few months, but they need to watch to see how it goes, how they go getting people down there to work and how successful and viable this project is in the longer run. We supported the project. With those few words, I will resume my seat.

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:47):** Thank you, member for Finniss, for your supportive words and your bipartisan support. With that, I commend this report to the house.

Motion carried.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MODBURY HOSPITAL TRANSFORMING HEALTH PROJECT**

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 530<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Modbury Hospital Transforming Health Project, be noted.

(Continued from 14 October 2015.)

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:48):** My, how things have changed since the last time I spoke on this motion on 14 October 2015. Unfortunately, I may not get to finish my remarks today. As I was cut off at that untimely moment over a year ago, I was winding up to talk to you about the services being provided at the Modbury Hospital emergency department. I had just recounted the story of how my son had had a stroke, and the department was busy and they told me to give him an aspirin. The corollary to that story is that, as a parent who had some inside feeling that the right place to be was the Women's and Children's Hospital, that is where I took my son. Of course, he has had really good care and recovered completely and leads a normal and full life now.

The purpose of my mentioning that particular case was to illustrate to people that, with the health system the way it is going to be, unless we educate people on how to understand where the services are going to be and how best to access the services they need, the whole Transforming Health program, project, transformation is not going to work as well as we need it to. All of it hinges, I believe, on a universal emergency ambulance subscription scheme, which is something I am going to work really hard on in the next few months. I will push home the importance of such a system as hard as I can.

**Mr Pengilly:** I would be surprised if you didn't.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Yes, and I would be looking at you to help me, member for Finnis. We know that the Ambulance Service has been substantially strengthened by this Labor government, for which I commend them, but we also know that there are some significant problems with the Ambulance Service.

Perhaps today I will not go into that quite as much as I will in future, but it is important for everyone to understand that the Ambulance Service must be resourced properly so that care can come to you as quickly as you need it. We know that 60 per cent of people drive themselves to hospital while they are having their emergency, which is clearly not good for anybody, neither themselves nor the people on the roads with them. We need to make sure that the Ambulance Service is working as well as it possibly can and that it is resourced as much as it needs to be.

The other point I will make around the Modbury Hospital is the improvement we will see from the 24/7 coverage of orthopaedics through Transforming Health changes. Neither the Modbury Hospital nor the Lyell McEwin Hospital had 24/7 coverage of orthopaedics. This will now be in existence at the Lyell McEwin health service. It will be really important that people from the Modbury area and farther afield into Ingle Farm and Pooraka actually understand that those services will be available for them at the Lyell McEwin health service.

One matter that was brought up in the first question I asked the Minister for Health in my new role as an Independent for the area was around the emergency department services at Modbury Hospital. He did say in his answer, when I asked my supplementary—you will find it if you go back to the *Hansard* of April—that the emergency department needs to have access to long stay, acute care beds. Without those acute care beds at the Modbury Hospital, the transferring of people backwards and forwards to the Lyell McEwin will only increase. We need to see that we can look after people who just need that one extra day of care rather than moving them between hospitals. This is another area we will have to really focus on if we are to make Transforming Health work as well as it can.

The other issue I need to bring up is another personal experience, which I touched on briefly previously, which was my overnight visit to the emergency section of the Modbury Hospital to have something removed from my eye. Because I was not bleeding, I was sent to wait in the corner, which was fine, but the damage being done to my eyeball by a piece of stone in my eyelid was almost as catastrophic as bleeding to death on the floor. If I had lost my eye, I would have been very unimpressed. I know our nurses are working as best they can, but we need to have a bit of a think

about how we triage at hospitals and make sure that it is working really well for people when they arrive.

Another thing that I found most disconcerting was that, for my four-hour stay between midnight and 4am, I had a parking fee. As members would know, in the past I advocated very strongly in this place for the first three hours free, but I was only able to achieve the first two hours free. However, I still do not understand why we need to be charging people, particularly in the car park that we own, for car parking between midnight and, say, 6am. That is another thing that I will be pursuing, and I look forward to assistance from my new chums on my right.

Again, in terms of the history of the Modbury Hospital, members need to understand that I have been there from almost the very beginning. Unfortunately, I was not able to keep birthing services at the Modbury Hospital. We have an excellent birthing service at the Lyell McEwin, but that is not the point of the story. The point of the story is that the doctors could not guarantee epidurals at all hours of the day and night at Modbury Hospital so, with that in mind, we had to transfer everything to the Lyell McEwin.

I will also talk later on about extending the wonderful Mother Carer service. I am sure you know about that, member for Little Para. It is an absolutely amazing service. That needs to be extended, increased and provided at other sites. There will be a lot more said about birthing in this place before the end of the year. I look forward to working cooperatively with members on all sides of the house and the crossbenches as we look at that.

The really good thing that we have to understand is the rehabilitation service that has opened at the Modbury Hospital. Everyone was really pleased to be able to have a look through at the services, which are amazing. Everything that is new is wonderful, of course. It was not possible for everyone in the north-east to get through on the open days, so I will see what I can do about trying to make sure that another couple of tours go through the place because several of the older members of our area missed out on seeing it and are quite excited to know that those services will be closer to their homes. This is another really good part about Transforming Health: making sure that the people of the north and north-east have those services close by.

The rehab service brings to light that there is a large proportion of people over 60 in my area—at least 38 per cent, as far as I know—which means that representation for the over 60s in this place becomes a much more important fact. I am sure that that message will not be lost on very many people in the chamber here today.

To recap, we have new services at Modbury Hospital and increased services at Modbury Hospital, but different services. That is the sort of point we need to drive home so that people understand the services available close to them in their general hospitals. We then need people to understand where their closest major hospital is. Particularly in the crossover between the old RAH and the new RAH, we are going to need to make sure that people use the major hospital closest to them.

I have been through the Lyell McEwin health service a couple of times recently. Most people do not realise that it has changed completely from the time it was a Nissen hut in a paddock. It is a huge complex now, and millions of dollars have been poured into making sure that it is a great facility. I will add two notes of caution. In his response in April, the minister did also say that the emergency department at the Lyell McEwin needed some attention, inasmuch as it is working very hard, but that it may need not only some extra facilities but also extra staff.

Parking at the Lyell McEwin health service remains a contentious and very important issue for people. The car park is six or seven storeys high. The car park is not owned by the government; it is privately owned. There must be some way, though, that we can put some pressure on to make sure that people are able to park safely in a secure car park, particularly between the hours of midnight and 6 am when there is not going to be a call for parking anywhere else.

While commending Transforming Health to people, I do strike a couple of notes of caution. As I said, I look forward to informing the house in the next few sitting weeks of the really important things that I think need to be done, particularly around the access to a universal emergency ambulance scheme in South Australia, as exists in other states already.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:57):** The 530<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee, noting the Modbury Hospital Transforming Health project, seems such a distant memory. The focus of the project was the establishment of additional rehabilitation capacity, which I think commenced more than 18 months ago. There will be a new ambulatory rehabilitation centre, inclusive of a gymnasium and a hydrotherapy pool, with the same dimensions as those in Flinders and The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

During the hearing, we were told that the hydro pool facilities were a vital ingredient in the north because the local community had been undersupplied with rehab capacity. I reiterate what the member for Florey just commented on because there is still more to be done out there. We know that Transforming Health does have some deficiencies. There are some hospitals and care facilities that are going to miss out for the sake of propping up the NRAH in the city.

We were told a number of things during the hearing, that there would be 54 rehab beds and a new ambulatory centre. The total cost of the project was \$32 million, GST exclusive. I asked a number of questions, such as whether the emergency department at the hospital would be open 24/7 and whether the project would address local concerns that patients will be delivered past Modbury if there are life-threatening issues.

Professor Keefe did answer some of these questions, but there was a lot of mist around what she actually meant when we asked what services Modbury would provide, what it would not provide and how many people, and under what circumstances, would bypass Modbury Hospital for the Lyell McEwin and, in some cases, farther afield. As I said, Modbury Hospital has had significant work done on it and the rehab centre has been upgraded. I commend the report to the house.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:59):** I rise to support the motion to note the report, and I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### *Bills*

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL POLICING INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND SERVICES) 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) (12:00):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Children's Protection Act 1993; the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007; the Disability Services Act 1993; the Spent Convictions Act 2009; and for other purposes. 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) (12:01):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The commonwealth merged CrimTrac and the Australian Crime Commission on 1 July 2016. The new merged body commenced operation on 1 July 2016. The new body is known as the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission (though legally it is the Australian Crime Commission). The merger resulted in a new scheme for the use and exchange of policing information between Australian jurisdictions. This new scheme also commenced operation on 1 July 2016.

The Statutes Amendment (National Policing Information Systems and Services) Bill 2017 makes consequential amendments to several acts to update references to the newly merged agency and reflect the new scheme for the use and exchange of policing information. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Bill amends the *Children's Protection Act 1993*, the *Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007*, the *Disability Services Act 1993* and the *Spent Convictions Act 2003*. The Bill is technical in nature.

The Government is keen to facilitate the exchange of policing information between jurisdictions. There is an obvious need in a modern context for the accurate, swift and effective exchange of policing information between Australian law enforcement and other agencies, notably in situations such as terrorism, serious and organised crime, domestic violence and child protection.

CrimTrac was established under an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the Commonwealth, States and Territories. A new IGA now exists to support the merger and reflect the changed agency arrangements and the new regime to share policing information. South Australia has signed this new IGA.

CrimTrac was a partnership between State, Territory and Commonwealth police forces. It provided police (and other agencies); whether frontline staff, investigators, intelligence or undertaking other functions, with information sharing services. While the majority of CrimTrac systems were available to most police, some of CrimTrac's systems (such as relating to child exploitation material) were restricted to specialist investigators and forensic specialists. CrimTrac had a transactional focus. CrimTrac supported police agencies to input, export and share data. Additionally, CrimTrac built and hosted systems such as the National Automated Fingerprint Identification System, National Child Offender System, National Investigative DNA Database, the Australian Cybercrime Online Reporting Network, the Australian Ballistic Identification Network and the Child Exploitation System which provide operational capability to State, Territory and Commonwealth law enforcement agencies. The new post 1 July 2016 scheme largely replicates the previous scheme.

The merger, though a Commonwealth operational issue, raised other implications for South Australia, notably in the new scheme for the exchange of policing information. As an interim solution in South Australia, the *Disability Services (Assessment of Relevant History) Variation Regulations 2016* and the *Children's Protection Variation Regulations 2016* came into operation on 1 July 2016. These Regulations ensured South Australia's continued unimpeded short term involvement in the national policing information scheme after the merger.

The purpose of the merger is to support operational effectiveness and enhance law enforcement and national security benefits and the provision of timely, accurate and cogent information to law enforcement and other agencies. The Commonwealth has summarised the benefits as:

'having a unified resource would enrich the national understanding of criminal activity, including volume crimes (such as domestic violence) and serious and organised crime and terrorism. The merger of the agencies would improve the quality, access and timeliness of intelligence provided to law enforcement and intelligence agencies and would allow police, justice agencies and policy makers at all levels of government to adopt a more effective, efficient and evidence-based response to crime.'

The use and benefits of the information scheme extends beyond law enforcement to supporting the State's legislative child safe and disability environment provisions as a broad range of both government and non-government organisations that provide services to children and certain persons with disability must ensure that a relevant history assessment is conducted for any person who will be performing a prescribed function.

The Statutes Amendment (National Policing Information Systems and Services) Bill 2017 supports the new scheme for the swift, accurate and effective exchange of policing information between Australian jurisdictions.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Children's Protection Act 1993*

###### 3—Amendment of section 8BA—Obligations of certain performers of prescribed functions in respect of relevant history

This clause amends section 8BA to update the reference to CrimTrac to the Australian Crime Commission (the ACC) established under the *Australian Crime Commission Act 2002* of the Commonwealth.

##### Part 3—Amendment of *Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007*

###### 4—Amendment of section 41—Commissioner may maintain DNA database system

This clause amends section 41 to update references to CrimTrac to the Australian Crime Commission (the ACC) established under the *Australian Crime Commission Act 2002* of the Commonwealth.

##### Part 4—Amendment of *Disability Services Act 1993*

5—Amendment of section 5C—Obligations of certain performers of prescribed functions in respect of relevant history

This clause amends section 5C to update the reference to CrimTrac to the Australian Crime Commission (the ACC) established under the *Australian Crime Commission Act 2002* of the Commonwealth.

Part 5—Amendment of *Spent Convictions Act 2009*

6—Amendment of section 3—Preliminary

This clause deletes the reference to the CrimTrac Agency that is listed in the definition of *justice agency* for the purposes of the Act.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Preliminary

This clause provides a definition of CrimTrac for the purposes of the transitional provisions in clauses 2 and 3.

2—Transitional provision—*Children's Protection Act 1993*

This clause provides that a criminal history report prepared by CrimTrac or a CrimTrac accredited agency or broker will, for the purposes of section 8BA of the *Children's Protection Act 1993* as in force after the commencement of Part 2 of this Act, be taken to be a criminal history report prepared by the ACC.

3—Transitional provision—*Disability Services Act 1993*

This clause provides that a criminal history report prepared by CrimTrac or a CrimTrac accredited agency or broker will, for the purposes of section 5C of the *Disability Services Act 1993* as in force after the commencement of Part 4 of this Act, be taken to be a criminal history report prepared by the ACC.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

## SUMMARY PROCEDURE (SERVICE) AMENDMENT BILL

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:02):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Summary Procedure Act 1921; and to make related amendments to the Electronic Communications Act 2000. Read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:02):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I am introducing the Summary Procedure (Service) Amendment Bill 2017. The purpose of this bill is to amend the Summary Procedure Act 1921 to achieve efficiencies in the criminal justice sector by facilitating greater use of electronic communications in relation to documents required for court proceedings and introducing other efficiencies related to the service of documents. This bill will have a positive impact on the community and those within the criminal justice sector. It will remove barriers and facilitate the greater use of electronic communications. Information will be able to be provided in a more timely manner, and it will contribute to a more efficient use of resources. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

The Bill has been drafted on the basis that it is to commence after the Summary Procedure (Abolition of Complaints) Amendment Act 2016 and Part 8 of the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify) Act 2017.

The provisions of the Act are invoked whenever a criminal prosecution is commenced in the State. At different stages of proceedings, the Act requires the filing in Court and the exchange by the parties of a number of documents. This includes the provision by the prosecution, under section 104 of the Act, of a brief of documents to the defence prior to a committal hearing.

The Bill seeks to be proactive and amend the Act generally in anticipation of current and future efficiency initiatives that would rely on electronic communications. As technology has become an integral part of everyday life, it is important that the criminal justice system be able to keep pace with the use of technology, and take advantage of the efficiencies that technology allows. There is clear public value in the criminal justice system being efficient whilst also preventing disadvantage to those without ready access to electronic methods of communication. The proposed amendments in the Bill would have the effect that general provisions in the Act for the serving or giving of documents and other material would allow electronic methods to be used, providing the method chosen is one that is readily accessible to the recipient and the document is able to be printed by them. Exclusions from particular methods of delivery, if any, are to be provided in an Act, regulations or Magistrates Court rules.

The reforms in the Bill are required to facilitate current projects being developed by the Government. One such project is to provide an electronic process for provision of committal documents to the defence under section 104 of the Act as a resource-saving alternative to SAPOL providing often voluminous hardcopies of documents to the defence.

The major provision of the Bill is the amendment of section 27 of the Act. The amending clauses are lengthy and technical. Briefly, their effect is that, subject to an Act, regulations or Court rules, any document to be given to a person (including a prosecution brief to be given to the defence under section 104 in respect of committal proceedings) can be:

1. given to the person personally;
2. left at or posted to the person's last known residential or business address, or if a body corporate, its registered address;
3. sent to a fax number or email address provided for the purpose of the particular proceedings by the person or their legal representative;
4. made available to the person by other electronic means, including:
  - a. sending the document to an Internet address provided for the purpose by the person or their legal representative; or
  - b. sending to an email address provided by the person or their legal representative a link to an Internet address from which the document may be accessed or downloaded; or
  - c. by means of a data storage device from which the document can be accessed or downloaded;
  - d. other means that may be prescribed in regulations or rules.

It will only be possible to give a document by fax, email or other electronic means if it has been previously ascertained that the intended recipient will be readily able to access or download (and if necessary print) the document. The requirement that the person must be able to access or download the document, and print if required, protects those persons who do not have ready internet access, or who may have access to the documents, but would not be able to print them for use, or who are unrepresented. This aspect of the Bill is modelled on similar provisions in the *Electronic Transactions (Legal Proceedings) Amendment Act 2017*.

Related amendments are made to the *Electronic Communications Act 2000* (currently the *Electronic Transactions Act 2000*) to change the word 'dispatch' to 'transmission' in respect of electronic communications. This aligns with language used in new section 27.

The Bill also amends section 57A of the Act to permit the defendant or their counsel to file in the Magistrates Court a guilty plea by an online process. However, they will continue to be able to file a guilty plea in writing under section 57A, should they choose.

Consequential amendments are made to other provisions of the Act to support the changes to sections 27 and 57A.

Other amendments made by the Bill are consistent with the aim to produce efficiencies in Court proceedings. Section 22 is amended by the Bill to change its current prescriptive terms and permit the Magistrates Court to make rules to provide for summonses for the appearance of defendants. The rules will enable the Court to stipulate, among other things, the form that a summons is to take, its contents, who may issue the summons and the manner in which the summons is to be given to the defendant. Consequential amendments are made to section 57. These amendments are intended to facilitate a project being developed by SAPOL and the Magistrates Court for SAPOL to be able to issue and serve a summons at the point where an alleged offender is detected and reported for an offence. It will no longer be necessary in these cases for SAPOL to obtain a summons issued by the Court, which may occur considerably later, and then attempt to locate the alleged offender to serve them with the summons.

At the request of the Chief Magistrate, amendments were inserted in the Bill to sections 27C, 62B and 62C of the Act, as well as other consequential amendments. Sections 27C, 62B and 62C deal with the powers of the Magistrates Court to sentence a person who has been convicted, or has pleaded guilty, but is not currently before the Court. Currently, under these provisions, there are certain penalties that the Court cannot impose in the defendant's

absence, including disqualifying the defendant from holding a driver's licence, and under section 27C the Court cannot take unproven prior convictions into account, without the Court first adjourning the hearing to permit the defendant to be served with a notice. The amendments inserted would permit the Court to avoid having to adjourn the proceedings if the defendant had been previously personally served with a summons that contains information as to the consequences that may follow if the defendant is convicted of the relevant charge, and consequential amendments are made to section 22 to facilitate this.

This measure will introduce efficiencies in the Court without prejudicing a defendant who is not before the Court during sentencing.

The Bill also amends the Act to enable the Magistrates Court, where proceeding in a defendant's absence under section 27C of the Act, to order payment of compensation if SAPOL have specified the amount of compensation sought in the information served on the defendant.

An amendment is made to section 99E of the Act, which is a provision regarding service of paedophile restraining orders and child protection restraining orders made by the Magistrates Court under sections 99AA and 99AAC. Under section 99E, these restraining orders must currently be served personally on the defendant in order to be binding. Under the proposed amendment, where reasonable efforts to effect personal service of the restraining order have failed, the Court can order service in such other manner as it thinks fit. Also, if the order as amended or varied is more favourable to the defendant, the Court may declare that the amendment or variation is to be binding on the defendant as from the day of the declaration or such other day as the Court specifies. These proposed amendments align section 99E with similar provisions in section 81 of the Act regarding non-association and place restriction orders. A further amendment to section 99E aligns section 99E with as yet uncommenced provisions of the *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009* and deems a restraining order to be served if the defendant were present in Court when the order was made.

The opportunity has also been taken to amend sections 99A, 99AAC, 99C, 99G and 99J relating to paedophile restraining orders and child protection restraining orders so that they may be commenced by the making of an application to the Magistrates Court rather than the laying of an information. These amendments are technical only and do not alter the operation of the provisions.

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 *Summary Procedure Act 1921*

###### 4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

It is proposed to amend this section to insert a new subsection that provides that, subject to the rules of the Magistrates Court, for the purposes of the principal Act—

- a reference to a summons, notice or other document, or documentary material, being served personally includes service by means described in section 27(1)(a) and (b); and
- a reference to a summons, notice or other document, or documentary material, being served by post includes service by means described in section 27(1)(c), (d) and (e).

###### 5—Substitution of section 22

It is proposed to repeal section 22 and replace it with a new section (Rules in respect of summonses) that provides that the Magistrates Court may make rules to provide for summonses for the appearance of defendants.

###### 6—Substitution of sections 27 and 27A

Sections 27 and 27A are to be repealed and replaced with a new section 27.

###### 27—Service

The substituted section 27 provides for the means by which a summons, notice or other document required or authorised to be issued, given or sent to, or served on, a person may be served, including by being given personally or by post to the person or, in the case of particular proceedings, by various electronic means.



## 7—Substitution of sections 27B and 27C

As a consequence of proposed new section 27, current sections 27B and 27C are to be repealed and substituted.

## 27B—Hearing on a written plea of guilty

New section 27B provides that, if an information and summons in the form required by the rules under section 57A is served on the defendant named in the summons in accordance with the rules and the defendant fails to appear in obedience to the summons but pleads guilty in writing to the offence to which that summons relates, the Magistrates Court may proceed to deal with the matter in the manner provided by sections 62B and 62C.

## 27C—Hearing if defendant fails to appear

New section 27C provides that, subject to the section, if a summons is served in accordance with section 27 on the defendant named in the summons and either the defendant fails to appear in obedience to the summons or the defendant fails to plead guilty in the manner provided for under section 57A to the offence to which the summons relates. In that situation, the Magistrates Court may proceed in the absence of the defendant to the hearing of the information to which the summons relates (and, despite section 62C, adjudicate the matter as if the defendant had personally appeared in obedience to the summons) or order that the information be heard in the absence of the defendant and adjourn the hearing (and, on the adjourned hearing, proceed in the manner provided for in paragraph (c) of subsection (1)).

On conviction after a hearing under subsection (1), the Magistrates Court must not—

- (a) impose any penalty other than a fine; or
- (b) disqualify the defendant from holding or obtaining a licence to drive a motor vehicle; or
- (c) treat the offence as other than a first offence unless the informant proves that the defendant has previously been convicted of such an offence; or
- (d) make an order for payment of compensation of an amount that exceeds an amount specified in the information,

unless—

- (e) the summons was given personally to the defendant; or
- (f) —
  - (i) the Court has first adjourned the hearing of the information to a specified time and place; and
  - (ii) the defendant is personally served, not less than 14 days before the time to which the hearing has been adjourned, with a notice informing the defendant of—(A)the conviction; and(B)the time and place to which the hearing has been adjourned; and(C)the provisions of section 76A; and
  - (iii) the defendant does not, within 14 days after the date of service of the notice on the defendant, apply in accordance with section 76A, for an order setting aside the conviction.

## 8—Amendment of section 57—Issue of summons by Magistrates Court

The proposed amendments to this section 57 are consequential on the changes proposed by new section 22 which will allow for the Magistrates Court rules to provide for the manner in which and by whom a summons may be issued.

## 9—Substitution of section 57A

It is proposed to repeal current section 57A and substitute a new section.

## 57A—Rules may make provision for written guilty pleas

New section 57A provides that the Magistrates Court may make rules to provide for a person against whom an information has been laid for an offence that is not punishable by imprisonment (either for a first or subsequent offence) to elect to plead guilty to the offence without appearing in the Court in obedience to a summons.

A defendant who returns a form in which the defendant pleads guilty in accordance with the rules need not attend the Court as directed by the summons.

If a defendant who has been served with forms of information and summons in accordance with the rules fails to return a form pleading guilty in accordance with the rules, and fails to appear in obedience to

the summons, the Court may, subject to section 62B, proceed to exercise its powers under section 62(1)(a) or (b).

This section does not apply in relation to a defendant who is a child within the meaning of the *Young Offenders Act 1993* except where the defendant—

- (a) is of or above the age of 16 years; and
- (b) is charged with an offence under the *Road Traffic Act 1961*.

#### 10—Substitution of sections 62B, 62BA and 62C

It is proposed to repeal current sections 62B, 62BA and 62C and substitute new sections.

##### 62B—Powers of Magistrates Court on written plea of guilty

New section 62B sets out the powers of the Magistrates Court that apply when a defendant fails to appear in obedience to a summons but has given the Court, in the manner and form prescribed by the rules made under section 57A, a form pleading guilty.

##### 62BA—Proceedings where defendant neither appears nor returns written plea of guilty

New section 62BA sets out how the Magistrates Court may proceed if, in any proceedings under the Act—

- (a) an information has been laid against a defendant; and
- (b) the defendant has been duly served with a summons but—
  - (i) does not appear at the time and place appointed for the hearing or determination of the information or at a time and place at which the information is subsequently heard or determined; or
  - (ii) in the case of an information and summons served under section 57A—the defendant neither appears nor pleads guilty in the manner provided under that section.

The section provides that the Court may proceed to adjudicate on the information in the absence of the defendant in accordance with current section 62, and in so doing regard any allegation contained in the summons, or information and summons, (as served on the defendant) as sufficient evidence of the matter alleged.

##### 62C—Proceedings in absence of defendant

New section 62C sets out the powers of the Magistrates Court where a defendant fails to appear in obedience to a summons and is convicted (whether on a plea of guilty under section 57A or after a hearing in the defendant's absence).

#### 11—Amendment of section 99AA—Paedophile restraining orders

#### 12—Amendment of section 99AAC—Child protection restraining orders

#### 13—Amendment of section 99C—Issue of restraining order in absence of defendant

All of the amendments proposed to sections 99AA, 99AAC and 99C are of a technical nature only and relate to, or are consequential on, the commencement of proceedings to obtain from the Magistrates Court a restraining order by making of an application to the Court rather than by laying an information before the Court.

#### 14—Substitution of section 99E

##### 99E—Service

The amendments proposed in new section 99E in relation to service of a restraining order on a defendant are consistent with changes proposed to be made in relation to the service of intervention orders under the *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009* and will deem that service on a defendant occurs if—

- (a) the order is served on the defendant personally; or
- (b) the order is served on the defendant in some other manner authorised by the Magistrates Court; or
- (c) the defendant is present in the Magistrates Court when the order is made, amended or varied (as the case requires).

#### 15—Amendment of section 99G—Notification of making etc of restraining orders

16—Amendment of section 99J—Applications by or on behalf of child

The amendments proposed to sections 99G and 99J are of a technical nature only and relate to, or are consequential on, the commencement of proceedings to obtain from the Magistrates Court a restraining order by making of an application to the Court rather than by laying an information before the Court.

17—Amendment of section 104—Preliminary examination of charges of indictable offences

These proposed amendments are consequential.

Schedule 1—Related amendments to *Electronic Communications Act 2000*

1—Amendment of section 4—Simplified outline

2—Amendment of section 13—Time of transmission

3—Amendment of section 13B—Place of transmission and receipt

Each of the amendments proposed in Schedule 1 will substitute 'transmitted' or 'transmission' for 'dispatched' or 'dispatch', consistent with the amendments proposed to the *Summary Procedure Act 1921* in Part 2 of the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

## SUPPLY BILL 2017

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 May 2017.)

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (12:04):** It is my pleasure to rise and speak on the Supply Bill. Before I address all the detail that I would like to on the Supply Bill, I will make some comments because last night, of course, the national Treasurer handed down the federal budget in the federal parliament.

I think, by and large, commentators on the national scheme have given this the tick of approval. It has provided some much-needed certainty in many areas, increased funding in terms of education and greater certainty with regard to how that funding is dispersed in a very logical and orderly way nationally. We see greater certainty provided in terms of health funding going forward and I think, very importantly, we see a resolution of the NDIS unfunded liability.

The NDIS, to be fair, is something that was put forward by the federal Labor prime minister of the time, but it received from day one strong bipartisan support. I think all Australians recognise that we need to do all that we can to provide support for those people who are living with a disability in our community. One of the things that I think has concerned this sector for a long period of time is that funding uncertainty. That funding uncertainty was removed with the federal budget that was brought down last night. I would like to commend the Treasurer and the Prime Minister for making sure that the NDIS will be fully funded and will support those people living with a disability in our community.

So there are lots of good things, no real surprises, and certainty for Australia. Yet, what do we hear from those opposite in this chamber? They could not wait to get out on the airwaves last night, on Twitter, talking to the trolls and telling them that this was a disaster for South Australia. In fact, they say that there was not one single solitary thing in this budget for the people of South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much noise on both sides. People will be warned, which means question time will be very tricky for you. The leader is entitled to be heard in silence. I cannot hear him over your noise. The leader.

**Mr MARSHALL:** This is a government—

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurna.

**Mr MARSHALL:** —that is completely unable to manage the economy in any useful way whatsoever and turns its attention to blaming everybody other than themselves and not taking responsibility. This is a theme of this government: never wanting to take responsibility for the situation that they have inflicted upon the people of South Australia. For them to come out today and say that they have had no support from the federal government means that they are dishonest, delusional or completely negligent—or all three. Let me provide—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order on my left!

**Mr MARSHALL:** Let me provide you with the evidence of this. When this current Premier came into this most important office in South Australia, this state government was receiving in the order of \$8.2 billion from the federal government—\$8.2 billion back in 2012. We are not even five years down the track and what are we getting from the federal government? It is \$10.5 billion—from \$8.2 billion up to \$10.5 billion—so another \$2.3 billion worth of commonwealth money is coming into the coffers in South Australia.

In fact, we have become more and more reliant on federal government money coming into South Australia since this Premier has been occupying that seat. In fact, 55 per cent—a staggering 55 per cent—of the entire South Australian budget is now coming from the commonwealth government. That is because this government has failed to grow our economy and failed to grow our state revenue, and we are becoming more and more dependent on the commonwealth. Shame on this government, shame on this Premier and shame on this Treasurer.

A staggering \$10.6 billion in total payments will come into South Australia in terms of health, education, infrastructure and industry support. The Premier and the Treasurer are out there saying, 'Nothing for South Australia.' I do not know whether they are having trouble reading on that side of the house, but I would like to help them out because I think that there are many things which ought to be brought to the attention of this house.

First of all, amongst those, I would like to commend the federal health minister, the Hon. Greg Hunt, for his support for the new proton beam therapy infrastructure or facility in South Australia. This is going to be the only facility of its kind in the entire nation, and it is going to be put here in South Australia. This is a great vote of confidence in our medical and research sectors in South Australia, and we say thank you very much to Greg Hunt for that \$68 million investment in our infrastructure.

When minister Hunt was the minister for industry, science and innovation, we spoke to him. We spoke to him about this opportunity, this new proton therapy facility for South Australia. He was the minister for industry, science and innovation at the time and he said that he would make representations to the then minister for health, minister Ley. Of course, several months later, he became the Minister for Health and we reminded him of his great interest in the proton therapy facility for South Australia and it did not take very long for him to say, 'Yes, we want to invest in it, and we want to invest in it here in South Australia.' So, thank you very much to him.

There is a \$110 million equity commitment to build solar thermal storage in Port Augusta. Again, this is a great vote of confidence by the federal government in the work of the member for Stuart, who has advocated on behalf of the people of Stuart and, quite frankly, on behalf of the people of South Australia since 2012, I think, when he set up in this parliament the select committee looking at the viability of establishing a solar thermal facility in Port Augusta. We thank minister Frydenberg, the Prime Minister and minister Morrison, the federal Treasurer, for their commitment of \$110 million worth of equity to go into that plant.

In particular, when we talk about that plant, I would also like to acknowledge the great work of the federal member for Grey, Rowan Ramsey. He understands more than most the problems that the people of his electorate are experiencing because of this government's hopeless mismanagement of energy in this state. We have the highest cost and least reliable energy in the nation. We have a government coming up with spurious plans—well publicised, I will admit that: well publicised because they are spending our taxpayers' money telling people about their spurious plans, but they are no good.

Rowan Ramsey has been rolling up his sleeves and doing the hard work advocating on behalf of this project. In addition to that money, minister Frydenberg has provided a further \$36.6 million to be made available to support investment in other energy infrastructure projects here in South Australia. I had the opportunity last week of again advocating to Arthur Sinodinos about how we can support industry in South Australia.

Labor has left our industry on the mat with little support for an extended period of time. Minister Sinodinos said to me, 'You're not going to have to wait very long, and we know why—because in the federal budget brought down in the House of Representatives in the Australian parliament last night we saw another \$100 million to be put into an advanced manufacturing fund to help our businesses in South Australia transition.

Of course, Labor talk about it; they have their own transition fund. I think there is more than \$10 million sitting in that fund, unspent because this government prefers to sit on his hands rather than roll up its sleeves and do the work to support employers in South Australia. In fact, recently the Premier very famously referred to the hardworking people in the small business sector of South Australia as the 'employer class'—as if we have a class system in South Australia: those people who want to put their private capital on the line to provide employment, and those people who do not. Let me ask you: where would we be in South Australia without the small business sector, without those people willing to take a risk to employ people in South Australia? It would be an absolute mess.

I would also like to highlight some of the excellent investments in important road projects that the federal government continues to make in South Australia. What we see for the next financial year is a commitment for almost \$200 million on the Darlington interchange project, more than \$100 million on the Torrens to Torrens project, and another \$233.8 million to be spent by the commonwealth next financial year on the Northern Connector project, a very important project for the people of South Australia.

Deputy Speaker, I know that you will be interested, because of your longstanding interest for the people on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara lands, that the commonwealth is again providing further support to improve the roads on the APY lands. In fact, next financial year another \$23.8 million of commonwealth money is going into improving roads. We know that if you improve roads, you improve the productivity and you increase the opportunity for people to have meaningful employment on the APY lands, and that is good for everybody.

One of my favourite parts of last night's budget was something that I, personally, have been arguing for—and I know that many people on this side of the parliament have been arguing for for a long period of time—namely, the return of the supplementary road payment to the people of South Australia. On this point, I would particularly like to pay tribute to the member for Goyder, who has done a lot of work. He came from the local government sector before coming to this place; he knows how important that supplementary road payment is for the local government sector, especially for those in regional South Australia.

The federal government had this wrong. They have admitted that they had it wrong, and we are now seeing another \$40 million going into the supplementary road payments for local government in South Australia—great work by the member for Goyder, and thank you very much to all the people in this place who advocated strongly for that.

I have the portfolio responsibility of looking after our veterans' community in South Australia as shadow minister for veterans' affairs in South Australia. When I came to this portfolio in January this year, I immediately set about talking to veterans about their priorities. Many of their priorities they needed to see addressed at the federal level. I made those representations to the Hon. Dan Tehan, and I am delighted with the package of measures that Dan Tehan has included in this budget: faster processing of claims and a significant amount of new money to accelerate the processing of claims for veterans; an expansion of the eligibility for people to access that federal government support from the Department of Veterans' Affairs, which is very important; and, I think most importantly, we see a real commitment with real dollars to finally address the issue of PTSD.

Our veterans have put their lives on the line to protect our freedom. Many people have lost their lives to protect our freedom. Many people have come back from the work they have done protecting our freedom here in Australia with shocking physical and mental consequences. It is

outstanding that the federal government has recognised that we need to do much more in this area, and I commend the fighting that Dan Tehan has done for better money to support veterans who have returned with some of these mental scars that many of us probably will never fully understand.

Overall, the federal budget was a very good budget; it provided certainty, especially around education, health and the NDIS. There is plenty in it for South Australia, and those opposite should stop whinging and get on looking in the mirror at their performance over the last 15 years in office in South Australia.

We return of course to the matter most important today, namely, the Supply Bill. Convention dictates that we will support the Supply Bill, but we will not do so before I highlight the arrogance of this government. Let's be quite serious. They have come to this place and asked for \$6 billion—this is just blank-cheque budgeting here in South Australia. There is no justification for this massive increase, and I will highlight to the house some of my concerns.

When the Supply Bill was presented in this house last year, the ask from the government was \$3.4 billion; the year before, it was \$3.2 billion. There was no explanation from the Treasurer, from the Premier, from anybody opposite, as to the reason for such a massive increase this year. I can only suspect that they are up to no good. I can only suspect that they are up to no good because an election is coming next March. They are only concerned with one thing. They have never been concerned about the people of South Australia: they are concerned about protecting their own political skins.

We see a massive increase in the request—\$5.9 billion they want us to approve—without one shred of evidence as to what it will be spent on. Nightly on our TV screens, we are seeing the contempt that this government has for the taxpayers of South Australia. If there were any truth in advertising legislation in South Australia, the only ad we would see on the television would be an apology from this government for the position they have put our state in. Instead, we see taxpayers' dollars wasted on spurious advertising campaigns. It is an absolute abuse and waste of taxpayers' money.

At the moment, they are advocating for this \$360 million gas-fired peaking plant to be put in place in South Australia. Of course, we have asked the logical question. I commend the member for Stuart, who is the shadow minister for energy in South Australia, who asks the logical questions. It might be \$360 million in terms of capital, but how much is it going to cost to operate? What are the recurrent costs to the taxpayers of South Australia? What will the interest costs be? No idea. What will the depreciation costs be? No idea. What will the annual operating cost of this plant be? No idea.

What they do have an idea about is printing brochures, putting ads on television and DLs in people's letterboxes. That is no way to run our government here in South Australia. They had a perfectly good opportunity presented to them by Alinta. That would have saved hundreds of jobs in Port Augusta and in Leigh Creek. It would have cost the taxpayers of South Australia \$25 million over a three-year period—\$8 million per year—and \$4½ million would have come back in mining royalties and payroll tax, so it would have been a net cost of \$3½ million per year.

In fact, our energy prices have gone up so dramatically since that Alinta plant was closed that we would have saved money by spending the \$8 million per year to keep Alinta operating, but they would not have that, because their ideology comes first—not the people of South Australia, their ideology. That is why South Australia finds itself at the bottom of the ladder in terms of economic performance in our nation. There is no care, no responsibility, no consideration of how hard people must work in our state to provide this government with money, which it wilfully wastes on a daily basis. It is not just the outrageous waste of money in terms of the spurious advertising campaign for their energy proposal.

What about the money they gave to one community? They gave one community \$750,000 to run their politically motivated campaign. All of them on that side of the house should hang their heads in shame. That is a completely inappropriate use of state taxpayers' money. It was more than the government spent to actually promote exports throughout South-East Asia, more than twice the grants that were provided to veterans in South Australia for the ANZAC Day Commemoration Fund, and almost \$200,000 more than the Housing Trust's annual homelessness grants, but these are the priorities of those opposite.

What I would like to challenge those opposite to tell us is: did they stand up in caucus or in cabinet and say, 'Mr Premier, this is wrong. This should not be happening. Taxpayer funds should not be spent like that.' I have not heard one of them make a grievance in this place, saying, 'Guess what? Jay got it wrong.' Not one of them! Look at them all hanging their heads in shame at their own government's performance, spending \$750,000 on their politically charged advertising campaign to save their own skins. It is absolutely disgraceful.

Where do we find ourselves in South Australia after 15 years of Labor administration? We are not in a very happy place, let me tell you. At the turn of the century, South Australia had a staggering 7.6 per cent of the nation's jobs. Do you know what it is now? It is 6.8 per cent. If we had just kept pace with where we were at the turn of the century, we would have another 98,000 people employed in South Australia. This is not about improving our performance; this is just staying where we were at the turn of the century. Ninety-eight thousand more people would be employed here in South Australia.

At the turn of the century, South Australia represented 8 per cent of the nation's population. We are now down to 7.1. When I was a kid, we were the 10 per cent state; we represented 10 per cent. At the turn of the century, we were down to 8 per cent and we are now down to 7.1. If we had kept pace—not accelerated, just kept pace with the national average—there would be another 198,000 people living in this state. This would be transformational, but people have been giving up on South Australia over the last 15 years.

For 15 out of the last 17 years, Jay Weatherill, the member for Cheltenham, has been at the cabinet table. He has been in the driving seat, driving this state's economy off a cliff. It is completely and utterly unacceptable. When we look at where we are, it is a sorry state. Since this Premier came to power, South Australia's average GSP has been 1.4 per cent, and that has been almost exactly half the national average. In fact, our economy would be more than \$10 billion larger if we had just kept pace with the national average, but we are nowhere near it.

We have had the highest unemployment rate for 28 consecutive months. It is impossible to believe—28 consecutive months and the government has done absolutely nothing about it. We have had a mass exodus of young people out of this state. Our net interstate migration now is 6,500 people per year. Our energy costs are the highest in the nation. A budget is coming down on 23 June, and this is a very important budget for the people of South Australia. It is an opportunity for the Treasurer, the Premier and this cabinet to press the restart button and start putting the people of South Australia first—forget about their own political futures and start focusing on the people they were elected to serve when they came into this place.

We need to see a much greater focus on creating jobs in South Australia. We need to see a massive reinvestment in creating exports out of South Australia. We are not selling goods and services interstate and overseas at anywhere near the rate we should be. We need to see more money going into exports. We need to see more money going to support families who are doing it tough at the moment. The cost of living is through the roof, and that is why we in the Liberal Party say that we will reinstate the emergency services levy, which will put another \$360 million back into our economy in South Australia.

Defence work is coming, courtesy of the federal government. We have to do everything we can to grab it with both hands and turn it into an economic explosion in South Australia—a jobs explosion in South Australia. That means that we need to do everything we can to make sure that we have the skills in place to capitalise on the work that will come to South Australia.

In my final comments to the house, I would like to acknowledge the very big decision regarding Arrium at Whyalla that is going to be made in South Australia in the coming six or eight weeks. I was in Whyalla last week. I was travelling there with my parliamentary secretary, the Hon. Terry Stephens, and also the Hon. David Ridgway, our spokesperson for regional development in South Australia. A big issue is looming there. The people of Whyalla have been doing it tough for an extended period of time. I was very grateful to get quality briefings from the people from KordaMentha, who have kept the opposition in South Australia fully informed about their deliberations.

There are two quality proposals on the table. I say to this government and those opposite: let us put our political pointscoring aside on this issue. Whyalla is critically important, not just to South Australia but, quite frankly, to the national economy. The people of Whyalla have historically been very important to this nation's defence and to our industry, and we want to make sure that they are not left behind.

I give a commitment from all those on this side of the house that we will work with the government in any way we possibly can to ensure that the Arrium operation not only continues but flourishes into the future. I would really like to see this very much front and centre in the budget that will be brought down in this place on 23 June. But the most important thing we must see in next month's budget is a government that decides, once and for all, that it is going to take responsibility for running this state on behalf of all the people of South Australia, not just for their narrow interest groups and, in fact, their Labor mates.

South Australia is not doing well. It has so much potential and so much opportunity, but at the moment it has a massive boat anchor, which is 15 years of failed Labor administration. Start taking responsibility. Start putting the people of South Australia in the position in which they should be, which is that South Australians need to be listened to, they need a lower cost of living, more jobs and more security for our next generation.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:30):** I, too, rise to speak to and commend this Supply Bill to the house. In the coming months, our Treasurer will articulate his and our government's vision for our South Australian community through the delivery of our state government's budget. It is important at this time to reflect on our priorities for our South Australian community and on our values. Our values are reflected in our spending priorities for our community. Our government is deeply motivated by our values, and we seek to advance those values in all aspects of our spending and through our activities in support of South Australians.

I understand and I am sure, having listened intently to the Leader of the Opposition, that there must have been some positive elements somewhere in last night's federal Liberal government budget. However, it was incredibly disappointing to learn last night, when I was listening to the federal Liberal government handing down its budget, that it is not motivated by values and that it is not prepared to back South Australians. As well as potentially vilifying unemployed people who often need a hand and others who need a hand through our welfare system, last night we learned that not one dollar of the \$70 billion allocated to infrastructure by the federal government will be spent in South Australia—not one dollar on new roads, transport systems, public buildings—not one dollar of \$70 billion.

Community legal centre funding has also not been fully restored for organisations like our Southern Community Justice Centre, the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, the Women's Legal Service, and all who access those crucial services set to suffer as a result. I find this extraordinarily unfair. Whilst many South Australians and I are disappointed, I am proud that our state Labor government is prepared to invest money in public projects, initiatives and infrastructure that will make a difference to people's ability to access world-class health care, to travel safely and to utilise public and community services and buildings. I am also proud that since our last budget we have continued to demonstrate that preparedness to support those measures that make a real difference in the lives of our fellow South Australians.

I have been delighted over the past 12 months to talk with local employers about the benefits of our \$109 million job creation grant scheme to help growing businesses to create jobs, which we created in our last budget. The scheme offered \$10,000 over two years for new full-time equivalent jobs created in small and medium-size businesses liable for payroll tax and \$4,000 over two years for new jobs created by other eligible businesses. I have heard from those who have taken up this grant how it is helping them to expand and also to offer more employment opportunities. This is how our state Labor government is continuing to grow jobs and to support workers and their families.

It is right that over the course of the past 12 months, and indeed before that period, we have also prioritised funding for measures that help to prevent and eradicate domestic violence and ensure adequate support for those who experience it. I spoke in this place last year about our government's earlier funding for, and creation and implementation of, the Multi-Agency Protection Service (MAPS). This is an innovative partnership relentlessly focused on bringing together agencies that support



those who experience domestic violence and deal with those who perpetrate it to ensure that community members do not fall through the gaps, that dangerous domestic violence situations do not accelerate and that we are harnessing, aligning and mobilising our resources around the prevention of domestic violence in the best possible way.

MAPS is a whole-of-government approach to responding to and intervening in domestic violence cases and child protection issues. It is an essential part of our government's commitment to eradicating domestic violence and to providing support and assistance to those who experience it. MAPS came from our government's abiding desire to do everything that can be done by government to protect those who experience domestic violence and to prevent the occurrence of it altogether.

I am very proud that our state government led the way in funding MAPS and I look forward to working further to build on MAPS by more deeply engaging our community sector and other sectors with it. I had the privilege of attending the launch of the new Women's Safety Services SA premises last year and have had the privilege for many years of working alongside the incredible women in that service and in other domestic violence services across our state, particularly with Southern Domestic Violence Service in our southern community.

I know how the Women's Safety Services is aligning its important efforts with other services, both government and otherwise, and the difference they make in the lives of women and children through doing so. An expansion of MAPS will further strengthen these efforts and will make a further difference in people's lives. Since last year's budget we have further strengthened our efforts in this area. In September last year, we committed \$9.9 million to the Domestic and Family Violence Intervention Program, with more intervention workers and clinicians being hired to run the program. This followed a pilot in 2015-16 that engaged with 100 offenders.

As I have outlined, South Australia has a coordinated approach to preventing domestic violence and rehabilitation programs within prisons that target perpetrators are an important component of this coordinated approach. This program for offenders has been designed to challenge the mindset of those with a history of domestic violence and to shift attitudes towards the creation of supportive, loving, safe and respectful relationships.

Sentenced offenders who have been convicted of a domestic violence offence or who present with a significant history of domestic violence behaviour are eligible for the program. Protecting women and children, and indeed all people, from violence is complex. It requires a coordinated effort from governments, our community and individuals. This is an important program to give offenders an opportunity to break the terrible cycle of violence. The more we invest in rehabilitation the less we will see repeat offenders and the safer and more harmonious our communities will be.

Since March this year people leaving another state or territory to escape an abusive relationship will have their protections carried with them into South Australia. These new intervention orders will fulfil a commitment from the Council of Australian Governments to ensure that those experiencing domestic violence continue to receive protections even when they cross state or territory borders.

In December 2016, we also created an extra magistrate's position specifically to attend to the growing volume of cases involving domestic violence matters, with a focus on intervention orders and related criminal charges such as alleged breaches of orders. There are thousands of reports of domestic violence every year, with more than 8,000 reported in 2015. The number of these reports grows as, thankfully, awareness around the issue increases. By providing a dedicated magistrate to hear these matters, since December 2016, domestic violence matters can be heard more quickly and provide much-needed protections.

Our government has also given courts the sentencing power to require perpetrators of domestic violence to bear the cost of an intervention program if convicted of breaching an order and requires courts to inquire about any other relevant orders under the Family Law Act or Children's Protection Act. Domestic violence is a blight on our community. Our government is determined to use its resources, as we are doing, and to work with everyone we can to tackle and to end the problem. We will continue to work to make sure the justice system is as accessible, supportive and

efficient as possible, and we will continue to do whatever we can to support those who experience domestic violence.

On this side of the house, we support education and understand how the changing nature of jobs and industries of our future means that we must change the way we educate our children, that we must teach them different ways of thinking and different skills. That is why, in our last budget, we committed to growing understanding of and engagement with science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) by investing \$250 million in STEM facilities at schools across our state.

In my electorate of Reynell, Wirreanda Secondary School and Christies Beach High School received \$2.5 million each, and Pimpala Primary School and O'Sullivan Beach Primary School were awarded \$1 million each under our STEM Works program. These are just a few of the 139 schools that received funding under this program. Each of the schools I mentioned, and others across our state, are now planning to or are building new or refurbishing existing STEM facilities to give students access to modern learning environments to best interact with and learn these essential subject areas.

It has been an absolute pleasure to see these schools deeply engage their school communities in how these infrastructure upgrades will take place, what they will look like and how students will engage in STEM through them, how they will learn to problem solve and think differently through that engagement. In a number of these schools the voice of children has been sought, and their innovation is evident in the plans being made. Research shows that 75 per cent of the fastest growing occupations are STEM-related. As South Australia transforms, so should our skill set.

This funding, and our ongoing commitment to schools, means that children will be prepared for the jobs of our future, including in areas such as advanced manufacturing and defence. On this side of the house, we will continue to support kids at school and ensure that they have safe, effective and innovative learning environments. This program has been delivered across our state because we believe that all children deserve modern learning environments so that they can reach their full potential.

Another aspect of last year's budget which is now being brought to life across South Australian communities and which I am thrilled to speak of in this place is our government's \$10 million Female Facilities Program—a program which is giving more women better access to every aspect of sporting club life and enabling them to equally and actively participate in the sport and code they love.

The first round of the program had an extraordinary response, and the second round is now open to not-for-profit sporting clubs and associations. Clubs can apply for up to \$500,000 to build new change rooms or to modify existing facilities so that women can also access them. From round 1 of the Female Facilities Program, 13 South Australian sporting clubs will share in \$4 million to upgrade and build female change rooms.

New change rooms at these clubs and associations will be used by more than 3,400 junior and senior sportswomen across 12 different sports, including soccer, football, hockey and basketball. This means that 3,400 girls and women will have an opportunity to play, train and participate in the game they love without worrying about where they will change into their uniforms and without having to step off a field or a court simply to get into their car to go and shower and change at home.

Latest figures from the Office for Recreation and Sport show that about 150,000 girls and women are registered with sporting clubs in South Australia. This includes almost 5,000 registered female football and soccer players and more than 1,000 registered cricket players. But, despite growing participation numbers, many women's sporting teams in South Australia have been forced to use male change rooms, car parks, offices or other areas at sports grounds, or close to them, to prepare for their game. I have even heard of girls changing behind trees and in hot sheds on 40° days. Women and girls deserve to have access to the same facilities as our boys and men, and this program helps to make this a reality.

The implementation of this program at a local level is transformative. Those clubs that are thinking about their culture, and including girls and women in every aspect of club life and applying for these grants as part of this process, are growing and achieving better outcomes through embracing diversity. Our government encourages young people to be fit, active and engaged in their communities, and we see sporting clubs as a key place for young people to be included and to be

part of a great big community family. We therefore want sporting clubs to be exemplars of inclusion and gender equality in all areas, and this program helps them to be just that.

We are currently experiencing a growing momentum of women and girls in sport and swelling numbers of female participation at all levels. Through the work of our South Australian Women in Sport Taskforce, which it is my privilege to chair, through the excellent and groundbreaking work of our Minister for Sport on equality issues in sport and through our government's strong commitment to advancing the interests and status of women in all areas of our community, we are making sustainable and lasting change. Together, we will continue to work to improve gender equality in sport, to change the face of sport leadership, to increase spectatorship and 'fanship' for women's sport and to keep attracting major women's sporting events to South Australia.

Our government is committed to our Achieving Women's Equality policy, which aims to eliminate barriers and to acknowledge the central role women and girls play in our economy and in our community. Whether a girl or a woman wants to write about sport, participate at any level, or administer it, coach it, or make a career out of it in any way, we must remove structural barriers to their being able to do so and we must support and celebrate their efforts. The Female Facilities Program is doing just that, and I look forward to further advancing this work.

In the lead-up to our next 2017-18 budget, I will continue to advance this work, and I will also continue to work with my wonderful, resilient and kind local community to advance their interests. There are a number of those local community issues that I am working with my community on—from local crossings to local walking tracks to minor upgrades at our local railway station—and I look forward to continuing to progress those issues through our budget and beyond.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I call the next speaker, I would like to welcome to the house today a former chairman of the District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula, Mr Brian Treloar OAM, and Mrs Wendy Treloar, the family matriarch. As we all know, behind every man is a great woman. They are the guests of their son, the member for Flinders, and are accompanied by their grandson, Max Treloar. We welcome you all to parliament today and hope you enjoy your time with us.

#### *Bills*

### **SUPPLY BILL 2017**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:44):** I would like to make some brief comments about the Supply Bill and, particularly, what has been topical on morning radio today with the reannouncement of the electrification of the Gawler railway line to Salisbury. The government must have gone to the little red book of 'What do we do in a lead-up to an election? We make another announcement and put some processes in place so that people actually believe that we are doing something.' That seems to be the government's mantra.

On 22 October 2013, (that was before the last election) there was a press release put out by the Premier and then transport minister, the member for West Torrens, stating:

The electrification of the Gawler line will now extend past Dry Creek—

if you remember, there was an announcement about a line to Dry Creek prior to this announcement—to Salisbury station following a re-scoping of the \$152.4 million project.

The release goes on to say that the work would start in 2015. Of course, we had the election and then we saw that 2015 became 2017-18. If we look at the tenders and contracts pages today, we will see that there is not actually a call for tenders out today, as the government had led people to believe, but an expression of interest for those who may wish to place a tender. We need to remember that this was a job that was started back in 2010 and stopped in 2012 by this government. As a matter of

fact, there is a very good chronology in the Auditor-General's Report of 2014 where the Auditor-General explains, in fairly simple terms, what actually happened in the lead-up to the cancellation of the electrification of the Gawler line. The report states:

The Gawler commuter rail line joins the regional city of Gawler to the Adelaide CBD. In May 2009 the Commonwealth Government committed funding of \$293.5 million to upgrade rail track and certain stations, and the electrification of the Gawler line.

At that time, the government said that, because of that, they would bring the project forward by two years. The Auditor-General's Report then goes on to state:

In June 2012 the Commonwealth (LABOR) Government advised the Department to cease expenditure of Commonwealth funds on the project following the SA Government's decision in May 2012 to suspend the project.

We all recall that the member for Playford was the treasurer at that time, and I think he blamed the global financial crisis for the need to stop that project. The report continues:

Further, in October 2012, the Commonwealth Government—

and, again that was the Gillard Labor government at the time—

requested that unspent funds (\$41 million) be returned to the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Government advised the Department that \$10 million of the unspent funds may be used for the Seaford rail extension and the remaining \$31 million plus interest was required to be repaid in accordance with the National Partnership Agreement.

And that happened. The Weatherill Labor government in South Australia decided to stop work on that project, and they returned the money to Canberra. It goes on:

The Department return to the unspent funds, including interest, to the Commonwealth...in April 2013. In June 2014 the State Government announced a restart of the project from Adelaide to Salisbury—

this was after the election, of course—

with the project planned to recommence in 2017-18. In 2013-14 the Department assessed expenditure incurred to date on the project, which totalled \$50 million.

The review identified a write-down of expenditure totalling \$46.6 million.

In other words, of that \$50 million that was spent, \$46.6 million was wasted.

The Department assessed that costs totalling \$28.6 million incurred for the project between Salisbury and Gawler were deemed to be obsolete—

in other words, deemed to be wasted—

or are not likely to provide any future economic benefit. Further, the Department determined that given that the project is planned to recommence in 2017-18, a considerable portion of the design, scoping, project supervision, tendering and mobilisation costs for the Adelaide to Salisbury section of the line totalling \$18 million were deemed to be obsolete—

in other words, wasted, once again. This is not me speaking: this is the Auditor-General in his report to the parliament in 2014. To finish the comment that the Auditor-General made in his closing remarks on this particular audit of the work done on the Gawler line back in 2011:

and are likely to be in the most part reincurred when the project recommences.

In other words, it will have to be redone. Today's expression of interest certainly confirms what the auditors raised as concerns back in 2014 because what the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure invites companies or consortia to do is to design and construct the electrification of infrastructure on the Gawler rail line from Adelaide to Salisbury. All the design work that was done previously, as pointed out by the Auditor-General in June 2014, can no longer be used.

It has to be redesigned, so we are seeing an additional cost to the taxpayers of South Australia because of that very bad decision made by the Premier and the member for Playford back in 2012 to stop work on the line when they had the money in the bank. It was their choice to discontinue that job. What is also interesting about the expression of interest request on the tenders and contracts page today is:

The electrification of the Gawler rail line is the next stage of the electrification program for the Adelaide Metropolitan Passenger Rail Network—

Remember, this program was announced in 2008 and work started in 2011. Here we are in 2017, and this is the next stage. It continues:

following the completion of electrification of the Seaford Line. This stage of the program will deliver an electrified service between Adelaide Railway Station and Salisbury Railway Station—

wait for this—

within a three-year timeframe.

Three years—an announcement today, before the election, of the tenders going out, yet according to the government's own tender documents we have no guarantee that the work will even start before the election. The instruction to those who are registering an interest is important. It is information that people base their costings on, so the information the government is giving about this project has to be correct. The tender documents, or the description for the registration of interest, on the tender and contracts page on the government's own website state:

This stage of the program will deliver an electrified service between Adelaide Railway Station and Salisbury Railway Station within a three-year timeframe.

If we look from when the work was started in 2011 through to when the work will be finished halfway—Salisbury is a little more than halfway between Adelaide and Gawler—we see that, a decade after the work was started and \$46.6 million of infrastructure was written off because of the government's decision to stop the work back in 2012, the job is half done. It is a very frustrating situation for the people in the northern suburbs.

As somebody who grew up in the northern suburbs, when I started my apprenticeship in 1980 I was reliant on the train at the Salisbury station to get me into town, so that I could clock on just after 7am, and to take me home in time for dinner at around 5.30 in the afternoon. It was a very reliable service at the time. The 6.30 train I caught at the Salisbury station ran about eight to 10 carriages. It stopped at all stations to Parafield Gardens and right through to the industrial stations along the way, including Islington, Dudley Park and the member for Adelaide's electorate—right through to North Adelaide. I remember that North Adelaide was a big stop at that time. All the employees from the brewery and Clipsal used to get off at that stop, and a few of us remained for the trip all the way into town.

It has been a very poorly managed process. You can understand why the federal government wants to see a business case. What is interesting about the minister's claims in the media today is that the federal government has seen a business case, yet on 22 October 2013, after the government's business case of 2012 was presented to the federal government for further funding, Premier Jay Weatherill revealed that, as part of the \$36 billion transport provision, the project had not been fully costed. That is another pre-election promise for which we have seen no outcome since it was made. He states in *Hansard* that 'the reinstatement of the electrification of the remainder of the Gawler line has not been fully costed'.

The minister said on radio that there is a properly costed business case. That business case is dated 2012, according to the minister's own Twitter account, where he placed a photograph of the cover of the business case to claim that the state government had done the work needed in order to get funding for this project. The Premier told the parliament after that business case that 'the reinstatement of the electrification of the remainder of the Gawler line has not been fully costed'. It is a very confusing situation for those commenting on this or those who are waiting for this job to be finished, a job that, according to the government's own tender documents, will not be finished until 2020. It seems an extraordinarily long time for a project that was promised in 2008.

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

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:01.*

*Ministerial Statement*

## **ENERGY SECURITY TARGET**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:02):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I wish to update the house about the impending consultation period around the state government's energy security target (EST) draft regulations. As part of the state government's comprehensive energy plan, announced on 14 March, the energy security target will help ensure that South Australia has a secure power system and is more self-reliant. The scheme works by requiring retailers to purchase a minimum quantity of scheduled synchronous generation from South Australian generators. Generators qualifying for the scheme will include existing as well as new sources of secure generation.

This scheme will apply to existing gas generators. It will also apply to concentrated solar or solar thermal plants and pumped storage. The EST is set to commence on 1 July this year at the target level of 4,500 gigawatt hours of generation, rising by about a third by 2025 to 6,000 gigawatt hours. Frontier Economics modelling shows that this scheme will result in lower wholesale electricity prices due to the increase in competition from local dispatchable generation.

If the federal government does not wish to demonstrate any leadership in the future with regard to national energy policy, our scheme will merge seamlessly into a national emissions intensity scheme should one be introduced. In the meantime, the South Australian government has developed a consultation package on the legal framework that establishes the energy security target. This will be available online on the Department of State Development's website this afternoon. Stakeholders are welcome and encouraged to provide feedback through a written submission by close of business Friday 26 May. I look forward to updating the house further as our energy plan progresses.

#### FEDERAL BUDGET

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:04):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement. Is that necessary?

**The SPEAKER:** It is necessary. They may want to hear from you once, not twice.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The commonwealth government of Australia last night delivered the federal budget for 2017-18. I want to start with a few measures in this budget which the state government welcomes. We welcome the \$68 million proton beam facility at the South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Not the proton beam facility—which was built on the first-class health precinct this government has built on North Terrace. The government welcomes the new tax on banks, which is something the Premier has been advocating for in different forums at the COAG. We welcome the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission investigations into the gas and electricity markets and extending funding to the Australian Energy Regulator. We congratulate the federal government commissioning the CSIRO to complete energy use data modelling and topping up funding for the Bureau of Meteorology.

It is also pleasing to see the commonwealth following South Australia's lead with the rollout of a PACE scheme, a plan for accelerated exploration, about which federal minister Matt Canavan called me today and said that imitation is the finest form of flattery. I thank him for that. The scheme provides incentives to encourage development of gas fields. Imitation, of course, is the greatest form of flattery.

However, the centrepiece of last night's federal budget was federal Treasurer Scott Morrison's \$75 billion infrastructure spend across the next 10 years of which there is nothing new for South Australia. This \$75 billion includes \$5.3 billion—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is called to order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —for a second Sydney airport, \$1.6 billion for Western Australian rail and roads, \$1 billion for Victorian rail and \$844 million for Queensland roads. For South Australians, there are no new roads, no new rail, no new ports and no new trams. There is even a bizarre decision by the federal government to buy back the Snowy Hydro from New South Wales and Victoria for \$5 billion. Shifting a publicly owned asset from one level of government to another does nothing to help transform our energy sector to a cleaner, more reliable and more secure energy network.

We would not be doing our job if we did not stand up for the citizens of our state and point out the lack of new funding. It is galling that the federal government can spend \$75 billion on infrastructure but not a single extra dollar on a new transport and infrastructure program in South Australia. Instead, the federal budget attempts to reannounce numerous projects that have been in the pipeline for a long time, including funds for the Torrens to Torrens, Darlington interchange and Northern Connector roadworks, which were already allocated, and there is not an extra dollar; the \$37 million asset recycling for energy infrastructure which is a payment under a previously announced scheme; and the \$110 million equity offer to support Port Augusta solar, which is both an old announcement and highly conditional.

On finances, the house should note that the commonwealth now estimates the GST contribution to South Australia will be \$6.3 billion in the forthcoming financial year. The total over four years is \$30 million less than the commonwealth in December estimated in its Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook and \$587 million less than the commonwealth estimated a year ago. This decrease will constrain our state budget. While restoring a very small portion of the Gonski funding, the federal budget does next to nothing to repair the billions of dollars of cuts to health and education from the disastrous 2014 budget.

Finally, this government needs to draw to attention to one of the most glaring omissions from the federal budget. In the last state budget, this state Labor government pledged \$50 million in grant funding for the successful purchaser of Arrium to invest in the long-term steelmaking capacity of Whyalla. To date, the commonwealth government has only offered \$50 million of loan support to Whyalla, despite recently earmarking \$1 billion to help fund a prospective coalmine in Queensland. The people of Whyalla should rightly expect the same level of support to save 3,000 jobs in their city.

While those opposite congratulate the federal Liberal government on spending money in New South Wales, we will continue to fight for South Australia's fair share. This federal budget is a great disappointment for South Australia, but I could not agree more—

**Mr GARDNER:** Sir, point of order—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —with the Leader of the Opposition when he says, 'I'll tell you the best guarantee for more money coming to South Australia—that is a hardworking Labor government which puts the interests of South Australians first.' That is exactly what we are doing.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** He bats for both sides. He wants to bat for us and the Liberal Party.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GARDNER:** Mr Speaker, is there some arcane technical point that we are unclear about?

**The SPEAKER:** Long ago and far away, when I was in your situation, I withdrew leave for a ministerial statement and the then Liberal government amended the standing orders to make sure I could not withdraw leave. Be that as it may, the member for Morialta is within his rights, as an individual member, to withdraw leave, and leave has been withdrawn. So the ministerial statement is at an end.

*Parliamentary Committees*

#### LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:11):** I bring up the 44<sup>th</sup> report of the committee—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

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

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is called to order.

*Mr Wingard interjecting:*

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

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is warned.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** Are we going to sign him up?

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Newland to order.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** —on Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

#### *Question Time*

#### **OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Before the minister read the report on the Easter weekend, did any member of her office or an SA Health employee advise her of the content of the report in any way, be it verbally or in writing?

**The SPEAKER:** As the member for Heysen would know, the leader means 'orally or in writing'.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Orally and not verbally?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:12):** What I will say is what I repeated in the house yesterday, that the parliament was well aware the report was coming and it was received late on the Monday afternoon and forwarded to Health. My staff had said the report was very serious and we had immediately sent it to SA Health for a full government response.

#### **OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13):** Can the minister outline whether that was the sum total of any oral or written representation made to her by her staff?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:13):** I have stated, as I have said previously, that it was a very serious report and it required a considered response. It was not to be rushed in a speedy or hasty way when they are such serious allegations.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Colton to order and the member for Morialta.

#### **OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13):** In the minister's discussions with members of her office or SA Health before reading the report over the Easter weekend, was the prospect of closing the Oakden facility discussed?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:14):** I made it very clear that all options were to be considered to ensure that the residents at Oakden were given the due respect, care and consideration they deserved, and



the department was to make all serious endeavours to ensure that the site was improved, that we met accreditation standards and that the people were cared for.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14):** Was one of the options considered the closure of the Oakden facility? Did the minister consider the closure of the Oakden facility before actually reading the report?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:14):** I have made it very clear from the very beginning that all options were on the table, and that included closure. As we know, the full government response was taken to the cabinet meeting the following Thursday, after the Easter break, and the cabinet fully adopted the recommendations in the report.

The government response was that we would close Oakden and that we would move the consumers, or the residents of Makk and McLeay, with appropriate clinical guidance at the appropriate time once Northgate was fully refurbished. We are in the process of doing that, and that is where we will be able to send a number of people in the coming months.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** Was that option discussed before you read the report?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:15):** As I have previously answered, there was a procedure that, once we became aware of care and concern complaints in Oakden, I triggered an independent review, and that process was underway. I released two parliamentary statements to this chamber before the report was even tabled, fully, after the cabinet meeting, and we took a number of steps in between.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16):** My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Further to the minister's commitment in this parliament yesterday, will the minister now advise the house what conversations took place between her staff and the Premier's office about the Chief Psychiatrist's report before the Premier went on leave?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:16):** As I stated yesterday—and I am happy to update the house again—we know that once care and concerns were raised by the community visitor in October, and initial conversations begun, and information sought from the northern Adelaide health network, we then, in late December, created a scoping with the Chief Psychiatrist's office for the commencement of the review.

At that time, in February, I made a ministerial statement; and I made a second ministerial statement. So, the parliament and the general public in South Australia—these are public records—will be able to see a public record that we were doing work at Oakden to rectify some of the concerns that were not fully known at the point until the document was released, after cabinet.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17):** In the minister's discussions with the Premier and the Minister for Health before reading the report over the Easter weekend, did she discuss any element of the potential government response to the Oakden report?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:17):** We knew that we were already placing additional staffing interventions onto the Oakden site, and supervision. I have outlined those in two previous ministerial statements.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17):** I'm sorry, I am seeking clarification as to whether there was any discussion with the Premier or the minister before you read the report regarding the Oakden report—the government's response to that Oakden report?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:18):** I would like to seek some advice about which minister the member is referring to.

**Mr MARSHALL:** The Minister for Health.

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS:** I am the Minister for Mental Health, these are the consumers in my portfolio, and I am the person who makes the decisions in regard to my portfolio.

**Mr MARSHALL:** A final point of clarification on this, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Make it a supplementary.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18):** Supplementary: can the minister confirm to this house that she held no discussions whatsoever with the Premier or with the Minister for Health regarding the potential to close the Oakden facility before she had read the report?

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is warned.

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:18):** The matters that I have laid before the house are very clear with parliamentary statements. I have made very clear in my answers over the last couple of days the process in which we have undertaken to improve the care and concerns at the Oakden site.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Minister for Mental Health discuss the content of the Oakden report with the Premier before he went on leave?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:19):** No.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** Did the Premier think it was unusual that the minister had received the report on 10 April but failed to read the content of the report herself, or discuss it with the Premier, or the Premier's office, before he went on leave?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:19):** No.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** Did the Premier not think, given the level of scrutiny on this issue in the house for the week leading up to him going on leave, that it might have been prudent to look at the contents of that report before he went on leave?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:19):** No, because, as the minister has already explained, steps had been taken to address the concerns at this facility from as early as January. Steps had already been put in place by the agency—

**Mr Gardner:** Well, she hadn't read it before you went on leave.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta, I warn him.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —to respond to the issues that were known at that stage during the course of the review. Of course, we didn't wait until the end of the review to take steps. As the minister has outlined in her ministerial statement, there was a series of steps that occurred from the beginning of the year that addressed those issues at Oakden. The matters, as we

understood them, were well in hand. The minister's explanation, which I think is a perfectly understandable explanation, is that she wanted the ability to have a briefing from the agency to sit alongside the report as she considered it and gave it her careful consideration over Easter. I think it is entirely appropriate.

#### FEDERAL BUDGET

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:20):** My question is for the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the house about the impact of last night's federal budget on health in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:21):** I thank the member for Fisher for her question. She has such an enormous passion for the public health system.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Where is this protein therapy unit?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I will get to that. Firstly, can I welcome the federal government's decision to fund Australia's first proton therapy unit in South Australia. This shows that the state government's investment in the largest health and biomedical precinct, on North Terrace, is getting results. It will ensure lifesaving treatment for South Australians and others who currently have to travel to the US for this highly specialised treatment. I understand that this morning the Leader of the Opposition informed the house that apparently South Australia is also getting a protein therapy unit. I am not quite sure what a protein therapy unit does—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I think it has something to do with some sort of cosmetic procedure—I don't know. Anyway, it's news to me.

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is warned for the second and final time.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** We do welcome the proton therapy unit and the grant to enable that to happen. It will be an Australian first. We can be very, very proud of what is happening in the biomedical precinct on North Terrace. However, last night's federal budget was not all good news for South Australian patients and their families. Again, South Australia's hospitals have missed out in the federal health budget. My early advice is that not only will we not see any increase—

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Adelaide to order.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —in federal health funding for our hospitals under the national health funding reform agreement but also it appears there will be a reduction in funding to the order of \$80 million over the forward estimates. That's on top of the previous federal cuts to health, starting with savage cuts in that infamous 2014-15 budget. This means that, despite more people going to our public hospitals than ever before, South Australia will miss out on crucial funding to improve our elective surgery and emergency department waiting times and provide South Australians with the sort of care they deserve. This is a budget that's designed to rescue this federal government from its terrible budget decisions of previous years. The only new thing in the budget for South Australians—

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Adelaide is warned.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —is an increase in the Medicare levy. Clearly, the federal government has had to find new money somewhere to make up for the \$639 million in dumped unsuccessful savings measures in previous health budgets.

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Adelaide for the second and final time.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** The Turnbull government's trumpeted reversal of their Medicare freeze is a massive insult to all South Australians, with next to nothing unfrozen in 2017 and some items remaining frozen for more than two years. We know that whenever the federal government makes it harder for South Australians to see their GP, they inevitably end up in our public hospital

emergency departments. Both public hospitals and South Australian patients will continue to pay more as a result of this budget.

In addition, the announcement of a Medicare guarantee fund is just a budget trick. It does nothing to lock in funding for Medicare. The federal government clearly thinks that South Australia is an easy target for savings. Last night's budget may have even more in the detail, more devil in the detail, much of which we are still waiting for more information on. For years, those opposite have had a chance to oppose the Abbott and Turnbull government's brutal cuts to health—

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order, sir.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —and to stand up for South Australians, but they just continue to be a mouthpiece for the Turnbull government.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**Mr GARDNER:** Debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I think it is. I uphold the point of order. Is the minister finished?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I have, sir.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier, or any member of his staff, have any discussion with the Minister for Mental Health, or her staff, in relation to the Oakden report between the time the Chief Psychiatrist completed his report and the public release?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:24):** I understand that the report was released by the minister after it had been taken to cabinet. It was during the cabinet process that obviously my staff, in supporting the Acting Premier in that role, would have become familiar with the report, but essentially the answer is no. The report was considered and responded to in the context of cabinet and then made public, and the matter was then discussed and promulgated from that point on.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25):** Supplementary: can the Premier confirm to the house that not only didn't he seek any information on this report but nobody on his staff sought any information regarding this report from the time of 10 April through to the time that it was publicly released, after cabinet.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:25):** The commissioning of this inquiry was a matter that was reported to the cabinet late last year. Indeed, the inquiry itself was scoped over the Christmas period and commenced, at least in its public announcement, in January. So, we were familiar with the fact that the minister had identified issues and that she wanted to have a detailed probe.

Remembering at that time that what we were dealing with was a series of individual instances, what has now been revealed by the report is a deep and systemic degree of abuse and neglect, which is alarming and which had escaped even the attention of the Chief Psychiatrist, who had been in the facility in June of last year. Indeed, the aged-care accreditation agency, which is charged with the responsibility of considering all of these questions—standards of care, leadership, culture, essentially abuse and neglect—all of those matters had escaped their attention to the extent that the facility had received full accreditation on each of the 44 areas of their responsibility.

This isn't just a one-off consideration. This is a detailed assessment that occurs once every three years and occurred in March 2016 and a clean bill of health was given to this facility. So, it managed to elude the aged-care accreditation agency and it managed to elude the Chief Psychiatrist. I understand there was a further follow-up visit later in the year. As all these events were playing out, I think around November, there was a further follow-up visit by the aged-care accreditation agency, I am advised, and that also didn't reveal these matters on that occasion.

Despite that, the minister was concerned enough to instigate this investigation. She kept us informed about that. We thought it was entirely appropriate that we await her return to cabinet with the outcome of that inquiry so that she could take the further steps. We knew that she was taking steps immediately to respond to the issue over the January period—new staff being brought in, new managers being brought in, training and assistance, and new night-time staff. So the matter was well in hand with the minister and cabinet awaited her return to the cabinet to advise us on what the next steps would be, which she did.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** Can the Premier inform the house when he read the report?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:28):** I read it over a period of time during my annual leave. I had a conversation with the minister and my staff where I was briefed about the report, and I read it during the course of my annual leave.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** Considering the report was received by the government on 10 April, can the Premier update the house as to the time he first picked up the report to begin reading this report?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:28):** It was during my annual leave. I can't recall the actual day. It was over a number of days, it is a lengthy report. I read it and reread it. So, it occurred over a period of days during my annual leave.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** Can the Premier update the house as to when he received the briefing on the report from his office that he alluded to earlier in his answer?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:28):** Yes, it was also during my annual leave. It wasn't a written briefing; it was an oral briefing from both the minister and my office. Then I received a written copy of the report and read that during the course of my annual leave.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29):** Can you provide us with details as to when that occurred?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:29):** During the course of my annual leave. It was over a number of days. I can't recall the actual day.

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley, I warn him.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29):** My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Did the Minister for Mental Health discuss the content of the Oakden report with the Minister for Health before he went on leave at Easter?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:29):** No, she didn't.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29):** Did the minister seek any briefing from the Minister for Mental Health before he went on leave?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:29):** No, I didn't. The Minister for Mental Health is not a junior minister to me; she's a full cabinet minister. She is responsible to the cabinet. She doesn't report to me. She has full authority and responsibility for the actions she takes in the portfolio. It would not be

appropriate for me to go to another minister and seek a briefing regarding things that are entirely their responsibility. The Minister for Mental Health doesn't report to me; she reports to the cabinet.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30):** Did the Minister for Mental Health at any point in time discuss the closure of Oakden with the minister before he went on Easter leave?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:30):** No, she didn't for exactly the same reasons that I mentioned before. The Minister for Mental Health is not some sort of junior minister to me. She is a cabinet minister and she reports to cabinet.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30):** While on leave, did the minister discuss the Oakden report or any matters relating to Oakden with the federal member for Makin?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:30):** Yes, I did have a conversation with the member for Makin.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30):** Can you confirm to this house on what date that occurred?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:30):** I would need to check, but it was while I was on leave.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30):** What was the period that you were on leave, so that we can narrow down that envelope?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:31):** It's publicly available, but I spoke to the member for Makin because he had written correspondence to me that was now in the public sphere and I wanted to discuss the matter with him.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31):** Can you provide the house with an update as to what matters specifically were discussed during that conversation?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:31):** I've already just said. There was correspondence that the member for Makin had written to me, and that correspondence was now in the public sphere and I wanted to discuss the matter with him. I'm not going to go to the house with exactly what was discussed, but it was pertaining to that correspondence. I think it was entirely appropriate for me to discuss it with him. I was concerned obviously about the privacy of correspondence he had written to me. It was in the public sphere, and I just wanted to briefly discuss the matter with him.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31):** Can the minister update the house as to whether he discussed Oakden with the Minister for Mental Health while he was on leave?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:31):** I had a brief discussion with the Minister for Mental Health, but that was after the report had been made public.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32):** Can the minister update the house as to whether his discussion with the federal member for Makin was before or after his discussion with the Minister for Mental Health regarding the Oakden facility?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:32):** It was roughly the same time. I don't know the exact sequence of events, but they were within days of each other.

**Mr Pisoni:** Conference call, was it?

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

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32):** Did the minister or any member of his staff have any discussion with the Minister for Mental Health or her staff in relation to the Oakden report between the time the Chief Psychiatrist completed his report and when it was made public?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:32):** If you are trying to suggest somehow my office was privy to the contents of the report, the answer is, no, not until the report went through the usual cabinet processes, and that's entirely appropriate.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33):** My question is to the Premier. During the four years that the Premier was the minister for ageing, did he visit the Oakden Older Persons Mental Health Service?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:33):** The Oakden Older Persons Mental Health Service was always within the ministerial responsibilities of either the Minister for Health or, when that portfolio was created, the Minister for Mental Health, so it didn't fall within the aged-care portfolio, so I had no portfolio responsibility for that particular facility. I have no recollection of visiting that facility during that period.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33):** Supplementary to that, sir: when the Oakden Older Persons Mental Health Service failed a significant number of its commonwealth aged-care accreditation standards in December 2007, did the Premier, as the minister for ageing, raise any concerns with the then minister for mental health, the Hon. Gail Gago?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:33):** No; as you can see, it was dealt with by the minister in the way in which she set out in a ministerial statement. The minister for mental health, as she then was, the Hon. Gail Gago, responded to the failure of a number of accreditation standards by commissioning ACH to undertake essentially a contractual arrangement for three years to work closely with the facility to ensure that its standards were lifted. Indeed, she reported the fact of the failure of the accreditation and the steps that she had been taking in very short measure to the parliament in the other place.

What we now know, from the ministerial statement that was given by the minister the other day, is that minister Hill, who was the relevant minister at the time in 2011, received a cabinet briefing note that suggested that the ACH contract for three years had been successful, that the accreditation had been formally restored, that a new culture had been developed, that new leadership had been developed and that there was confidence the facility was back on track.

That was what, essentially, the government, through its ministers, understood about this facility at that time, and it was appropriate that responsibility for that was taken by the relevant portfolio ministers. It's a misunderstanding of the ageing portfolio to suggest that it had any responsibility for what was a highly specialised mental health care and aged-care facility within the health network.

### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:35):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house as to the implications of the federal government's education funding announcement for South Australian schools?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:36):** Thank you to the member for Torrens for asking this question. Naturally, this has been of enormous interest to everyone involved in the school system, which means a huge proportion of South Australia.

We had, as members will recall, a six-year agreement that involved most of the money coming in the last two years in order to bring us up to the level of funding and resourcing for schools that we know is necessary for a high-quality education to prepare our kids for the future. Some 77 per cent of that was sitting in the final two years of the six-year agreement, so it was devastating when the original budget, under treasurer Hockey at the time, simply pulled out those last two years. While we maintained our commitment to our final two years, we were missing some \$335 million in those final two years.

What we had as an announcement last week looks like—and I say that because we are yet to have all the detail to be confident of exactly what quantum we are talking about—something like \$70 million out of what had been \$335 million. So, that still leaves us significantly short on what we had all agreed and all understood, both sides of parliament all across the country, was an appropriate amount to spend on schooling.

What we have been told is that we now have the idea of having as much funding for our schools as has been agreed and is across the country in 10 years' time—instead of two years' time, in 10 years' time. What we are being told is that students of today have got to wait. Of course, kids don't wait. They go through one year, they go through the next year, and in 10 years we will have lost an enormous number of kids through our system who will not have had the benefit of the funding that we all agreed four years ago was necessary.

We have done some analysis to try to understand how this will affect each of our schools so that we can get a sense of what the level of damage is. You can see the difference per capita. If you took all schools and all students, regardless of sector, and did an even cut, it's something like \$280 per head for the students over the next two years that they will now get. It would have been over a thousand dollars per head. Of course, we don't fund evenly like that because what this is about is funding to need.

I was pleased to hear minister Birmingham and the Prime Minister acknowledge that funding to need was the correct model. There had been a lot of doubt about whether they appreciated that that was the case and I am pleased that they are now saying that. The problem is that, if you have a small amount of money and you have a perfect model for dividing it up, it is not going to make much difference. If you have the reasonable quantum that we had agreed was necessary and you divide it according to need, you will then start to get a significant change in the quality of education that students are experiencing.

I have been to many schools, and I am sure that every member of this chamber has been to many schools, where they are able to tell you what they have done with the small amount of Gonski additionality that they have received to date—the way that they have been able to bring in extra people to work with students who need additional help, and those interventions are essential; the way we have been able to provide more resources for kids with disabilities; and the way that we have been able to provide resources to support children, regardless of their family background, if they need some more assistance in order to catch up in order to be able to perform well at school.

I have a couple of examples of where we have started to analyse what the figures look like. In the electorate of Black, public schools will miss out on something like \$3.4 million just in the electorate of Black over those years. In the electorate of King, their share of cuts is worse. They will miss out on something like \$4.2 million, which is something like the equivalent of 39 teachers over just two years. So, we will see across this state a recognition in every school community—

*Members interjecting:*



**The SPEAKER:** Alas, the minister's time has expired.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40):** My question is to the Premier. Who is responsible for what the Chief Psychiatrist found in his report to be, and I quote, 'the substandard quality of infrastructure'?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:40):** As the Chief Psychiatrist said to me, health services are run by clinicians not ministers. Fundamentally, the clinical leadership there was at fault. What we do know, though, is that there can be service failure in any institution; that's why we have in place a series of safeguards.

At the fairly basic level, there are the safeguards for people to make complaints to Health, and the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner provides opportunities for complaints to be made. The Community Visitor Scheme, which actually physically goes into facilities and observes for themselves, which fortunately, belatedly, at the end of this matter, was a crucial part of uncovering what was going on here, did work, although belatedly.

The Chief Psychiatrist has responsibilities under the act that empower him to monitor the services that occur within our mental healthcare system, and this was within his province of responsibility. Pretty fundamentally, the aged-care accreditation agency, which is charged with the very responsibility of looking through 44 standards of aged care in these facilities, was accrediting this facility, first, on a three-yearly basis when there was trouble in 2007 and then on a three-yearly basis as late as March of last year. In fact, they received a three-year accreditation.

But it is true that SA Health has its own governance issues, which should have caught this particular set of failings. There is no doubt about that, and there have been steps taken to change the leadership in the levels both directly at the facility and the next level above the facility. There is a range of staff who are the subject of disciplinary proceedings.

There are two categories of failure here. There is obviously the misbehaviour—the abuse and neglect—which can have no justification under any system, and those people are being dealt with through a disciplinary process, but then there are the cultural and broader issues, which were the lack of oversight and governance that occurred within our health agency. They need also to be grappled with, and they are being attended to by the minister and senior levels within SA Health.

But can I say this: at all times, the policy of this government has been to pursue service excellence in relation to every one of our health facilities—every single one of our health facilities—and overwhelmingly that's what we do achieve. It's also the policy of this government that every patient in every one of our facilities should be treated with dignity and respect.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** It is a principle of the way in which this government operates its facilities, and by and large we achieve that. It is also a principle of this government that we have zero tolerance for elder abuse, or indeed the abuse of any vulnerable person within this community. Assertive steps need to be taken to enforce those standards, and we make no apologies for taking strong and assertive steps to assert those standards.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Supplementary, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** Before we go to the supplementary, I call to order the members for Schubert, Davenport, Mount Gambier and the leader. I warn for the first time the members for Mount Gambier and Schubert, and I warn for the second and final time the member for Morialta, the deputy leader and the member for Mount Gambier. Leader.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44):** A supplementary to the Premier: which minister is responsible for the cultural failure that the Premier referred to in his previous answer?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:44):** The Minister for Mental Health has accepted full responsibility for this by the way in which she has accounted for the matter. First, she uncovered the—

**Ms Chapman:** She uncovered it?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Absolutely. Before—

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will be seated. The deputy leader has continued to interject even after a second warning. I remove her from the house for an hour under the sessional order.

*The honourable member for Bragg having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** If I have leave to continue my remarks, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Before a word was uttered in this house and before any public attention was drawn to this issue, the Minister for Mental Health commissioned this inquiry. And not just a small inquiry, not just an inquiry into the presenting incident or incidents, but a comprehensive inquiry.

**An honourable member:** It should never have got to that stage.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** It is true and disturbing that it took the community visitor to have to escalate his concerns to the minister for that inquiry to occur, and that is a failing; there is no doubt about that. But when the minister became aware of that, she instituted the forensic inquiry, which revealed the extent of the difficulties that even the Chief Psychiatrist himself, when he was in the facility for 2½ hours in the months before discussions occurred with him about this broader review, were not revealed to him.

Let's be clear about this. In discussions that the minister and I have since had with a number of the families, they were at pains to suggest to us that their criticisms were not of the whole facility; indeed, they were incredibly grateful for the care and excellent work that was done by a very significant number of staff at this facility. So, while there are very troubling issues that have been revealed through this report, it is not a universal condemnation of everybody who worked at this facility. They wanted us to know that and they wanted us to make that clear because they felt badly for those staff who had been tarred with the same brush as those who had been doing the wrong thing.

There is no doubt that this minister acted appropriately, got to the bottom of the concerns here and has taken assertive steps to respond to the recommendations of this report. That is the essence of responsibility—by taking responsibility, by being open and honest about the nature and extent of the problem, by owning responsibility for the solutions and by taking steps to implement those solutions.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:47):** My question is to the Premier. Following the Chief Psychiatrist's finding that staff of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network have harboured, and I quote, 'deeply held concerns about the Oakden facility for many years', who is responsible for those concerns being ignored?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:47):** I don't think I really need to go very much farther than to draw your attention to the previous remarks that I have made, but it is probably also worth noting that the Chief Psychiatrist himself notes in the report that there is a disturbing culture of nondisclosure that occurred within this facility.

**An honourable member:** I wonder where he gets that from?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That is a good question, because it is certainly not the policy of this government. Our policy has been to shine a light on those issues which are disturbing failures, whether they be in the child protection system or, sadly, in this area. It is, of course, deeply distressing when there is any section of the service that we provide by the state government that fails our

citizens. It is probably even more profoundly so when those people are themselves some of our most vulnerable and needing our greatest care.

For me, it is a source of enormous distress to think that some of these older people here were grappling, probably in and out of lucidity, with their mental health care issues, being incredibly frightened when people were dealing with them roughly or in an abusive way. For me, that is a shattering idea, and I know that that is at the heart of the concern of these family members. These are family members who often feel incredibly guilty about the fact that their loved ones can't be at home or in an aged-care facility.

It is always a hard thing to put a loved one in an aged-care facility. I have been through this myself. You worry about it every day. The only thing that is worse is if you think you have made a decision where they have actually been exposed to additional risk, or something bad has happened to them. It is true that some of the behaviours of a number of these patients are extreme, but that is no justification for them to be treated with anything less than absolute respect and dignity, and it is shameful that they weren't—

*Mr Tarzia interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Hartley to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —and we repeat our apology to those patients and to their family members. Our responsibility now, knowing about this, is to act assertively to fix it.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49):** Was it treating the families with respect and dignity not to read the report for more than one week and not to make any public comment on the contents of the Oakden report for more than two weeks?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:50):** We had a minister who made an immediate and unconditional apology. We have an acting premier and arrangements in place to ensure the continuity of government when any minister or any premier or deputy premier is absent on leave. It is entirely appropriate that the matter was dealt with by the minister in my absence, and as soon as I returned from leave I made an immediate public remark expressing my distress and concern about the events, offering to meet the family members, which I did within days, and together with the minister we have been taking steps to address their distress and the issues that they wish to bring to us.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the members for Goyder and Davenport, and I warn for the first time the leader and the member for Hartley, and I warn the member for Hartley for the second and final time. Leader.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:51):** How does the Premier justify his ongoing support for the minister claiming that she acted as soon as she was made aware of this, given that the Chief Psychiatrist has reported significant problems were known as far back as 2007 and "have been present throughout the last 10 years"? How is it that the Premier is not prepared for any of his ministerial colleagues to take responsibility for the problems of Oakden which have been known for years and years and years?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:51):** I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition does this deliberately or whether he does it accidentally, but he has completely ignored the factual material that we have just put before the house. When the minister in 2007—

**Mr Marshall:** 2007—that is what the Chief Psychiatrist said.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Yes, he did, and this is the same Chief Psychiatrist who said that these matters were not observable to him when he was in the facility just last year. The very same Chief Psychiatrist who has reached these conclusions, and I presume you are not seeking to

impugn his credit, has said that merely walking through the facility, one wouldn't have been aware of these things. Indeed, he was in the facility—

**Mr Marshall:** Come on!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, these are his words.

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned for the second and final time.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** These are his words, not my words, so if you want to take issue with the credibility of the Chief Psychiatrist, do so, but I don't think it will reflect well on the Leader of the Opposition's credit. He said that he was in the facility for 2½ hours dealing with concerns in the middle of last year and was unaware of the depth of the concerns that have been now revealed. Indeed, he said that without the forensic inquiry where he spent day after day, week after week in this facility speaking to multiple staff, seeking to get them to reveal what they had previously concealed, he still wouldn't have got to the bottom of it. This was the report that was given to John Hill in 2011 about what had happened over the previous three years:

A strategy has been implemented to reassure both the Department of Health and Ageing and the Aged Care Standards and Accreditation Agency that improvements made in Makk and McLeay would be maintained...

There has been significant amount of learning, changes and development of individuals in their roles and functions within Makk and McLeay. Staff have a better understanding of the requirements under the Accreditations Standards and are aware of the need to pursue continuous improvement having a resident focus...

Older Persons Mental Health Services do not consider that accreditation is at risk, but as with any nursing home, there is potential for issues to arise which may impact on the accreditation...

When the ACH Group contract expired—

after three years, of bringing in an aged-care provider—

meetings were held with the Department of Health and Ageing, which were supportive of the strategies suggested and confirmed that Makk and McLeay is no longer under the scrutiny generated by previous non-compliance with standards. The Aged Care Standards and Accreditation Agency was also supportive of the strategies outlined, and advised that Makk and McLeay can expect an unannounced review visit shortly following the end of the ACH Group contract.

Of course, what they did was they got a further two three-yearly accreditations without qualification. This is what ministers were aware of. Individual incidents being raised in any of our facilities—whether they are hospitals, aged-care facilities—are, of course, a cause for concern. We ask for them to be investigated and we respond to them when people raise issues, but we don't immediately assume that we have a culture that is so devastatingly bad that service quality is profoundly compromised, unless there is something that draws that to our attention. When the minister began to suspect that, she then instituted the inquiry that revealed that very thing.

Members are in here. They did not ask a question of the minister—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Davenport.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —before she instituted this inquiry. The media did not ask a question of the minister before she instituted this inquiry. She exposed herself, and indeed this government, to a deep inquiry, a searching inquiry, about matters that we knew were not going to be pleasant but that were necessary to ensure we got to the bottom of what appeared to be an alarming number of cases of abuse and neglect which seem to be clustered towards 2016.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier's time has expired. Leader.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:55):** My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Has the minister read the Annual Report of the Principal Community Visitor 2015-16?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:56):** Yes, I have.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56):** When did the minister receive and read this report, which was dated September last year?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:56):** My understanding is that that was received in either late September or October last year, and I tabled it in the house in December last year. I would have read it at some period of time in that space.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56):** Why did it take the minister so long to table this report, which raised very serious allegations regarding the Oakden facility?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:56):** A number of reports come up to my office and I regularly table documents, as we are required to, for the parliament. During the time that I received correspondence from the community visitor in October, I triggered an initial briefing request to NALHN about the Spriggs family.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:57):** What action did the minister take when she read this report, which did raise very serious concerns regarding the Oakden facility?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:57):** I have just answered that question.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:57):** Can the minister outline to the house whether she undertook any further investigation into the very serious allegations that were outlined in this report and made by three separate families regarding the treatment and care of their loved ones at Oakden?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:57):** As I have outlined in a number of answers today, when I became aware, with the community visitor's report and the family coming forward about the Spriggs case, that we needed to get answers from NALHN, we asked for a briefing. That process triggered a number of inquiries across the health system that have brought us to the point we are at today, to ensure that the people at the Oakden site, residents there who are frail and vulnerable and deeply confused because of their medical conditions, receive the appropriate level of care that they have going forward.

I am focused on acting, as I always have been since becoming aware of this situation. When I became aware of the level of concern for this institution, that is the reason I triggered an independent review by the Chief Psychiatrist.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58):** Did the minister act upon the very specific recommendation tabled in this community visitor's report regarding Oakden? If so, can she outline to the house what actions she took regarding that recommendation?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:58):** I would have to reread the community visitor's report before I answer that question.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58):** Is the minister suggesting that she doesn't know what the specific Oakden recommendation was in the Annual Report of the Principal Community Visitor 2015-16?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:59):** The community visitor's report is a very large document, and I would want to refresh my mind before I made a statement.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** You've got one right next to you.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart, I call him to order.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:59):** I will refresh the minister's memory. Recommendation 24 says, 'That a review is undertaken of the clinical hours in contrast to patient acuity at the Older Persons Mental Health Service—

**The SPEAKER:** Is there a question here?

**Mr MARSHALL:** —at Oakden to ensure the provision—

**The SPEAKER:** Is there a question here?

**Mr MARSHALL:** —of quality and safe care to patients residing in this facility.' What action did the minister take to implement that recommendation?

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:59):** Could the opposition leader seek leave and repeat the question again?

**Mr MARSHALL:** Is that permissible?

**The SPEAKER:** Well, without reading the quote again.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MARSHALL:** She doesn't know what the recommendations—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart is warned. Leader, my instructions are clear.

**Mr MARSHALL:** The instructions are clear, and so I repeat my question to the minister. What action did she take regarding the recommendation made by the community visitor's report into the Oakden facility which specifically addresses clinical hours in contrast with patient acuity at the Oakden facility?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS:** I think that's a fairly straightforward answer. I have outlined in three ministerial statements what action has been taken in the matter of Oakden. When we became aware in late December—when I became aware in late December from a briefing from NALHN about the depth of care and concerns on this site—we commissioned an independent review by the Chief Psychiatrist. I believe that the review is more comprehensive than perhaps even the Leader of the Opposition is trying to hint that we should have undertaken.

#### OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:01):** Supplementary: can the minister confirm to the house that the community visitor's annual report 2015-16 was addressed specifically to her as the Minister for Mental Health?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:01):** As I have said, I get a number of documents that come forward to my office every week, and I would have to review the covering letter that went with that. I do know that where I had matters raised by the community visitor with me in October we went to NALHN and asked for advice. We began investigating the issues raised around these cases, and particularly the Spriggs case, which was the matter that eventually led to me triggering the inquiry in December.

**OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:01):** Does the minister stand by her repeated comments in this house, and also in public, that she took action to establish the inquiry as soon as she was made aware of the concerns at Oakden, given that now we realise—and she has just said to the house—that the community visitor's report was received by her, in her office, directed to her in September last year?

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:02):** May I correct the Leader of the Opposition, in the sense that it arrived in late September/October, and therefore it goes through a paper process. Eventually, I would have read the report, as I said earlier today, in somewhere between that period and—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert, I warn for the second and final time. The leader is already on two warnings. Minister.

**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. What I have said about this matter is that when issues were raised by the community visitor during the October period and I became aware of the concerns, we went to NALHN and began to establish the information that led to the triggering of this review once I was thoroughly briefed by the head of NALHN in December.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Finniss to order.

**FEDERAL BUDGET**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:03):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure advise the house of reactions in South Australia to last night's federal budget?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:03):** Can I thank the member for Light for his question because I know that, like many people—particularly those living in the northern suburbs—they had some great expectations of last night's federal budget, but of course, like so many other areas of government, last night's federal budget completely duded South Australia. The federal government failed to commit one new dollar, one new dollar—

*Mr Bell interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I know the member for Mount Gambier is keen to attend the Mount Gambier racing carnival—and so am I—and I will give him that opportunity if he continues. Minister.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The federal government failed to commit one new dollar for state infrastructure projects in South Australia. Last night's budget was great for New South Wales: \$8.4 billion for inland rail, \$5.3 billion towards a new western Sydney airport and \$5 billion to Snowy Hydro. So, while the Prime Minister's home state was rewarded with nearly \$20 billion in new projects—

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Adelaide is on two warnings.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —South Australia got nothing. The member for Adelaide says 'protein' again. I think we have established it's not protein. I think we have established that. I am happy to get her a briefing. It's a slight difference, but we will sort that out for her. So, \$1.2 billion was allocated for Metronet in Western Australia, the federal finance minister's home state—a project that doesn't have a business case, doesn't have a project report, but apparently it's okay to fund those sorts of projects.

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Wright is warned.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Here in South Australia, there is no new money for South Road upgrades, no money committed to public transport projects and no new regional projects. The only thing that the federal Liberal government is crowing about in South Australia is finally unpicking those cuts that federal members like Tony Pasin and Rowan Ramsey voted to impose on local government by getting rid of the supplementary road funding.

**Mr Whetstone:** Did you say submarine funding?

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, we are not talking about your IQ. We are talking about things above surface.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mitchell is warned. The member for Chaffey is warned.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Today, the Civil Contractors Federation came out against—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It's not having the desired effect, Mr Speaker. We have the Civil Contractors Federation come out against the lack of infrastructure funding in the federal budget, with their chief executive officer saying, 'Make no mistake, despite all the rhetoric to the contrary, SA has been severely short-changed on funding on major infrastructure projects needed in this state.' He went on, 'Less than a year out from a state election, last night's budget could well come back to haunt the SA Liberal opposition.' How true. The RAA has also been scathing. They said:

The lack of funding for South Road is a serious oversight. The Abbott Government committed to a complete upgrade of South Road within a 10-year period. Without a funding commitment for the next section— it's unlikely this will be met. Of course, the Freight Council said—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is on two warnings. Did he interject just then, or was he talking to himself?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Both.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The Freight Council slammed the budget. Senator Nick Xenophon has slammed the budget, but there is one South Australian who thinks it's fantastic, of course. That simpering sycophant, the Leader of the Opposition, has once again stood up for his federal mates—

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —just like he did about chasing Holden out of town, just like he did about getting rid of the pensioner concession funding, just like he did for the \$80 billion of health and education funding. There he is, out there defending—

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will be seated while we deal with the question of 'simpering sycophant'.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Yes, sir—completely unacceptable, way beneath the minister.

**The SPEAKER:** Well, the leader would have to take the point of order.

**Mr Marshall:** Get on with it.

**The SPEAKER:** Okay.



**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That simpering sycophant Leader of the Opposition has not only backed up his performance on health and education cuts, chasing Holden out of town, rejoicing in the lack of pensioner concession funding from the federal government—

**Mr PENGILLY:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** I would prefer that a point of order be made by someone with clean hands in this question time.

**Mr PENGILLY:** Relatively. Sir, I ask you to rule whether the minister is debating.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Well, the member for Finniss's colleagues appear to have ruled on his point of order. Minister.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Of course, there was one last contribution from the Leader of the Opposition. He said, 'I will tell you the best guarantee for more money coming to South Australia: that's a hardworking Labor government that puts the interests of South Australia first.' Oops, he did it again—he did it again.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer is on two warnings. The member for Ashford.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL VOLUNTEERS

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:09):** My question is directed to the Minister for Health.

**Mr Gardner:** They're still protecting the Minister for Mental Health.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** Can the minister advise the house how volunteers will support the operation of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:09):** Our volunteers are very important, and I know the interest that the member for Ashford has in the wonderful work our volunteers do. They are an absolutely critical part of care across SA Health, giving up their time to help patients and their families in our healthcare system.

Across our state, thousands of volunteers give of their time in our hospitals. They are a lifeline for patients. They are the human face of care. They provide that human contact that is so important if you are injured or unwell. From making wigs to wayfinding, providing pastoral care and a listening ear, our volunteers support the daily functions of our intensive care departments, emergency departments, inpatient wards, laundries and much more. They raise much-needed funds and provide support and care to whomever they meet.

Today, I had the pleasure of spending time with a number of volunteers, who will be based at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, as they looked inside the new hospital for the first time. Their enthusiasm was absolutely infectious and their commitment was second to none. Kathy, one of the volunteers I had the opportunity of meeting today, has been at the Royal Adelaide Hospital since 1999. Her main role is to support patients and relatives who present to the emergency department, especially in times of distress, providing comfort and a shoulder to lean on. Such critical tasks support the work of our doctors and nurses and are very much a valued part of the hospital.

From the 1920s, when the Royal Adelaide Hospital Auxiliary was established, through to the Lavender Lads and Ladies, spiritual care visitor service, wellness centre and heritage office, volunteers have been the lifeblood of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. These individual volunteer groups will come together at the new RAH as the Royal Adelaide Hospital volunteers. The call is now out for generous and enthusiastic people to join their volunteer program. It was interesting speaking to the volunteers. You don't necessarily need to be not in full-time employment. One of the volunteers we were speaking to was full-time employed and she made herself available a few hours every week to assist at the Royal Adelaide Hospital kiosk.

Over almost a century of service, volunteers have had a long and proud history at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and will continue to make a significant contribution at the new site. In volunteers week, I am incredibly proud to support the call for volunteers to be part of our wonderful new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Any members or anyone who is interested in becoming a volunteer at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital can get information at [newrah.sa.gov.au](http://newrah.sa.gov.au).

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta's interjection that the Chair is protecting the Minister for Mental Health is risible, given that more than 50 questions were provided to Her Majesty's Opposition yesterday on this topic and 41 today. Just because he didn't get the call, being No. 42 on the opposition's question list, doesn't mean that this Chair is protecting a minister.

**Mr GARDNER:** I seek leave to make a personal explanation in relation to the comment you have just made about what I apparently said. To the best of my recollection, I did not reflect upon the Chair. I said 'they' were protecting her—'they' being the government.

#### *Grievance Debate*

### **WOOLENOOK INTERNMENT CAMP ANNIVERSARY**

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:14):** I would like to speak about a local event that I attended over the weekend, the Woolenook internment camp's 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary. It was a unique event on the great River Murray, north of Renmark. We all had to hop onto the *PS Industry*, one of the most famous paddle steamers on the River Murray in South Australia. It has always been regarded as the fastest paddle steamer in South Australia on the River Murray. In fact, most of the people who attended the anniversary of the internment camp travelled up on the *PS Industry*. It was an opportunity for me to unveil a plaque commemorating the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of a historic site in the Riverland. It is a piece of Riverland history with a unique story that has not received as much attention as it deserves.

At the unveiling, it was great to see one of South Australia's great young regional ambassadors, Jackson Wickham, address those in attendance. Jackson has a particular interest and passion in our river history, particularly as a young fellow who now captains a riverboat. It was a pleasure to unveil the plaque commemorating the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of this historic site. As I said, it is a piece of Riverland history with a unique story that has not received the attention it deserves.

To provide the house with some background on the Woolenook internment camp, when World War II broke out Japanese people living in Australia were sent to internment camps, many of which were in the Riverland at Loveday (I am sure the member for Light would know about that), Katarapko and Woolenook Bend. Initially, there were 30 internees at the Woolenook Bend camp when it was established on 7 May 1942, many of whom were previously pearl divers in Broome in Western Australia.

By the time the camp was closed in 1945, there were 264 internees, most living in Nissen huts. Their task was to cut firewood for the Renmark Irrigation Trust and later for the Berri Irrigation Trust, with some sawn wood sent to Adelaide. The internees were paid six shillings a tonne. The wood was taken from the Murtho Forest Reserve and the timber was used for fences, buildings and vineyard trellises and to supply fuel for the Renmark irrigation pumps, electricity generators, domestic needs and passing steamboats. The invisible fact of delivering this wood to the riverbank and then loading it onto the paddle steamers is that it was all done by hand. It was all done by the internment camp internees. It was incredibly difficult work back in those days.

I walked around the remains of the internment camp. It was amazing to see that there is still a cricket pitch, a tennis court and some remnants of a road that was underpinned by rock. The camp essentially consisted of a tented compound surrounded by barbed wire. The camp was officially closed on 6 May 1945, and within a year all salvageable buildings were sold at auction.

At the plaque unveiling, it was fantastic to have Trevor Reed in attendance. His father, Robert Baden Powell 'Bob' Reed, was the owner and captain of the paddle steamer *Kelvin*. Captain Reed had the contract to supply all the wood to the Renmark Irrigation Trust's number one pump from 1932 until 1945. Trevor said that his father was always very kind to the internees and, as a result, the internees presented him with the gift of a model boat, carved from the boom of the *PS Kelvin*.

This boat carving has been presented to the Renmark Irrigation Trust. It is truly a credit to those internees that they carved and turned a piece of broken mast into what is now an absolute piece of artwork named *The Blue Moon*. Captain Bob was a great humanitarian. He was very kind to the internees. He allowed them to cook and heat food, their rice, which was fittingly rewarded by the presentation of *The Blue Moon*.

I would like to thank the people who attended the Woolenook internment camp's 75-year celebrations. It was great to see history being passed down by the older generations. One of my constituents, Ted Townsend, was there in 1943. He told stories that were then passed down to the next generation, and they are now being passed down to another generation. It truly is a great piece of Riverland history. I think it is great that we have recognised 75 years. I look forward to being around to celebrate 100 years of the Woolenook internment camp.

### COMMUNITY EVENTS

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:19):** Everyone matters. I know that the contributions of everyone in this state matter because of the wonderful, positive and selfless acts I see as I move around the Florey electorate, the north-eastern suburbs and more broadly. On Monday 24 April, I saw veterans of the 66<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Battle of Kapyong at the Royal Australian Regiment Association's Burnside rooms. I listened to Dr Donald Beard's eyewitness account in his commemorative address as a Kapyong veteran himself charged on the days between 23 and 25 April with the medical care of casualties and worse. It was the closest I hope I ever get to a battlefield and I thank all who have, all who are and all who will serve their country for their service.

Again on 24 April, as an ambassador for the Freemasons Foundation Centre for Men's Health, I attended the Governor's visit to see and learn more about the research projects underway. Following the welcome of Professor Gary Wittert, the foundation's director, the Governor acknowledged incoming members of the board of patrons and congratulated new scholarship students and later attended a briefing with key representatives of the centre. One of the projects I saw there that I was particularly interested in concerned research into helping farmers and men on the land cope with the many health issues they face with the message of early intervention, which is a very important part of all health issues.

Later that same day, I took part in the ANZAC Eve Youth Vigil at the National War Memorial on North Terrace, also attended by the Governor and Mrs Le. This is now one of 13 such services held throughout the state. Young members of service organisations attended, such as the Girl Guides, the SES—I note today is SES Day, which is why some of my colleagues are wearing orange—the CFS, the Surf Life Saving and many other groups. A very impressive young man, Sam Doering from Faith Lutheran College, gave an address and an equally eloquent vote of thanks was given by 14-year-old Fletcher from Surf Life Saving South Australia.

The Salisbury RSL welcomed me to their dawn service, which was very well attended and supported by the Salisbury City Band. Bands play (pardon the pun) a very important part in such services. They then travelled to the city to be part of the march at 10am, so it was a long day for them.

Because of my Italian heritage, I also attended Com.It.Es South Australia's commemoration of the 76<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Italy's Festa della Liberazione. This is a day of national significance as it marks the end of the Italian Civil War and Nazi occupation during World War II, the end of 22 years of fascist rule and five years of war. Many Italians resisted the occupation and dictatorship and suffered greatly. Their courage is remembered and honoured on 25 April.

On 28 April, I also saw families united in grief at this year's service of Victims of Industrial Death. I acknowledge the work of all those who help families come to understand the situations they face. Later that day, also with the Governor and Mrs Le, I attended the Tea Tree Gully Rotary Handover Dinner. We all know about the work of the Rotary clubs in South Australia.

On 29 April, along with minister Bettison and many other MPs, I was welcomed by members of the East Turkistan Australian Association to celebrate the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the establishment of their community in Australia. This wonderful group of people have also faced hardship in their homeland and they are now proud to call Australia home. Many young people and children made the

evening wonderful with entertainment. During the evening, it was great to speak with Libby Hogarth, whose advocacy on behalf of this community is well known. She is a tireless worker for refugees, especially those from the East Turkistan area.

That night, I was also able to attend the final night of the Calisthenic Association of South Australia's Graceful Girl competition at the Royalty Theatre. Senior champion, Elyse Pavan, who was coached by Melissa Lydyard from the Marden club, gave a marvellous performance among the 17 outstanding routines—even to make the finals makes you a winner.

I would also like to congratulate Gracie Lovelock from the Brighton club, coached by Sharni Truscott, who won the intermediate 15 to 16-year-old championship division, which makes her the holder of the Frances Bedford trophy for the year 2017. Thanks to president, John Maguire; all the adjudicators, writers, coaches, clubs and competitors; and the families, of course, who support their girls in the competition. As a CASA and ACF patron, I wish all of them well in Sydney in July for the nationals.

The weekend of 6 May saw Generations in Jazz in Mount Gambier. Modbury High School competed, continuing a fine tradition under the care of Rosie Carr. I was there in spirit, as I was for the Loxton heat of the Pedal Prix, another wonderful annual event I am very proud to be associated with. May Day was commemorated that weekend with the annual city march following on from the May Day dinner earlier in the week. Sadly, not everyone remembers the struggle that is commemorated, and there are many who are no longer with us remembered at the Port Adelaide Workers Memorial on the Sunday immediately after May Day. I attended garage sales at the Churches of Christ and the St Luke Anglican Church.

### SALT FESTIVAL

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:25):** I would like to talk about all the things that have been happening on Lower Eyre Peninsula, particularly the inaugural SALT Festival, which occurred just a couple of weeks ago from 21 to 30 April. It was a 10-day festival and over 100 events took place. Over the 10 days, there were almost 6,500 attendees.

The festival had an initial vision of a 'global' concept, with the global and local informing each other. It gave artists who would never have otherwise exhibited a platform to celebrate their work. It included art classes, workshops, exhibitions, conferences, music, live performances, writers events and many other things right across Lower Eyre Peninsula, not only in Port Lincoln but also in Tumby Bay, Cummins, Coffin Bay and, dare I say it, even the tiny town of Edillilie, which of course is my home town.

The target at the outset was to hold 35 events and, as I said, they finished up with over 100. I remember Terry Krieg and Tim Coote both coming to me on separate occasions 18 months ago with the germ of an idea that they simply wanted to float with me. After an extraordinary amount of work and the pulling together of a very capable committee, the result was a tremendously successful festival. The festival will occur again next year. The dates are already in, so please lock in 20 to 29 April 2018.

I was able to get along to a few events. I did not get to all 100, but I certainly tried to get to one on each and every day. Of course, I attended the opening at the SALT Shaker—the venue which headquartered the festival. I attended a piano concert by internationally acclaimed pianists Simon Tedeschi and Kevin Hunt, and a walk for Parkinson's at Tumby Bay, which incidentally was opened by ABC identity Peter Goers, who also did shows at Cummins, Tumby Bay, Coffin Bay and Port Lincoln.

I attended the Tin Shed Rockers dance at the Edillilie Hall, and I congratulate the Edillilie Memorial Progress Association, particularly Julie Carter and Reta Coffey, on their work there. It is nice to see the Edillilie Hall being used again. It was an afternoon show. There were some pretty hard-core rockers there. In fact, the Port Lincoln Car Club made the journey up as well. The event was well attended, and they really enjoyed the afternoon.

There was the Bank of I.D.E.A.S. workshop with Peter Kenyon and Kat Baddeley. Peter Kenyon is known throughout the nation. He is Western Australian by birth but has made his profession travelling regional areas of South Australia and giving invigorating and encouraging

speeches. On the day I attended in Cummins, he talked about reinvigorating country towns and also the businesses that are so vital in those country towns.

In a nutshell, the SALT Festival provided a platform for artists and contributors to showcase their ideas and interact, and the festival allowed people to converge in arts, innovation, conferences and discussion. I also attended the energy summit, which was entitled 'Line in the sand'. Of course, the power issue, the electricity issue, is so critical to this state, this nation and especially Eyre Peninsula, and there were lots of good ideas and solutions being worked towards. We were fortunate enough to have Professor Ross Garnaut at that particular workshop. He probably has more experience in this area than anyone else in Australia.

Congratulations to the SALT Festival committee: the chairperson, Tim Coote; festival coordinator, Lisa Kuerschner; Andrea Broadfoot; Sally Neville; Cherie Broad; Jack Ritchie; Mark Thomas; Kathryn Hardwick-Francou; Peter Mihalaras; Emma Pedler; and Terry Krieg. I am sure that there were many others who contributed and helped along the way, but particularly to that committee: a job well done and tremendously successful, and we are looking forward to next year. This was on the back of the Peter Teakle motorsport event in Port Lincoln two weeks prior to that, where there was live motor racing around the street circuit that was created in Port Lincoln. We talk about Mad March in Adelaide; it was certainly active April in Port Lincoln.

#### ELDER ELECTORATE

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:30):** Today, I rise to speak on an issue affecting a significant number of residents in my electorate of Elder and, I suspect, statewide. It is a matter that many constituents have raised with me and I am very concerned for the welfare of these constituents. On a daily basis, I have constituents reach out to my office worried for their futures. They are worried for their children's welfare and their futures, and they are worried because the cost of living expenses are not being met by the current Centrelink payments.

We live in an increasingly expensive world and those on low incomes or Centrelink payments are being increasingly disadvantaged, in large part due to our federal government policies and attitude to those who are not able, for many reasons, to earn their own way in life. The recent Anglicare Australia Rental Affordability Snapshot painted a stark picture. The majority of low income individuals are struggling to afford appropriate housing. We know that Housing SA and community housing struggle under the sheer volume of people requesting support. We know that many South Australians are living rough on the streets.

Newstart Allowance for a single person without children is around \$536 a fortnight. This amount is to cover rent, food, bills, clothing, transport and medications. I did a quick search online earlier this week and struggled to find even a share house in the Adelaide suburbs that costs less than 50 per cent of that, with rent assistance for a single no dependant share house situation, where there is a subsidy of \$88.13 a fortnight. Even share housing, a situation that does not suit everyone, is increasingly becoming unaffordable. When we add the bills that the standard household faces, the problems worsen.

In summer, many South Australians in these situations make the choice between food or staying cool. In winter, they make the choice between paying their rent or paying for heating. These are the most vulnerable people; often they have medical conditions that make the weather not an inconvenience but a life-threatening situation. The trade-offs that people find themselves making in this situation are stressful, fear laden and guilt ridden, as I hear firsthand, 'Shall I buy school shoes for my child this week or shall I cut down to two or one meal so I can do that, or shall I forgo prescription items that are essential to my health or my family's health?' The list goes on.

I am hopeful that the South Australian government's energy plan will deliver tangible results for my constituents by both increasing reliability and reducing cost, but energy is only a small part of the pressures that squeeze their purses. We have a federal Liberal government that through its actions says that it does not care for its vulnerable people. We witness this with the Centrelink debt drama earlier this year where people who could least afford it and who had the least resources to fight it were chased for debts that did not exist in many cases (or in any case, as far as I could see) and had to face down the full and intimidating power of the bureaucratic hurdles before they could even discuss the debt with a real live person.

All of us heard of and saw the traumatic impact that this had on many South Australians. We saw them victimised, singled out and blamed instead of addressing the systemic and societal issues that contribute to the plight of these most vulnerable people. We also see low income earners have their income under threat, with penalty rates being threatened and stripped. At the same time, the Liberals are keen to change shop hours and deregulate them, which says that those who are at the lower end of the wage-earning scale apparently do not deserve time with the family and that apparently they should be happy with lower wages. The Liberals want you to work longer hours for less pay. That is shameful.

We as a state need to stand up for our vulnerable. We need to ensure our systems are in place to help people off the streets and into affordable housing. We need to put pressure on the federal government to increase pensions and welfare payments. We must fight for the vulnerable of our state to ensure a fair standard of living for our constituents. We must give each and every South Australian dignity.

This is not a political issue. It is a societal issue, a state issue and a community issue. Every South Australian citizen deserves to live in appropriate and affordable housing, to afford to have the heater on and their fridge full, to have access to health care and education, to live with self-worth. I call on all members in this house to stand up and fight for South Australians doing it tough. Society can only be judged by how we all treat the vulnerable and how we include them.

### MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:35):** Yesterday, the house reflected on the life of the late Hon. Robin Millhouse, former attorney-general in this place, who went on to serve on the bench and make a significant contribution to the life of South Australia. That was reflected on by the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Speaker himself and, from our side, the Leader of the Opposition and Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Robin Millhouse, in his contribution to a book entitled *The Liberal Movement*, talked about the importance of liberalism and the importance of our parliamentary system, our democracy and responsible government. I quote Robin Millhouse:

To Liberals, the importance of mankind lies in the importance of every single human being, and not in the State or in a power structure.

He continued:

Liberalism believes that sovereignty lies in the people. The sovereignty is expressed through a Parliamentary system in which elected representatives of the people are free to act upon their own convictions, which have previously been expressed and accepted by the majority of electors.

In the political sphere, Liberalism upholds:

- an independent judiciary
- the control of the executive by Parliament
- the utmost possible decentralisation of Government
- an election system which maintains majority rule and regularly-held elections.

The words of Robin Millhouse are as true today as they were then. They are the essence of liberalism, they are the essence of responsible government, and I am going to come back to the issue of Oakden and ministerial responsibility. If this house so proudly and correctly upholds the virtues of the late Robin Millhouse—and everyone spoke glowingly of him yesterday—we should take that as the bar of what ministerial responsibility should be all about.

Over the last couple of weeks, and since late last year, the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse has been asked probably in excess of 150 questions on her ministerial responsibility in relation to Oakden. At no point in any of her answers back to this house did the minister choose to act in a way that reflects responsible government. At every single opportunity she has ducked and weaved from her responsibility in answering to the house. Of course, in answering to the house it is not about her wasting an hour of question time; it is about her being responsible to the South Australian people. That is one of the biggest travesties in this whole sad Oakden debate, that we have seen the breakdown of ministerial responsibility in the state of South Australia.

If we look at the question time from April, time and time again the minister was asked what she knew of Oakden, the tragedy at Oakden, when she attended the site, to whom she spoke, yet at no time did the minister give answers that were appropriate or fulsome. At all times she sought to avoid being specific in her responsibilities as a minister. She has provided this house several ministerial statements, all of which have changed their tune every time. We see inconsistencies in her responses to that of the Premier once again today.

The people of South Australia want to know what the minister knew. Today in question time the Premier got up and said that the ministers are not responsible, they are not clinicians, they are not responsible for what happens in their department; that is the job of the bureaucracy and the clinicians to do that. I would argue, and the average person in the street would argue, about the needs of responsible government, and unfortunately for this government they fundamentally fail the pub test in terms of ministerial responsibility on this issue.

We have had a minister who constantly hides behind her desk, who says, 'I have so many reports to provide, I can't read them all.' She failed to provide, on time, the borderline personality disorder plan and she failed to provide, on time, the Alcohol and Other Drug Strategy Plan. She has failed to present to parliament, on time, the Suicide Prevention Plan, and she failed to appoint the Mental Health Commissioner on time. She has failed time and time again in her duty as a minister to be responsible to this house, to be responsible to the families that have been tied up with the whole sad Oakden scenario, and she has failed in her responsibility to live up to what it means to be a responsible minister in a Westminster government.

#### **NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:40):** Today, I want to add some more comments to what the Minister for Health said earlier about the role of volunteers in our community. This week, being National Volunteer Week, is an opportunity for us to do a couple of things. One is to acknowledge the work volunteers do in our community, and it is also an opportunity for volunteers to show the community the important role they play.

Volunteering comes in all shapes and forms right across our communities. According to some Harrison research undertaken for the Office for Volunteers, 42 per cent of the community are involved in some sort of formal volunteering and another 49 per cent are involved in informal volunteering. Formal volunteering means people who are involved in some sort of community organisation, be it sporting, recreation, community or health, etc., and informal volunteering is those people in our community who, on a regular basis, just help out a neighbour or a friend who needs some support.

In this state, 920,000 South Australians are actually involved in some sort of volunteering and contribute 1.76 million volunteer hours a year. The same research found that in terms of volunteers it is mainly women; more women than men volunteer. Generally speaking, the biggest group is the 35 to 54-year-old age group. Most are actually in paid employment, so they are volunteering alongside paid employment, and they are university educated. Research also tends to suggest that more volunteers than not are people who are married or in some sort of de facto relationship.

Of the volunteers involved, 29 per cent are involved in some sort of sporting organisation (which would not surprise people here), whether that be Aussie Rules, soccer, netball, cricket or hockey. Certainly all amateur and even professional sport has volunteers involved. At the local level, most sporting activities would not take place if it were not for the role of volunteers. At the junior levels, they often have volunteer coaches, and parents often volunteer as other officials, team managers, etc. Even in the professional field, many people who make Port Power and the Crows work, for example, are volunteers as well.

Another 25 per cent of people are involved in welfare and community organisations, such as, in my community, Heartbeat, and the various seniors groups, people who volunteer for councils in information centres or libraries or local museums. The local Care and Share Group in my community, for example, which turned 40 yesterday, looks after and supports seniors in our community. Also, let us not forget the number of service clubs in our communities who volunteer their time raising funds for valuable community projects. Another 12 per cent are involved in education

and training; for example, in schools they are involved in governing councils and they are involved as coaches. Many parents volunteer in their schools with reading or as volunteer SSOs and the like.

Why do people volunteer? Research indicates that there are two main reasons: one is a desire to help others, people who believe they are fortunate in their own lives and wish to assist others in the community; the other reason is a desire to give back to the community which enables them to live a good quality of life. In my view there are a couple of things that are really important in volunteering. While the economic factor has been calculated to be roughly a \$6 billion benefit to our economy, more important factors include the social aspects in terms of volunteers helping other people to remain connected—for example, Meals on Wheels. For some people who for some reason are housebound, Meals on Wheels volunteers are the only contact they have with the outside world.

People who volunteer enjoy better health and wellbeing. If you want to understand the work that volunteers do, just imagine your community without any volunteers for just one week. Volunteers are very important and are often recognised through various awards, and last week I attended the Northern Volunteering awards in my area.

### *Bills*

## **SUPPLY BILL 2017**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:45):** I rise to speak on the Supply Bill 2017 which proposes to give the government \$5.9 billion to spend in the next financial year, ahead of the budget being prepared. This is equivalent to five months' worth of the budget, or five-twelfths. Previously, for the last several years, this has been in the vicinity of \$3 billion. Why is there such a large increase of almost double the money that is not being accounted for that is simply being given without reason?

Why can this Labor government, after 15 years, not deliver a budget in a timely manner, well before the end of the financial year, so that they do not have to ask for the equivalent of five months' worth of money without any approval, without any transparency and with no idea of what the money is for? I note that the Victorian government, the New South Wales government and the federal government have managed to get their budgets prepared in the month of May with plenty of time, not needing a huge amount of appropriation without any due consideration.

For the last two financial years, the government have described their budgets as jobs budgets, yet the statistics show that the unemployment rate for South Australia is 6.7 per cent, which is the highest in the nation. We have 58,800 people unemployed and looking for work. Only 16,900 jobs have been created since Labor promised 100,000 extra jobs in February 2010. Since 2004, 39 companies have closed in South Australia and 72 companies have downsized. During Labor's 15 years in government, 7,728 companies have been declared insolvent.

This government has no ability to manage the finances of the state, nor does it have the ability to help the economy, to help small businesses to grow and to help people stay in our state. We know we are losing people interstate: our net interstate migration for the year ending September 2016 was 6,484. The people who are leaving are leaving because they are getting jobs interstate. These are highly employable people who are very valuable to our state. They are leaving because there are no opportunities for them in South Australia.

I reflect on one of the main reasons that I decided to run for parliament. There were two main reasons, but one was that I could not bear the thought of this Labor government destroying my state any further and watching the poor priorities. The bad economic management of this state was all too much. Having a modelling agency, I saw young people finish their degrees and leave our state for work. That was one of the reasons that prompted me to get involved in parliament so that I could make a difference and make the changes that were required.

I believe that people with a small business background, an entrepreneurship background, who have worked and who can see opportunities, who have started something from nothing after risking everything they have to make a go of it, are exactly the type people we need in parliament to



turn around the economic mess that we have after 15 years of Labor. We cannot afford to be losing our best and brightest out of the state.

We also have another issue. Some people come back to have their children and then many of them leave again. Most of the people in my age group, in their 40s, leave because the management and the higher positions are in the head offices in Melbourne and Sydney. Remember that in the eighties, we were in the top 3 of the states, not only in population but in the number of the top 100 companies. So, you could have upper management jobs and stay in South Australia, whereas now there are hardly any of those jobs.

In fact, I meet people every week in a situation where the husband now lives interstate, away from the wife and family. We know South Australia is a beautiful state. It is a wonderful place to live. We have great weather, we have great city planning, we have great amenities in our state, but we do not have jobs. Many families are being separated so that the husband or the wife, whoever has the job interstate, spends most of their time living interstate, or it could be that they fly out for the week and then fly back. We must put an end to that and get our state working again.

Nearly every primary school in the state seat of Adelaide is at capacity. Prospect North is almost at capacity for the first time, but every other school is at capacity. We need to be looking at how we change our schooling zones, or whether we add extra schools or add extra capacity to the schools we have. I note that Labor has been forced into implementing the Liberal policy that was announced in 2009 for a second city high school. Thankfully, that is underway and should hopefully open in 2019.

I note that for around a decade there was an issue that was ignored by the Labor government. It was only through the persistence of myself and the parents on the governing councils and all the principals of the primary schools, through their hard work and lobbying, that finally Labor had to listen. They are finally building a second high school. It should open 10 years after it was announced by the Liberal Party, but better late than never I guess you could say.

In my electorate, I have been doing extensive doorknocking as I have done for every election, as I have done for the two federal elections and as I have done every time there is an issue that is worthy of doorknocking the area. The main issues that are raised continually are around development. This Labor government's pig-headed pursuit of their own deeply flawed 30-year plan, with overestimated population targets, has meant there has been a rush to put high-rise development, tilt-up concrete and unacceptable developments throughout all residential areas.

In Prospect in particular, where the mayor was the Labor candidate and very keen to pursue the Labor policy, we have seen a plethora of units being built all along Churchill Road and Prospect Road where residents continually complain to me about the poor design, the lack of green space, the lack of parking, the issues for traffic management and the overshadowing of their gardens, their solar panels, their sunlight and their enjoyment. The issue we will have when all the gaps are filled and these units are built right to the boundary is that, as soon as the next lot of units are built in the gap, their balconies will basically be touching.

There are grave concerns. I have had people in tears, long-term residents of Prospect, who are moving out because they cannot bear what is happening to their local area. It is not that people are opposed to development and improvement. Prospect is actually one of the most densely populated suburbs in Australia; it is not as though we needed to rush to add more people. A lot of the blocks are quite large and were already being split into twos and threes with hammerhead developments and duplexes adjoined with a wall.

There was no need for us to push ahead and rush to build as much as possible, which now means that everyone is regretting what has happened in Prospect. It is also happening in the city. The Mayfield development is a good example. At least five years ago, I remember being part of community protests in Whitmore Square against the Mayfield development when they were proposing three towers. I believe they were to be around 10, 12 and 14 storeys high.

Five years later, that project is not off the ground at all, despite increases in height limits being approved. People in Adelaide do not want that development. They are not prepared to live in that style of development. I note that the Ergo Apartments that were also released for sale around

the same time, which I believe are four or five storeys in height, sold like hot cakes. That development is finished and people have been living happily there for years now.

You do not just develop the highest you can, with as many people as you can and make as much money as possible. You need to look at development that people actually want to live in, that enhances the natural community that we have and does not destroy the very way of life that people live in an area for: the trees, the greenery, the community feel.

I met Jan Gehl in Copenhagen. The famous architect from Copenhagen has done several reports in South Australia and he said that if you cannot design a building that is profitable to five storeys then you are not a very good architect and you are not a good businessperson. We do not need high-rise to be profitable or affordable. We need to start thinking about our own community and what Australians like living in and start developing that with high quality. Yes, we need affordable housing, but we do not need every single bit of space used up, leaving us with no greenery and with overshadowing and no design. We need the structures to look good.

We have had 15 years of a Labor government that pays lip service with grand gestures and reviews. We need action. We do not need any more reviews and commissions we need action. The state government is expecting a \$300 million surplus this year. However, bear in mind that they received a \$490 million payment for the Motor Accident Commission, which they sold, which is privatisation.

This government keeps going on about ETSA being sold, yet during its time, and during my term here in parliament, this Labor government has sold the forests, it has sold the lotteries, and it has sold the Motor Accident Commission. Kevin Foley even tried to sell a building in the city the government did not even own. They are now selling the Lands Titles Office. I believe they are selling the State Administration Centre and buildings around Victoria Square. Anything that has value, this government is selling to prop up its own budget so that it will leave an incoming government—hopefully a Liberal government next March—with absolutely nothing to work with.

But we will—and we will do it gladly—build from nothing, as I did with my business. I started from nothing. The Liberals know how to do that. Unfortunately, history shows that Labor comes in, spends all the money, trashes the house and sells any assets that make money. The Liberals come in and have to fix it all up again. We will do it and we can do it.

Under this government, we have seen our water prices rise by 233 per cent, to the extent that the sewerage and water services just coming to your house are so expensive, particularly in my electorate, where the cost of land has increased so significantly that one of my residents, 96-year-old Dorothy, in order to try to save money on her water bill, uses her rainwater tanks and carries buckets of water into the house. That really does not do a lot other than hurt her back, but she feels that she needs to save every bit of money that she can because she is on a pension and it is very difficult to afford even just the supply charge.

The supply charge is actually the biggest amount that she is paying, but to try to save even a few dollars she risks injuring herself by carrying buckets of cold rainwater from her backyard into her house. This is what this Labor government has done to the people of Adelaide and South Australia, not to mention the power bills and the crisis that we are having there. We know that we have the most unreliable, highest-cost power in Australia. We should have low cost power in our state. We have plenty of assets that can produce electricity.

We have gone too fast, too soon with our green energy, without a proper backup, without a base load supply. There have been many warning signs that this government has ignored, including an offer from Alinta of \$25 million over three years that would have secured a base load during the transition. We are all of the view that a transition to green energy is wise, but it must be done in a sensible way so that you do not shut down businesses, that you do not lose jobs and that you do not have households losing all the food from their fridges and freezers, hundreds of dollars worth, because we cannot get our energy mix right. That just shows you what this Labor government is all about.

Whilst we will support the Supply Bill, I note that this government continues to be reckless with our state's money and economically mismanage our state, as it has done for the last 15 years. Hopefully, by next March, we can put an end to it.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (16:00):** I want to make some comments in relation to the Supply Bill. I do not think that I need to traverse what the Supply Bill looks to achieve. I have been here long enough to understand what this piece of legislation is all about. Questions have been raised on this side of the house in relation to the increase in funding sought concerning the Supply Bill between now and when the budget is brought down in about six weeks' time.

I listened to the leader's contribution today. As usual, he laid out the argument extremely well and succinctly. He did an outstanding job in highlighting the deficiencies of this government over a very long period of time, over the 15 years it has been in power. One of the interesting statistics I took from the leader's contribution was that in 2012 the level of federal government grants was \$8.2 billion and that five years later, this year (2017) it has increased to \$10.5 billion. That is a 25 per cent increase over the last five years.

For this government to bleat, cry poor and say that the federal government is underfunding them and to make all sorts of baseless accusations is blatantly incorrect. We have seen a 25 per cent increase in those grant moneys over the last five years. I think that is a very important point to reiterate and for the South Australian community to understand.

The next couple of months will be a very important period for my electorate in particular because two significant infrastructure issues need to be addressed. Members of the community and I have been calling for these infrastructure projects to be funded in this year's budget. The first project I refer to is the regional sports hub proposed for Mount Barker. I have previously spoken extensively in the house about this project. We are looking at funding stage 1, which includes facilities, ovals, courts, soccer pitches, to provide sporting facilities for AFL football, soccer, tennis, cricket and netball.

Stage 1 of the project is estimated to cost \$11.8 million. As we know, the federal government has committed \$3.75 million. I have written to two ministers, the Minister for Regional Development and the Minister for Recreation and Sport, seeking the state government to match, at least at a minimum, that level of federal government funding of \$3.57 million. At the time that the then member for Mayo and the Prime Minister announced the federal government funding, the Liberal Party on this side of the house called for the government to match that level of funding at a minimum of \$3.75 million.

I have written to both the Minister for Regional Development and the Minister for Recreation and Sport. I also led a delegation to the Minister for Regional Development last year that was made up of the local mayor, Mayor Ann Ferguson of the Mount Barker District Council, and senior council officers, such as the CEO. Also in attendance were the president of the local football club, representatives of the Hills Football League and representatives of the South Australian National Football League (SANFL). We met with the Minister for Regional Development to highlight the critical need for this important sporting project.

We all know that Mount Barker is one of the most rapidly growing districts not just in South Australia but right across the country. Significant tracts of land are being opened up for development. Back in December 2010, the government rezoned 3,000 acres of land for residential development. Progressively, the development applications are being processed by the local council and they are being approved. We continually see houses being built through those areas of development.

This growth puts pressure on the facilities and the services within the town and within the district, and this is no exaggeration. We hear a fair bit of exaggeration at times in the parliament, but I can assure the house that this is no exaggeration. The sporting facilities in the Adelaide Hills, particularly in the Mount Barker district, are being utilised at an over capacity level, so it is critically important that the government listens not just to me in the house but to the community concerns on this issue.

I know that the local council has made a number of representations to the government over a period of time in relation to the regional sports hub at Mount Barker. As I said, I led a delegation to see the Minister for Regional Development last year. I met with the Minister for Recreation and Sport's Chief of Staff and his sport and recreation adviser to highlight the importance of this important infrastructure project. I strongly urge the government to provide at least \$3.75 million in this year's budget.

A couple of weeks ago, a meeting was held in Mount Barker and attended by people who were interested in the project. They were provided with an updated overview of what the project involves. I have had representatives from the community come to me to emphasise the importance of this project. This is pretty much what we refer to as a 'shovel-ready' project. I heard the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure on the radio this morning talking about shovel-ready projects, and I can assure the house that the regional sports hub is a shovel-ready project.

To provide the house with bit more information, quite a detailed report was tabled at the Mount Barker council meeting last week, and that obviously passed through the council with unanimous and strong support. The community supports this project and the local council supports it. All we need is the state government to support it by approving at least \$3.75 million in the budget in a couple of months' time.

The next issue I want to refer to is what is known locally as the Nairne intersection. This is the T-junction where Woodside Road meets with the Old Princes Highway. This is another issue I have highlighted before in the house going way back to over 10 years ago. To provide the house with a little bit of history on the matter, I lobbied extremely long and hard on this issue more than 10 years ago. Approximately 10 years ago, if my memory serves me correctly, there was some work done on the intersection, and the school crossing was shifted from the western side of the intersection to the eastern side and upgraded as a signalled crossing. Previously, it was a school crossing with the old-style, 25 km/h flashing lights with a marked area across the road.

The local schoolchildren would hold out the lollipop signals to stop the traffic and then the schoolchildren would cross the road and go up Saleyard Road, which is very close to that T-junction intersection, to the school. That was dangerous. Some motorists would not obey the signalling from the children. The children were being abused. It was an unsafe and unsatisfactory situation. A decade ago, the government moved that crossing from the western side to the eastern side and put in a signalised, push-button pedestrian crossing. The children and other pedestrians use it and walk up a special path that has been created into the school grounds.

At that time, the government thought that might be a solution to the traffic congestion at the T-junction. I can tell you that it has not been. I questioned it at the time. I did not think it would be a solution, and that has turned out to be correct. At certain times of the day, in peak hour in the morning and evening during school drop-off and pick-up times, the traffic banks back along Woodside Road and for several hundred metres back across the railway line, so the situation is quite unsatisfactory.

A community forum was held last week hosted by the Liberal candidate for Kavel, Mr Dan Cregan, an outstanding young gentleman who is certainly campaigning strongly to hold the seat. Dan Cregan, the Liberal candidate for Kavel, held a forum in Nairne, which about 80 people attended, on this specific issue of the traffic condition at the Nairne intersection. They had the local council representation and a traffic engineer speak at the forum. It was a very worthwhile community engagement, with 80 local people attending, so that is evidence that there is strong community concern in relation to this issue.

Again, we are calling for a long-term solution to be funded in this budget in six weeks or so. Whether it is a roundabout, traffic lights or whatever the solution is, we need the government to commit to the solution in this year's budget and then put it into place. There has been some discussion that they could somehow synchronise the pedestrian crossing, which would help with the traffic congestion and traffic flow through the T-junction. They are talking about that being a short-term measure. My concern is that sometimes these short-term measures turn into long-term solutions and nothing is progressed, and I am not supportive of that proposal at all.

They said that moving the crossing from the west to the east was going to assist and it has not. I cannot see how synchronising the signalling on the pedestrian crossing is going to work. We need a long-term solution delivered and thought through sensibly, whether it is a roundabout or signalised traffic lights on the intersection, that looks to include Saleyard Road, which runs up to the school. A significant volume of traffic runs up to the school at drop-off and pick-up times.

But it is not only that. We have also seen an increased volume of traffic at the intersection since the Bald Hills Road interchange on the freeway opened because, as I predicted, if motorists from those towns to the north—for example, Woodside, Oakbank, Lobethal—are looking to travel

onto the freeway, they are now coming into Nairne and going down the Old Princes Highway onto Bald Hills Road, onto the interchange and then onto the freeway, whereas previously they were getting on at Mount Barker at what we call the Adelaide Road interchange.

The Bald Hills Road interchange is a magnificent infrastructure improvement and something that I lobbied for very strongly for a long time and something the previous member for Mayo delivered in his time as local member. I am very pleased that it has been delivered but, as a result, motorists from those northern towns in the electorate are coming through Nairne and putting pressure by way of increased volumes of traffic on that intersection in Nairne. I cannot stress enough that these are two important local infrastructure projects that I am urging the government to fund in this year's budget.

Bill read a second time.

*Supply Grievances*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (16:17):** I move:

That the house note grievances

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:17):** I would like to resume with some of my concerns, particularly those around economic growth in South Australia, but I want also to touch on population growth because it is the key ingredient for economic prosperity. It is the key ingredient for vibrancy in South Australia, a great state that in 2016 lost 6,484 people to interstate. I think that is a damning statistic that shows that, while South Australia continues to lose great minds, future minds and our future brains trust (it is called 'the brain drain'), we continue to see a population exodus out of South Australia. People are not leaving just because they are going to a warmer climate; they are leaving because they cannot get a job or because there are job opportunities interstate.

If we look at population growth, and we look around the country, New South Wales has the majority, Victoria then comes in, followed by Queensland and Western Australia and then South Australia. Once upon a time, South Australia always had a strong population growth and it was always about third on the list. We are now languishing way down the bottom of mainland Australia. If we look at population growth—and this is what I want to talk about—Victoria led the way with 1.94 per cent population growth and in New South Wales it was 1.36 per cent.

If we want to get further into it, Queensland's growth is 1.3 per cent, Western Australia 1.15 per cent and South Australia's growth is 0.57 per cent. That is a damning statistic in itself because it shows that this state has little to offer and, in response to that, people are leaving. Why are they leaving? Because they cannot get a job and they feel uneasy with the uncertainty of what South Australia has to offer, but it is also about businesses that are going interstate to set up. It is about businesses that are shutting shop. I want to touch on some of the medium to large businesses which have closed. I will also touch on some of the small to medium businesses that have closed around the state. The number of businesses in South Australia that have either downsized or closed is quite damning.

We know that Kimberly-Clark closed. We know that Sheridan, the linen people, downsized by 150. AGL downsized by 200. GMH has downsized by 600 with more to go. In 2008, we remember the closure of Mitsubishi and the loss of 930 jobs. However, the list goes on, and it is not just about ones and twos; it is about huge businesses like National Foods in my Riverland electorate. National Foods closed in South Australia, losing 200 jobs. They relocated to Griffith, New South Wales, where they built or upgraded a plant. It meant that we did not have outlets for processing or manufacturing, so again we have lost that extension with a business that has either relocated interstate or downsized here for the sake of jobs. There were 200 jobs that were lost in that one exercise at National Foods in Berri.

We look at Clipsal which has closed. Bridgestone closed here and South Australia lost 600 jobs. Bianco Steel Supplies, that was 50 jobs lost. We look at Santos downsizing by 100. We look at Carter Holt Harvey, the timber industry in the South-East, the sale of the forest, and 207 jobs just gone. Orlando Wyndham downsized in South Australia, 85 jobs gone. I go all the way down the list. Accolade Wines at Reynella lost 175 jobs; Qantas, 150; we look at Mondello Farms in my

electorate which closed, 140 jobs. Then we have Holden walking away again; they have downsized and 400 more jobs have gone; Penrice, 180 jobs, Pacific Services Group, 100 jobs; and the list goes on. We look at the jobs that went from Nyrstar. This is a continual trend of businesses in South Australia that are closing.

I understand if some are downsizing or restructuring their business to deal with all sorts, but this is a continual trend. All these businesses have either closed or downsized, and it continues to happen. The more I look at the numbers, the more I see how businesses are closing. There were a couple in 2005, but the closer we get to 2014, the more jobs have gone. I have two full pages relating to resources that have either downsized or closed in 2015. We get to 2016, and I have more pages. It is just heartbreaking to think that these businesses are moving out of South Australia.

Why are they moving? Are they seeing other opportunities interstate? Is it cheaper to operate a business interstate? Is it easier to access a skilled workforce interstate? Is it because the South Australian skilled workforce that they need has moved interstate, so they are chasing that skilled workforce? It really makes you wonder. The cost of power, the cost of any of the utilities and the cost of water are issues. We all know that in manufacturing the two prime ingredients are power and water. Again, South Australia is there at the top of the tree when it comes to the cost of power and water. It really resonates as to what is going on in South Australia.

We look at red tape. We look at the NRM levy increase, and that is just a cost-shifting exercise by the government, dipping into the pockets, particularly of landowners and water licence holders. We look at the disgraceful behaviour of the state government when it came to blackspot funding. It was about the state government collaboratively putting some money on the table, with the federal government, with local government, with business, to actually understand that technology is part of tomorrow's world. Technology is part of today's world, yet they would not put money up. Round 2 came along and they decided they would put some money up, but it was not even anywhere close to what should be about South Australia moving into the next dimension of technology, research, helping our businesses.

If we look at one of the great shining lights in our export economy, it is food, it is beverage. What are those food producers and beverage producers doing? They are all using technology on farm, they are all using GPS, they are all using satellite imagery, and they are all using their markets. While they are in the tractor, they are selling the produce they are harvesting. It is all about giving them the tools to generate an economy, giving them the tools to make South Australia's bottom line look good, make it look healthy. When they do that, that is when the government can stand up and say, 'Look at how good South Australia is. Look at the numbers.' At the moment the numbers are not showing that form of support.

We look at the road maintenance backlog and supporting those people who are bringing their produce to be put into manufacturing, supporting those food producers who are bringing their product down to the port, bringing their product down to the airport. It is about making sure the roads are safe and that they are acceptable. I note that the Minister for Transport has put some money into upgrading shoulders, small amounts of money, but it is not the amount of money that we need to see going into productive infrastructure here in South Australia.

It is all very well that we are having all these wonderful north-south corridors, that is great, that is something we need to do too, but we need to actually put the spotlight on productive infrastructure in the regions of South Australia that are going to help us with efficiencies, that are going to help us when it comes to growing our economy, employing more people, exporting more. That is what it is all about.

I just want to touch on the issue of Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme. This is a great opportunity. It is treated water that is currently flowing out to sea, and it is going to be put into pipes and it is going to be put into food production. It is a great initiative. This has been on the burner for a while now, and we have seen it announced, I think, two or even three times, but we are yet to see it actually enacted.

What about the rest of the coastline that the treated water is being pumped out to? There is all the South Coast, we have Christies Beach, we have Glenelg, we have Bolivar, we have the treatment works down in the Onkaparinga. Where is all that water being used? Why can we not make

it affordable, put it into purple pipes and put it out onto our parks and gardens and stop pumping or using the draw from the River Murray? Put that water into the market and let us start growing our economy. Put that water into the market so that we can grow more food, grow more wealth and employ more people. It is a pretty simple analogy of what we could be doing with water that is currently being pumped out to the sea.

What is it doing to our gulf waters? What is it doing to our seagrasses? What is its impact on our fish stocks? We see at the moment that the government has reduced bag and boat limits. I will seek to continue my remarks on another day.

Time expired.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (16:28):** Until the budget last night, I was not going to speak on the Supply Bill, but I have decided I will speak because of the lack of commitment to a sustainable future for the steel industry in Whyalla. You would like to think that last night would have been an opportunity to flag a strong commitment to the steel industry in this country, a strong commitment to the production of structural steel, but there was not a single word in the budget last night.

What that means is that if the federal government does not come to the party the state government, in its budget, will have to do the serious heavy lifting when it comes to ensuring the survival of the steel industry in South Australia. I am not totally lacking in confidence that the federal government will do the right thing. I am hoping that in the coming weeks, as it becomes clear who the new owner is going to be, there will be an effective partnership between the state government and the federal government when it comes to sustaining the future of structural steelmaking in this country.

There has been a one-way exchange so far about our procurement policy. Let me tell you a little bit about steel procurement policy in this state. When I was elected as the member for Giles, I indicated to the Premier that my number one priority was the overhaul of steel procurement in South Australia—my number one priority. In order to do that, the work was pursued over a period of time to the point where we have ended up with the best steel procurement policy in the country, and you do not have to take the government's word for that.

**Mr Knoll:** Have you put a \$70 million order in?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Schubert, let me see what you are on.

**Mr Knoll:** My dance card is full.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Have you been out yet, because you will be going. Those lips cannot move.

**Mr HUGHES:** You can refer to the words of the Australian Steel Institute back in 2015 and you can refer to the words of Arrium back in 2015, before they went into administration, when they glowingly indicated that South Australia had the best policy in the country.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**Mr HUGHES:** Indeed, it is true. It is absolutely true and, as I said, you do not have to take—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I just remind the member for Chaffey that his dance card is also full.

**Mr Whetstone:** Full?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes, which means you will be leaving us—

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You will both be leaving if there is another sound.

**Mr HUGHES:** Without a doubt, we have the best steel procurement policy in the country. At the time we introduced this policy, I had a debate in the media with Rowan Ramsey, the member for Grey, and I indicated to him at that time that when the federal government was handing out money to the states for various infrastructure projects and construction projects they should make it a requirement of that federal government assistance that Australian steel be used in those projects.

Rowan Ramsey, the member for Grey, rejected that out of hand. He said, 'Nothing to do with the federal government. It should be up to the state governments to decide whether they use Australian steel.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I know you have spoken, member for Chaffey, so you obviously do not want to stay in the room; is that right?

**Mr Whetstone:** I want to listen to facts.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, if you want to listen, then listen in silence.

**Mr HUGHES:** You can go and get the *Whyalla News* from that period. He indicated that it should be up to the states to determine whether they used Australian steel in their projects. I agree that before the policy change some of the projects in this state fell well short of where they should have been. They fell well short of where they should have been, and that was my motivation for initiating the change in steel procurement policy in this state; hopefully, as a result, it will lead to policy changes in the other states and at a national level. As has been indicated, some states do not do too badly. Victoria has been mentioned as one state that does not do too bad a job when it comes to steel procurement.

Recently, we had the Acting Prime Minister, Barnaby Joyce, in Whyalla to witness the signing of an MOU with the administrators and Adani in relation to a potential project in the north of Queensland. The interesting thing about that project is that it has not gone ahead. There is no go-ahead for that project at this stage, yet we had this travelling circus come to Whyalla to try to argue that that particular contract, if it were to go ahead for the supply of rail, would be a lifesaver for the steel industry in Whyalla. I think the exact expression used was 'a lifeline'. Anybody who knows anything about the steel industry and that particular contract knows that the contract itself, if that project ever does get the green light, would be over a two-year period. In year 1, it would represent just over 25,000 tonnes of steel and, in year 2, just over 25,000 tonnes of steel.

The steel industry in Whyalla produces close to 1.2 million tonnes of steel per year, so the contract is not a lifeline to the steel industry in Whyalla. What would be a lifeline to the steel industry in Whyalla is something similar to what Adani is going for in northern Queensland. They are going for a \$1 billion concessional loan in order to help that project in northern Queensland get off the ground. It is interesting to reflect upon the bucket of money that comes from. That is a \$5 billion bucket of money available for northern Australia.

There is nothing comparable available for the communities of Upper Spencer Gulf or Eyre Peninsula to assist with the types of projects we have in our area. If it ever goes ahead, the Adani project will secure something like 1,200 employees with Adani. When you count contractors, there are approximately 2,000 to 3,000 jobs in Whyalla alone when it comes to the steel industry. It raises an incredibly important question: if Adani were to get the go-ahead for that \$1 billion concessional loan, what would happen to all the other really worthwhile projects throughout Australia where it might make a difference to get concessional loans from the federal government at that scale?

There has been some discussion recently about Iron Road because the state government has now signed off on all its approvals for that project. It is still a project with a long way to go, in that it needs over \$4 billion worth of investment to get off the ground. If a serious concessional loan were available for Iron Road, it could make a real difference to that project. Why are projects in South Australia not given the same weight and the same attention as those in other states?

When it comes to my community, whether it is concessional loans or whether it is direct grants, it will make a real difference because Whyalla is facing an existential threat if we do not get the support required. It would be deeply concerning. The scale of the job losses and what would happen to my community would far outweigh any of the support offered to maintain the steel industry. It was disappointing last night to see that the federal budget did not flag up-front support for projects in South Australia, but especially for the Whyalla steelworks.

Time expired.



**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:38):** Deputy Speaker, I just want to say that even though my dance card may be full from time to time, as the 1998 winner of the year 10 Christian Brothers and St Aloysius dance class best couple I will always find room on that dance card for a dance with you.

In talking about the Supply Bill and grieving on the Supply Bill, I have a wish list of projects I would like the government to consider in the lead-up to the state budget, and hopefully part of the \$5 billion that is on the table as part of the Supply Bill can go towards those. Before I do that, I want to finish a topic I missed out on during my griever yesterday, and that is to thank and congratulate the 11 men and women who were involved in the Barossa Vintage Festival's Young Ambassador Program that finished up on the Sunday of the Barossa Vintage Festival at the Feast, Folk and Fossick festival. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the winner, a very vivacious and intelligent young woman named Nicola Biagi, whom I met on a number of occasions throughout the program.

For the uninitiated, the Young Ambassador Program is designed around helping young people to understand better the beautiful place in which they live and to become fierce advocates for the Barossa, and Nicola is certainly one of those. Her project centred around bringing a music festival to the Barossa that featured female headline artists. It was said of the project that it had the level of detail and sophistication that could actually make it become a live project in the Barossa. I look forward to going to that festival, and if Nicola needs a washed-up, has-been, early-2000s DJ, then I would be more than happy to participate.

I also want to congratulate Maddison Perry, who was also an award winner. I particularly want to congratulate Ellie Neindorf on her participation. She happens to be the housemate of Courtney from my office who long suffered Courtney's discussions on this topic, and I actually think Courtney was more upset than Ellie that Ellie did not win; nevertheless, congratulations to everybody who was involved in the project.

There are three main areas that the government needs to consider investing in in the beautiful Barossa Valley. This is a highly productive area, an area that punches well above its weight in the return it brings to South Australia and an area that really does not ask much of government. It has an unemployment rate sitting at about 4 per cent, which is the envy of the rest of the state. We produce about \$150 million worth of wine exports and we bring in somewhere between \$150 million and \$200 million worth of overseas and interstate tourism. On top of that, depending on the season, we produce somewhere around \$1 billion worth of wine.

It is an extremely important region so, Mr Treasurer and Mr Premier, we ask for only a few small things in return. The first and foremost is funding for a new Barossa health facility. I know that a business case has been conducted. The government will not give me the business case, saying that it is subject to cabinet-in-confidence. I hope that means that it is being considered as part of this budget process and the lead-up to this year's budget. I look forward to there being a fully funded, full-scale business case into the building of a new health facility. I put on record that I would be more than happy to help to bring the community along with whatever type of facility the government feels needs to be put on the table.

In terms of road funding, there are a couple of spots that really need to be looked at, and the first of those is a 5.2-kilometre stretch of the Davison Road to Freeling. It has to be one of the most awful patches of road to drive on and one that is becoming an increasingly important thoroughfare to bring the new expanding suburb of Freeling closer to the Barossa where a vast majority of people do their shopping and many people come to work.

I also want to highlight the section of Owen Road below Hamley Bridge. The recent Pinery fire and subsequent flooding last year have essentially disintegrated the road to a point where the government has had to patch up certain sections with gravel. They recognised that, above Hamley Bridge, Owen Road needed upgrading and they have committed to that. Congratulations on doing that, but I contend that that piece of road below Hamley Bridge is actually used much more often and is in much worse condition than that which is above it, and I desperately call on the government to fix it. I have had a huge number of people contact my office about that.

In terms of education infrastructure, I still believe that Nuriootpa Primary School and Nuriootpa High School have work to do. Again, both those schools were given money in relation to

the STEM upgrades in last year's budget, but the structural issues with Nuriootpa Primary School will still remain. It is an odd experimental-shaped school that has some significant acoustic issues that need to be dealt with.

Also, Nuriootpa High School, which is seeing record levels of students this year—just under 1,000 students—desperately needs investment. It is doing a great job of educating our young people. It is why people from far and wide in the district are choosing to send their kids there. It needs to have their money invested in it in line and commensurate with the confidence that locals have in sending their children there.

The third area that I want to talk about is in relation to mobile blackspots. As the member for Chaffey illuminated in his speech, the government failed to put any money on the table for the first round of the federal government's mobile blackspot funding program. They put a measly \$1½ million of state government money into the second round of mobile blackspot funding. We know that round 3 is underway. It is a huge issue within my electorate. Next to roads and the hospital, this has to be the most important issue.

So many small businesses within my region want to start up, and are starting up, and they desperately need connectivity to help take their business to the next level. Mobile communications, in my view, is the great limiter that is stopping the flourishing of businesses across rural and regional South Australia, and if fixed it can help us drive economic growth in our state. There are over 40 identified blackspots within the Schubert electorate, but I want to highlight some of the more major ones, and they centre around two towns at the back of Eden Valley, being the town of Eden Valley itself and Springton. We need better connectivity between Greenock and Kapunda.

The town of Wasleys is a dead zone when it comes to mobile phone coverage. You can get phone coverage up until and past the town, but in the town, where the people actually live, is the place you cannot get any mobile reception. There are some things underway, with Telstra and, potentially, Optus getting involved, but that is certainly an area in which the government needs to get involved. Lyndoch has poor mobile reception coverage, to the point where a temporary tower had to be put in place to provide enough connectivity for the thousands of people who came to witness the stage ending during the Tour Down Under in January.

There is also a mobile blackspot between Sandy Creek and Concordia. In fact, you only have to travel a couple of kilometres out of Gawler and, all of a sudden, your mobile phone coverage becomes extremely patchy. It is extremely important that this is an area in which the government invests, and it is something that we will be looking for in this year's budget.

The last thing that I would like to address is the funding of the upgrade to the Stott Highway. Last year, I wrote a letter to minister Malinauskas in the other place about a seven-kilometre stretch of road from the outskirts of Yalumba Terrace in Angaston through to the Mid Murray Council border heading towards Keyneton. To my surprise, I got a wonderful letter back from the minister saying, 'We are going to reseal seven kilometres of your road.' I thought that was fantastic. I gave the government credit for that.

That work was supposed to start in February and March this year, and when the work did not start we again sought some reassurance from the minister about what was going on. The minister's response was not that this seven kilometres of road was going to be sealed. He said that there was only going to be \$500,000 worth of shoulder sealing. I am no civil contractor, but resealing seven kilometres of road is not the same as shoulder sealing that same stretch of road for \$500,000. When questioned about it a third time, it seems that minister Malinauskas's office backflipped and conceded that there has been a serious delay in the resealing of the road and that we are to expect that to happen sometime before the end of calendar year 2017.

I still fundamentally do not understand why you would go ahead with some shoulder sealing works only to come back six months later to reseal that same section of road, but I am willing to keep an open mind that the government is not stuffing us around and that we will see the very much needed upgrade to the Stott Highway. These are things, amongst others, that I will be looking for in the budget in mid June.

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (16:49):** I rise today to speak about the extensive investments in my electorate of Fisher made by the Labor team in the last few years. The government is committed to

delivering for the families of the south in suburbs such as Aberfoyle Park, Chandlers Hill, Happy Valley, Reynella East, O'Halloran Hill, Woodcroft, Clarendon, Cherry Gardens and Coromandel East.

As a lifetime local, spending all my life living in Morphett Vale and Woodcroft, I have lobbied hard to secure for our community the highest standard of public education, the safest transport and the best community and sporting opportunities. I know what a difference it makes to get a good education, to be able to safely and easily travel around our local area and to enjoy the connectedness and good health that come with sport and community engagement.

I am proud to say that I have lobbied hard during my time in this place for the best interests of my community. With the support of the Labor team, I have achieved some outstanding results for local people. I will take you through just some of those, starting with Happy Valley Drive. For many years, it has been a common complaint amongst locals, including me, that Happy Valley Drive was undulating and rather noisy. I was delighted to secure funding to upgrade Happy Valley Drive as part of the additional \$70 million allocated towards critical road maintenance in the 2015-16 budget over four years. This work was completed in late 2015. These upgrades make for a better travelling experience and also improve safety on our roads.

The next achievement relates to Kenihans Road. For 32 years, ever since I got my learner's permit, I have been negotiating the complicated series of intersections around Bishops Hill Road and Regency Road. This is a trip that many locals make daily and, like me, other drivers have complained. In fact, this is one of the issues that most commonly comes to my office. It is little wonder that this stretch of road also has the highest number of accidents of any road in my electorate.

That is why I have been lobbying the transport minister and have secured \$350,000 for a road management plan for not just Kenihans Road but also Candy Road. The plan will not only provide an overview of existing operational and safety issues along Kenihans Road but also identify short to medium-term traffic management treatment options to be implemented, including treatments for intersections at Tripoli, Bishops Hill and Regency roads, as well as at the junction of Candy Road and Main South Road.

The plan will cover from Chandlers Hill Road at Happy Valley Drive to the junction of Panalatinga Road and Reynella East, as well as the Candy Road and Main South Road intersection at O'Halloran Hill. When this plan and the resulting works are completed, it will no doubt lead to a safer and more comfortable journey for drivers in the electorates of Davenport and Hurtle Vale in the future, as well as visitors to the area. I am proud to have negotiated this outcome for my local community and look forward to seeing a much improved Kenihans Road, where the works have already commenced.

Other resurfacing works that I have been pleased to push for and have achieved upgrades for include the resurfacing of Black Road and Chandlers Hill Road. As part of the critical road maintenance periodic asphalt resurfacing program, approximately six kilometres of asphalt resurfacing work was undertaken on Black Road between Main South Road and Main Road in February this year.

This work included the removal and reinstatement of the existing asphalt surface to improve the road condition for all road users. The works were completed on 18 March 2017, and the ride is much smoother. As part of the state periodic maintenance program, approximately 1.2 kilometres of spray sealing work has also been undertaken on Chandlers Hill Road, between Kenihans Road and Education Road. This work was completed on 14 March 2017.

There is also a project coming up called the Flinders rail link project. Transport is not all about roads, so I am delighted that \$85.5 million is being invested over three years in the Flinders rail link project. This project is jointly funded by the commonwealth and will make life easier for the many people in my area who study and work at Flinders University, or study, work and access services at Flinders Medical Centre.

As a former nurse—I am a current nurse working here, but I was formerly at Flinders Medical Centre—I know that attracting great staff to work at our hospitals is as much about providing them with safe and affordable ways to get to and from work as it is about the experience we provide them when they walk in the door. The Flinders rail link project is a great investment with wideranging

benefits, including employment benefits for the south, with 70 full-time positions being created during construction. I am a great advocate for the use of public transport, especially to major facilities like our hospitals and universities where parking comes at a premium. I hope that this measure will help reduce traffic congestion and deliver environmental benefits, too.

In respect to education and the STEM labs in particular, as a nurse I am passionate about health care and the science and technology that go into creating healthier communities. Our future as a city and a nation does lie in the science, technology, engineering and maths fields. Some people like to include arts in that as well and make it a STEAM focus. We can make great cultural, health and economic advancement by investing in these fields. While that includes investing in things like state-of-the-art hospitals like Flinders Medical Centre and the soon to be opened new Royal Adelaide Hospital, it also means investing in our kids' education so they are ready for the jobs of the future, the jobs of an advanced economy.

Last year, Aberfoyle Park High School secured \$2.5 million under this Labor government's science, technology, engineering and maths lab upgrade program. That work is now well underway and I look forward to seeing the final result, a result that will no doubt entice young minds into the wonderful world of science and help fuel our economy into the future.

The school loans scheme has also been a big winner with Pilgrim School in Aberfoyle Park, as part of the campus schools, winning under this Labor government. Under the innovative school loans scheme, which provides low-interest loans to schools for STEM and early-learning facilities, the school has been granted more than \$1 million. This was just in the first round of the scheme. I look forward to advocating for more schools in the upcoming rounds of this valuable fund.

In regard to air conditioning, it is a simple fact that kids cannot learn if their environment is distracting and uncomfortable. In fact, kids are quite easily distracted sometimes. Old and ineffective air conditioning can make learning a lot less enjoyable for teachers and for students, so I was delighted to secure \$100,000 in last year's budget to replace outdated air conditioning at Aberfoyle Park High School. Greater comfort for students and staff means they can all get on with the important task of learning and teaching our kids, not fixing the air conditioning or wondering how they will fund the repairs.

The Sustainable Schools program is a fantastic initiative for our schools with lighting and energy of course being critical infrastructure for good learning environments. As a Labor government, we also want to do what we can to model environmentally responsible behaviours for our kids and save our schools money so they can spend it on education.

That is why I am delighted that nine schools in the electorate of Fisher/Hurtle Vale recently received funding under the Sustainable Schools program, with \$25,000 for LED lighting provided to the Aberfoyle Hub R-7 School, Braeview, Happy Valley Primary, Morphett Vale East, Pimpala Primary, Reynella Primary and Woodcroft Primary. This is expected to save each school \$5,000 a year. Aberfoyle Park High School and Wirreanda Secondary School will also receive money: \$250,000 each to fund solar panels. Those schools will save an estimated \$30,000 each year in energy costs, which is a great investment that is good for education and great for our environment.

Sport has always been a huge part of my life. The Active Club grants, through the Office for Recreation and Sport, play a critical part in supporting the activities in our southern suburbs. We are blessed with so many active sporting clubs and more than a few are champions in their field. Sport is critical to the health of our communities both in terms of our physical health and wellbeing but also in building community spirit and teamwork.

I am proud to have advocated for sports grants for my local sporting teams and clubs. As the patron of the Hub Netball Club, I am delighted that they have scored \$4,800 in the latest round of Active Club grants from this Labor government. The Coromandel Valley Croquet Club has potted more than \$2,600, the Flagstaff Community Centre scored \$4,500, the Happy Valley Football Club is kicking goals and getting more than \$2,800 to build a barbecue area, and O'Halloran Hill Tennis Club aced it with more than \$1,400. All up, 15 local sporting clubs have scored funding under the Active Club program in my area since 2014 and, each year, more clubs in my area have been successful. Those amounts of money may be modest, but they make a big difference to our clubs and the health of our communities.

One club that is very dear to my heart is the Happy Valley BMX Club. I am very proud to announce today that the Happy Valley BMX Club has been granted \$3,600 for a great program called Cruises for Seniors. It is funded through the Labor Grants for Seniors fund. Cruises for Seniors will create opportunities for older people to take up or get back into the sport of racing BMX in our local community. The program will include come-and-try nights and senior classes at weekly race meetings.

The funding comes on top of \$200,000 that this government provided in 2015 to bitumenise the club's berms. Berms are the angled bank curves that make up the track. This upgrade has improved speed, safety and also capacity while reducing the ongoing expenses. Of course, Happy Valley is the home of Sam Willoughby, and we all send our love to Sam and best wishes for his recovery. I have visited Sam recently, and I can tell you that he is doing really well.

There are many more success stories in Fisher and much more to do. The investments are only possible with a hardworking and committed local member—a person who can get the ear of decision-makers, who can make the case for the people of Fisher, who has walked in their shoes and who is truly part of the community. I am really proud to be that person. Hopefully, the people of Hurtle Vale will also support me.

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (16:59):** I would also like to make a contribution to the supply griever. I hope that the state budget coming up at the end of June is as good for South Australia as the federal budget handed down last night was good for South Australia and Australia. We saw massive investment from the federal government in those things that are important to so many Australians. Most importantly, there was an investment to guarantee the funding for the NDIS, which is a very important scheme and one that receives bipartisan support, but up until last night it was not fully funded. With the announcements from Treasurer Morrison, we are going to see the NDIS fully funded, which is wonderful for South Australians and all Australians who live with a disability or their carers, so there was some good news in the federal budget last night.

It was also good to see the federal government commit to its infrastructure spending. Projects in my community such as the Darlington project are receiving 80 per cent funding from the federal government, which is of such benefit to residents in my community. Also, as the member for Fisher touched on, the train link to Flinders University, and the extension of the Tonsley line to Flinders University, and the investment in public transport that that will create for our community are so important. Congratulations to Treasurer Morrison on his budget.

I hope that the budget to be handed down by Treasurer Koutsantonis is as successful but I am not going to keep my hopes up, and I know that so many of us on this side of the house are not. How do we know that it probably will not be a good budget? Because the best indicator of future behaviour is to look at past performance, and on past performance we have seen year on year neglect by the Labor government to properly invest in South Australia, to properly deliver programs that will deal with the big unemployment issues that face our state, and we have failed to see time and time again any decent investment from this Labor government in my community.

The financial mismanagement of this state is one of the reasons why the government has not been able to invest in my community. We have seen huge budget pressures year on year from this government and that is a result of bad policy decisions. That is a result of years of squandering GST revenue under premier Rann and treasurer Foley, and we have seen that continue with Premier Weatherill and Treasurer Koutsantonis. We have seen the disgraceful Transforming Health proposal, which we all know is designed to save the government money but has done anything but that.

We have seen repeated failures by this government to care for our most vulnerable and disadvantaged, including the absolute disgrace that was the Families SA royal commission, and at the moment with Oakden we are seeing the disgraceful care provided to South Australians. That all comes at a cost. Not only does it come at a moral cost, a cost of care and a cost to those who are negatively impacted by bad government policy, but there is the financial cost of the cover-up, there is the financial cost that goes with holding a royal commission, and there is that whole financial cost. We have seen department after department squander and waste money on the implementation of terrible public policy by this government and that leads to the inability to be able to invest properly in infrastructure.

At the same time that this has been happening, the government has been flogging assets left, right and centre. In 2015, we saw the sale of the Motor Accident Commission. Before that, we saw the sale of ForestrySA, the Lotteries Commission, Glenside acreage, the Hampstead hospital, and we have the government's stubborn commitment to sell the Repat. It is funny that, with all the asset sales at the moment, so much of those asset sales have to do with health, and so much community infrastructure is being destroyed by this Labor government through the sale of key community assets, especially key community health assets.

The sale and closure of the Repat is an absolute disgrace as so many of this side of the house know. I believe that many on the other side of the house know as well. It was a bad policy when it was announced, and it is an even worse policy today in the light of what is happening with Oakden. We know that Oakden is going to be closed, but we also think the Oakden facility could be moved to the Repat site which is ready to go. Of course, it has a wonderful standard of care, a wonderful reputation in its care, and it is a site that is begging to be used as a public health asset. However, this government is forging ahead in its stubbornness to close the Repat and to close the Oakden facility as well.

On this side of the house, we have a policy to commit to renewing the Repat and retaining its specialist dementia ward (Ward 18). We should use that ward for the residents of Oakden as a home for those needing care into the future. As I have said, this government has an opportunity to stop the sale of public assets, especially public healthcare assets, and has the ability to deal with this crisis at Oakden at the same time as keeping the Repat open, which is an important issue. The government has that opportunity in the budget that will come before us in June this year.

We have seen a philosophy from this government, essentially to rob Peter to pay Paul; we have seen that time and time again. We have seen the debt burden increase, we have seen fees and charges increase time after time, as have motor vehicle renewals, driver's licence fees and speeding fines. We have seen a blowout in the debt. In last year's budget, we were sitting at a trend debt of about \$14 billion, and of course we are seeing the interest on that being paid every day.

As I always say in this house, when you look at the opportunity cost of the total amount of debt that we have, we can ask where will the money come from to service this debt and where will the money come from to provide South Australians the decent public services that we need? There is the option of going to the federal government for help, although the Premier does not seem to be keen on working in a collaborative manner with his federal counterparts, or we can invest in South Australia.

We have been waiting for these grand investment announcements in key infrastructure and economic producing assets from this government, but we have not seen them. We might see something in the coming budget. We might see the government invest in Globe Link which is the Liberal Party's plan for economic growth and investing in productive infrastructure. We actually might see the government invest in our youth and unemployed.

As we know, we have the highest unemployment rate in the nation. It has been like that for too long now, so we might finally see some investment in programs and skills-based training that might help the unemployed of South Australia, but I do not think we should hope for too much. Last year's budget predicted jobs growth in South Australia of only 0.75 per cent, and this was reaffirmed in the Mid-Year Budget Review. This is less than half the national growth rate of 1.8 per cent.

In the time I have left I would like to talk about some road infrastructure in my electorate. As I said before, there has been a lack of investment for many years in road infrastructure in my electorate. Investing in that main road corridor through Blackwood and Belair and down through Fullarton is one of the biggest issues for my community. That road corridor needs to be upgraded, the Blackwood roundabout needs to be upgraded and the Blythewood roundabout and the through road to Fullarton Road need to be upgraded.

The Liberal Party in government will commit to funding the first \$20 million of the road management plan through Blackwood and the Mitcham Hills. This will be of great benefit to my constituents and those beyond in Flagstaff Hill, Aberfoyle Park, Happy Valley and those who use that road corridor on a daily basis. They will be great beneficiaries of the investment in infrastructure within the Mitcham Hills.

There is the road infrastructure, but there is also the public transport infrastructure that needs to be invested in. Time and time again we talk about park-and-ride facilities. There are so many opportunities for investment for this government to make South Australia a better place. What we would like to see is that actually happen, as opposed to what we normally get which is the blame game from the government about the inadequacies of the system and supposed failures of the federal Liberal government.

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (17:09):** I, too, rise today to grieve on the Supply Bill. I spoke the other day about a number of key elements of the Supply Bill and what is impacting South Australia from the perspective of my portfolio areas of industry, sport, rec and racing.

Today, I would like to speak on those but also about some of the more vulnerable in our community who are being impacted by the actions of this government. We know we have the highest unemployment rate in the nation, and I think South Australians are getting the message now. They are sick and tired of it and they are sick and tired of what the government on the other side of this chamber is delivering. We have the highest unemployment rate in the nation on trend, at 6.7 per cent currently, and we have had that rate for more than two years; in fact, for 28 months we have been the worst state in the nation, and currently our unemployment figure is 7 per cent, as well, when it comes to raw figures. That is very disconcerting for all South Australians.

We know, again, the high cost of electricity. We have the most expensive electricity in the country and the least reliable supply. That is another big impact on South Australians and they are really starting to feel the pinch. I have spoken about those economic impositions on South Australians previously and how that is impacting on business, and an effect is that businesses are leaving South Australia as are a lot of South Australians, who are leaving our state to look for opportunities elsewhere. Opportunities are not being created in South Australia and that is, as I said, very disheartening for all South Australians.

What is more disheartening, what has come to light over recent times, is that there really has been a build-up of these incidents. The most recent one, of course, is Oakden, where we again see, under this state Labor government, our most vulnerable being impacted, and impacted in a very adverse way. We were here just before Easter and questions were being asked of the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse from this side of the chamber about a report into some concerns about things that were happening at Oakden. In fact, the member for Davenport was asking these questions, and we were not getting any answers.

A report had been handed out on the Monday in the lead-up to Easter, but even on the Thursday these questions were not being answered. The minister was going to take the report away and have a look at it over Easter, as she ate some chocolate, and decide what was going on there. As we found out later, there were some alarming concerns, and the families involved were also rightly concerned about what was in this report. The fact is that the minister said she had staff looking at it, she then looked at it—and the Premier was, of course, away on holidays—but really nothing was done to satisfy the outcomes of this report.

It was a damning report that had some very alarming and concerning findings, but it took a very long time for the minister to come out and actually let the South Australian public know what was going on. Questions were asked on this side of the chamber but, unfortunately, yet again we got no answers. The families of the people involved in the Oakden facility were really let down, and the South Australian public was really let down as well. Ultimately, in this case, it was our most vulnerable people.

We know about the child protection fiasco, and we know the stories that have gone on there as well under this state Labor government. Again, vulnerable people are being let down by our state Labor government, and that is incredibly disappointing. We know about the chemo bungle as well, and Andrew Knox, and the disappointment and let down there with them not being made aware of what happened with their underdosing as far as chemotherapy was concerned. Again, vulnerable people are being let down. We also know that this government, and the big campaign to try to save the Repat, have actually turned their back on those people as well and let them down. We see a constant theme here of South Australia's most vulnerable being let down.

We looked at the economic side, which I talked about earlier and in a previous speech, and now we look at South Australia's most vulnerable, and we can see why South Australia is getting fed up with the state Labor government. The Premier really has to go. We need a change of government sooner rather than later because South Australians should not be putting up with this any longer.

While I have a few more minutes I would like to take the opportunity to talk about a couple of infrastructure projects and the federal budget, a federal budget that was handed down last night that had a lot in it for South Australians. The Turnbull government delivered a total of \$10.6 billion in total payments to South Australia for 2017-18 across health, education, industry and infrastructure. Incorporated in there is a \$100 million advanced manufacturing fund, which will go between Victoria and South Australia to help generate action out of the automotive industry which, as we know, is closing down later this year with jobs going. There was action and money put in place for a number of things there but, across the board, \$10.6 billion in total payments for health, education, industry and infrastructure is quite generous.

We have talked about schools and a number of projects that are very important to South Australia, and there are some big infrastructure projects on the table that are happening now. We know that the federal government is putting in the lion's share for the north-south corridor at the Darlington interchange. We fought very hard for that, and it is great to have it happening. As I said, the feds are putting in the lion's share for that project. There is the Torrens to Torrens project, there is money for the APY lands and there is also the Flinders Link project.

One project I want to talk about where the federal government has put \$40 million on the table is Oaklands crossing. I know that I speak about this a lot in this place, but it is a prime example of what the state Labor government has been doing and how it has been messing with people as far as projects are concerned in South Australia. To make this project happen, the state government says that they have some money saved from different bits and pieces, but they are still looking for that money that is saved. It is federal government money and they want it reinvested in the Oaklands project.

That is absolutely fine and dandy, but we need to justify where that money is. I have been asking them and I have been asking the feds where the money is. The feds say that the state Labor government have to put this request through Infrastructure Australia. That is where the funding comes from and that is where funding has to be ratified. There are projects where they say their savings are coming from, but they have not been built yet, so that is where verification is needed, but they have to go through Infrastructure Australia.

The minister is saying that, no, he is going to go around the back door and find another way through, that he is not going to go through Infrastructure Australia and that he does not need to do that. He thinks he can be exempt from the process that has been put in place by the federal government to make sure that all deals are fair and above board. The interesting thing about the minister in our state, the Minister for Infrastructure, is that his CEO is a former CEO of Infrastructure Australia, so you would think that we have a couple of people who know exactly how the system works. How the minister can sit there and say that he is going to bypass the Infrastructure Australia process is absolutely beyond me.

I heard him today pointing to other projects that did not go through Infrastructure Australia, or so he claims. My question to him is: that is all well and good, but why do you not go through the process you have been asked to go through to get this project advanced and ticked off? He will not do that. I have asked again to see the works that have been done, and I have asked to see the plans and the costings so that we know what is going on, but still those have not been put forward. He has not outlined whether the plan is now to take rail under or over, and that is what we are going to need to know so that we can get this grade separation process done.

I just wish the minister would get on with it. I wish he would do what the federal government is asking in relation to finding this money and putting the business case forward, as he was asked to do. I know that he is continuing to work with the federal government, and that is great, but I say: let's get on with it, let's get this work done and let's get everything out on the table. There is a project proposal report that needs to be done, and I would love to see that happen so that we know exactly where we are.



I am a bit disappointed that the minister is still messing around with this and not giving the federal government and Infrastructure Australia, the body that manages these projects, what they want. If he ticked all those boxes, we could get on and move on with it. Sadly, he is not doing so, and that just makes it confusing and disappointing for all the people in the community of the south because this project stretches way beyond my local community down south to Reynella and farther south again to the end of the Southern Expressway and to Seaford. It goes up into the Hills into the Blackwood area, where the member for Davenport sits, and it even stretches down to Glenelg and Colton. They are impacted by this intersection.

The excitement and the opportunities associated with this upgrade are absolutely endless. I look forward to working with the minister here locally if we can get this done, but he is keeping me very much in the dark. I speak regularly with the federal minister because this is a project we really need to get done as the opportunities and the upside that can come from this project could be very great for the southern region of our state and our city.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:18):** I rise to speak to the Supply Bill grievance debate. I note there has been a bit of discussion today about the federal budget handed down by Scott Morrison and the Turnbull federal government last night, and I want to make a few points in regard to that. The simple fact is that the federal government is delivering \$10.6 billion in total payments to South Australia in 2017-18 alone, across health, education industry and infrastructure, and in this budget there is \$3.1 billion in infrastructure spending for South Australia.

Another thing that has happened is that \$40 million over four years for supplementary road funding has been reinstated for local governments. This goes on top of what has been the largest single investment in any one state or territory in the history of the commonwealth: the \$89 billion naval shipbuilding program, which will secure South Australia's future for generations by creating more than 5,000 direct jobs and thousands more across the supply chain. SAHMRI 2 has \$68 million in 2017-18 to support the establishment of a proton beam therapy facility. There has been a bit of discussion about that. It is world-leading technology coming to this state.

We see education funding through schools in South Australia continuing to grow to record levels, with \$16 billion being invested over 10 years. The federal government is supporting energy in this state with \$36.6 million for energy infrastructure, plus \$110 million equity funding for building solar thermal with storage in Port Augusta. Certainly, South Australian businesses will benefit from further assistance in the transition to high-end manufacturing through the \$100 million advanced manufacturing fund. I have talked about a lot of those issues.

The commonwealth is also committed to regulatory reform to make it easier for businesses to operate, providing incentives to remove unnecessary restrictions on competition and cut red tape through a national partnership on regulatory reform. The commonwealth will make available \$300 million in funding over two years, from 2017-18, for the delivery of reforms that drive Australia's economic performance, with a focus on small business deregulation. The budget also guarantees Medicare with the establishment of the Medicare guarantee fund, which can only be used to pay for Medicare and medicines. The National Disability Insurance Scheme will be fully funded to secure the future for South Australians with disabilities.

Major projects that are on the go in this state at the moment are 80 per cent federal funded. Today, we heard the transport minister expressing his faux disgust at not having more money fed to South Australia. It just shows how this state Labor government relies so heavily on that 80 per cent funding from the federal government for these major projects. These projects include the north-south corridor Darlington interchange, \$496 million, with \$198.7 million of that to be provided in 2017-18; the north-south corridor Torrens Road to River Torrens project, \$400.5 million, with \$105 million in 2017-18; the north-south corridor Northern Connector, \$708 million, with \$233.8 million to be provided in 2017-18; the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Lands, \$85 million, with \$23.8 million to be provided in 2017-18; and Flinders Link, \$42.7 million, with \$36.3 million to be provided in 2017-18.

Back in the 2016 federal election, the Australian government committed \$56 million towards these three projects across the state: Oaklands crossing, the Lobethal B-double route and Marion Road planning projects. Certainly, the Lobethal B-double route will be vital for Thomas Foods abattoir

at Lobethal. There is a \$10 billion rail fund in the budget and projects such as the AdeLINK can apply for funding, pending the submission of a business case yet to be submitted by the state government. As indicated earlier, there is the reinstatement of supplementary road funding, which I know will please South Australian local governments.

Interestingly, I heard some comments by the Treasurer today on FIVEaa, where he was trying to tell the people of South Australia a simple untruth. He was saying that \$500 million of federal money would have shored up Holden to stay in this state. That is simply not true at all. The head of General Motors in Detroit made the decision. They said that no amount of subsidy would keep them here in Australia, and that is a fact that anyone can check out. So, we have a government that is a bit loose with the truth, to say the least.

Yet we see funding that can be made available to this state, like the River Murray diversification funding, which I have talked about many times in this place, which would have put \$25 million throughout South Australian river communities, as it did through communities in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. Those states all accepted their \$25 million, so that was \$75 million that went into projects to diversify communities from being so reliant on the River Murray.

But what happens here? We have a government that makes out they do so much for the River Murray, but when it comes down to actually supporting those river communities they just left them in the lurch and walked away. It was an absolute disgrace. They just walked away from those communities, from those projects that would have got those communities to build infrastructure to invest in jobs so they were not so reliant on direct irrigation industries on the River Murray.

It smacks in the face when you see the Treasurer, ministers and Premier Weatherill banging on about supposedly not getting enough funding when they have funding put in their hands and they just do not put it into the communities that drastically need it, yet they will be on their high horse and tell everyone who cares to listen, if they are still listening, about how much they do for the River Murray and River Murray communities.

It is no different from the government finally taking to ESCOSA the supply chain costs in regard to grain handling. This came out of a report from a committee that I established here in this house back after the harvest of 2010-11, and the lack of falling number machines fiasco with Viterra. I note that the member for Frome was on the committee as chair. One recommendation was that supply chain costs should be investigated by ESCOSA so that we could get an accurate picture of those real costs that are attributed right back to individual farmers. That report was tabled in 2012. It has taken five years—five years—to get that recommendation acted on with regard to grain supply chain costs for the thousands of farmers in this state. It is an absolute disgrace.

There are so many things that need support in my electorate. The Murray Bridge emergency department needs \$3.5 million to get it up to speed. It has not had any major upgrade there for 30 or 40 years. So much can be done in my electorate. People are still looking for storm recovery funding but are missing out just because they are the wrong side of a council boundary. I have written to the minister about it, and I hope I get a favourable outcome for those few farmers who are in the Karoonda East Murray area.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (17:29):** I wish to take a couple of minutes to point out some deception that has been put about to try to deceive the people of South Australia that South Australia is not getting its fair share from the commonwealth government. The Treasurer came into the house today and made a ministerial statement, lamenting that, 'For South Australians, there are no new roads, no new rail, no new ports and no new trams.'

The Treasurer would have us believe that South Australia has been given a dud deal by the commonwealth in the budget that was handed down last night. I spoke on the Supply Bill yesterday and raised a number of shortfalls in funding by this government in South Australia. Then we had the commonwealth budget handed down last night and the Treasurer made this ministerial statement, trying to make the argument that South Australia has been treated badly.

Then we had question time today in the house when a number of particularly senior government ministers in some of the big spending portfolios—health, transport, education, etc.,—were asked Dorothy Dixers about the impact of the federal government's budget yesterday. Also, we saw this farce when ministers stood up and reported to the house that there was no extra funding in

their portfolio area, trying again to give the impression that South Australia was indeed being given a bad deal by the commonwealth. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

I hark back to the famous press conference where the Premier busted in on Josh Frydenberg's press conference, when he was announcing an electricity deal here in Adelaide, and the Premier said that this state had been treated so badly by the commonwealth. Again, nothing could be farther from the truth. The commonwealth has unfortunately been put in the position where it has had to treat South Australia as a mendicant state. The commonwealth has had to prop up South Australia.

I suspect that in the budget handed down by the state Treasurer in a few weeks' time it will be revealed that over half the revenues accounted for in his budget will be money directly sourced from the commonwealth. We will not know the exact figure until we see the Treasurer's budget. That is in stark contrast to the way every other state in our commonwealth is treated. Every other state lifts its own weight.

The figures I have in the back of my mind are dated and some years old now, but I know that the trend is that South Australia is going from bad to worse and that the percentage of the total state's budget derived from the commonwealth is increasing. A few years ago, I think it was the 2012-13 budget, it was about 49 per cent, whereas the average across the whole of Australia was around 40 per cent. It was certainly nowhere near 49 per cent. I strongly suspect that when the state budget is handed down we will see that over half the revenues accounted for in the South Australian budget will come directly from commonwealth payments.

The majority of those payments are through the GST system, so they are untied payments. They are not directed at specific purposes, they are not specific-purpose grants and they are not grants directed at particular parts of the budget, for instance health or education. They are untied, so the decisions on where that money is spent are purely made by the state government, by the cabinet and by the Treasurer. They make the decisions on where this money is spent, and I will come to some figures in a moment.

That is how ministers can stand up and say, 'Woe betide us. We've been given such a bad deal because we haven't been given any more money for education,' or, 'We haven't been given any more money for health.' The only truth in those statements is that, yes, the tied grants in various portfolio areas may not have been increased. In some cases, they have been, but they may not have been. The lie in this argument that has been put about by ministers of this government is that the total revenue from the commonwealth is not recognised. That is the lie.

The reality is that the amount of money that the state has to spend on any functions, and indeed the totality of the functions that the state is responsible for, is increasing. Not only is it increasing, it is increasing at a far greater rate than it is for any of the other states. South Australia is indeed being treated absolutely—absolutely—better than any other state in the nation.

I turn to the commonwealth budget papers. The total payments made to South Australia in the current financial year 2016-17 from the commonwealth are \$9.856 billion. In the next financial year, in the budget that was handed down last night, that figure climbs to \$10.576 billion. That is a huge increase—something like \$700 million. Indeed, it is over \$700 million. We have had these ministers stand up and lament that South Australia has been treated badly, but none of them will actually say that in totality South Australia is getting \$700 million more than it did last year.

What are they going to do with that \$700 million? If they do what they have done in recent years, they will squander it because that is what has happened. The total payments from the commonwealth to the states in the budget that was handed down yesterday increased year on year from the current financial year to the next financial year. The total increase is in the order of 2.7 per cent. That is the total of the payments going to all the states.

In the case of South Australia, that increase is 7.3 per cent—more than double the average increase enjoyed by the states as a whole. It is more than double, yet we have the Premier and his senior ministers trot out this alarmist lie that South Australia has been treated badly. South Australia has been treated extraordinarily well by the commonwealth. The bad treatment that South Australia

is suffering is in the decision-making of this state government. This state government manages to squander the largesse that is showered upon us by the commonwealth.

Of that \$10.576 billion that South Australia will receive in the next financial year, some \$6.3 billion will be in GST payments; that is, totally untied grants. It is \$6.3 billion and that is up from \$5.93 billion—\$370 million more than South Australia received in GST in the current financial year. The temerity of this government to claim that we have been treated badly by the commonwealth is only overshadowed by this government's own incompetence.

The only thing that I am happy about with the state of politics in this state is that come March next year there will be an election. For the first time in over 40 years, it will be fought on fair boundaries and, in my opinion, there is a very, very strong chance that we will see a new government sitting on the government benches. That augurs very well for every South Australian.

Motion carried.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (17:39):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

At 17:43 the house adjourned until Thursday 11 May 2017 at 10:30.