

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 30 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 Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome students from St Joseph's School, Hectorville, who are guests of the member for Hartley.

Bills

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

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 April 2017.)

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:03): I rise today to speak on the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. In doing so, I indicate that I will be the lead speaker.

To put the health minister out of his misery, the bill comes in three parts and the less contentious issue around changes to the giving and tidying up of information between the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission and CrimTrac, and also some small changes around the unauthorised dispensing of optical appliances are things that we can get on board with. However, I indicate that we will not be supporting clause 4 of the amendment bill, which deals with the increase in the number of licences that the Friendly Society Medical Association can hold from 40 to 45.

To explain our stance, there is a long-held principle, which has strong consensus behind it at both a state and federal level, that the pharmacies in Australia and in South Australia should be pharmacy owned, pharmacy led and pharmacy driven. That is a principle to which all parties over a long period of time have held. As this is an area that is caught up in both state and federal law, there are some things we can do around upholding or choosing not to uphold that principle, but there are plenty more at a federal level on what they can do under the same.

In choosing to make this decision, the Liberal Party here wants to stand up for small, individually owned pharmacies all around South Australia. The reason this area is regulated in this way when other industries are not—for instance, a butcher's shop does not have to have restrictions put on it about how many different outlets it can hold—is that inherent risk comes with the dispensing of pharmaceutical products. They can otherwise be dangerous substances when used and abused incorrectly, so it is only right and fair that these products are regulated quite heavily.

There is a balance that we need to achieve when dispensing these potentially life-saving products, and that is a balance between allowing companies in the medical industry (I am talking about doctors' practices and small pharmacies) to conduct a business, and to successfully conduct a business, whilst at the same time ensuring that appropriate levels of clinical care are provided.

We want a system where, if somebody goes to the doctor and they desperately need an X-ray because they think they have a broken leg and the doctor says, 'Yes, no worries; let's go and do it,' it pays for that service and a person gets appropriate clinical care. We do not want a system

that incentivises beyond what is appropriate and right (again, we cannot really get rid of this out of the system completely) for a doctor to prescribe in a clinical situation.

The same thing applies for pharmacists, in the sense that we want small, owned pharmacies to be successful in the businesses they run but that we want them to provide the clinically appropriate care. I am not suggesting for a moment that there are situations where that is not the case, but the long-held principle has been, is now and should be into the future, in my view and in the view of the Liberal Party, that that is best served by pharmacist-owned and pharmacist-run pharmacies, the idea being that pharmacists are the best people to ensure that their eye is very much on clinically appropriate care and delivering the right sort of care as a proper balance between what can be two competing interests.

In doing this, as I said, we are sticking up for the small, individually owned pharmacy or the pharmacist who owns a couple of pharmacies. If there is going to be a move away from this long-held principle, then that is a discussion and a decision that need to be had more broadly. It is a decision and a discussion that need to be had at the federal level as much as at a state level because, whilst we have some power (and we are seeking to exercise some of it today), this very much needs to be driven from a federal viewpoint. Until that changes, I think there is really no reason to see change.

In the minister's second reading speech, he admits that potentially there will be some change at a federal level around competition policy, and also that this may have an impact on pharmacy regulation in the future, and that recommendations may come from the Review of Pharmacy Remuneration and Regulation commissioned by the previous commonwealth minister for health. He goes on to say that there is a community pharmacy agreement in place, and will be in place, until 2020 and that there is a lot happening in the federal sphere that may have an impact upon what the government is seeking to do here today. I think that what we are doing here is jumping the gun on this issue.

The other point I want to make is that we have not been presented with evidence that suggests that there is an unmet demand out there that needs to be met by the friendly societies. There is no evidence of an increased membership base and there is no evidence of an unmet need in the community. In our view, this bill will derogate from this very strong principle, that we want to see small, independently owned, pharmacist-led, pharmacist-owned, pharmacist-run and pharmacist-driven pharmacies across South Australia, run by people who are connected to and involved in their communities and who deliver the highest quality care they potentially can.

The pharmacists I have just described are extremely important to the Barossa. There are a number of pharmacies in my electorate, for sure, and I want to highlight some of them and the good work they do; in fact, as the father of two young daughters, I have visited almost every single one of them. Wayne and Miriam Goodwin at Priceline in Tanunda do an excellent job and provide an excellent service. I have spoken to Wayne on a number of occasions about individual issues, and he has been extremely helpful and appreciative.

Guy Ewing at Tanunda owns a couple of pharmacies. He contributes hugely to the community. He is deeply involved in the community and he is a pillar of the community. People know that when they go to him they will get the very best advice and care and somebody who puts the best interests of the people first and foremost. Tim Siv is at the local Amcal at Angaston. Amcal is our local pharmacy, and they do an absolutely stellar job. They are open early to late for when we need to be there. Nothing is ever too difficult. When we go there seeking medication for the kids or for ourselves, we get a strong commitment to providing advice. It is not just simply handing over the drugs and walking out of the store. They are keen and very interested to know the issues and what is going on so that they can advise us in the best way so they can deliver the best sort of care.

I know that we will have a number of speakers talk to various issues, so I do not propose to take up a huge amount of time in the house. Essentially, in this instance, we will be sticking up for small business, as we are the party that has traditionally done so over a long, long period. We will be sticking up for small, independently owned pharmacies. We see absolutely no reason for change at this time. Until such time that there is a federal consensus that moves away from this very important principle, a principle that has been in place for a long time, we see no reason to support clause 4 of this amendment bill.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:14): I rise to speak to the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2017. I reiterate what the lead speaker, the member for Schubert, said—that we will be supporting small businesses, that we will be supporting competition and that we will be supporting the individual pharmacy owners in this bill. We will not be supporting the increase one group wanted in their ownership capability, but we will be supporting other measures in the bill.

It is interesting to note the growth of pharmacies, and some have turned into quite big businesses. For example, there is a Chemist Warehouse in Murray Bridge as well as, I think, at least six other pharmacies around my electorate, in places like Tailem Bend and Goolwa. Pharmacies are a very important part of everyone's life. Certainly, as you get older, you find that you need to go to them more and more often for various things, not just for yourself but for your family. They are a very important part of our community, and we need to ensure that the legal and regulatory framework around chemist ownership and pharmaceutical supplies throughout the state is right.

The Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010 provides the legislative framework for the professional registration of health professionals, and it also deals with related matters that are not part of the national registration scheme, including pharmacy regulation. Under the act, all pharmacy premises and their owners must be registered with the Pharmacy Regulation Authority South Australia, primarily to protect the safety of the public—and that should be paramount.

The regulatory provisions include a requirement that an entity be limited on the number of pharmacies it may own. A pharmacist can individually own up to six pharmacies, but there is no cap on the number of pharmacies owned by individual pharmacists in aggregate. In regard to ownership, most European countries and all Australian jurisdictions require pharmacies to be owned by pharmacists to uphold the quality of pharmacy services and protect the sector from the damage perceived to have been done by the penetration of large corporate chains in the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

The strict regulation in Australia is aimed at stopping major chains from getting involved in the industry, but the regulatory framework can be subverted. There are some companies that have over 300 pharmacies through maintaining a web of partnerships that interconnect around members of two families. There are others that have accumulated a range of up to about 25 pharmacies. At the last federal election, Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull wrote:

The Coalition continues to support the model of pharmacies being owned by pharmacists to ensure community pharmacy remains focused on the needs of patients. The established community pharmacy model continues to serve Australians well.

Friendly societies are allowed to own pharmacies in all jurisdictions except the Australian Capital Territory. The bill we are discussing today was introduced on 12 April 2017, and the major element, as I indicated earlier, is to increase the limits on pharmacy ownership for friendly societies. The Friendly Society Medical Association Limited, trading as National Pharmacies, was established in 1911 as a mutual organisation where profits made through operations are returned to members in the form of monetary benefits and services.

By 1928, National Pharmacies owned and operated seven pharmacies, 13 pharmacies by 1939 and 26 by 1947. Since 1947, National Pharmacies' ownership has been capped at 26 from 1947, 31 from 1961 and since 2007 the cap has been set at 40. National Pharmacies have over 200,000 South Australian members, pays a payroll tax of around \$1.56 million per annum and employ 1,000 people. Other friendly societies are limited to nine pharmacies in total. Only one such pharmacy operates, and that is in Mount Gambier.

Since 2014, National Pharmacies have sought to increase their cap by 15, from 40 to 55. They particularly seek that rise to, in their words:

...give National Pharmacies the opportunity to maintain their market share—that is to operate the same proportion of pharmacies as a percentage of total pharmacies that they owned in 1947 when the cap was introduced.

They further argue that when the cap was first introduced in 1947 National Pharmacies had a 12.1 per cent share of South Australian pharmacies but that their share has now fallen to 8.7 per cent.

An increase to 55 pharmacies, as at today, would have provided ownership of the same percentage of total state pharmacy numbers that existed when the cap was first introduced in 1947.

I note that this bill seeks to increase National Pharmacies by five rather than the 15 previously sought. In National Pharmacies' calculations, this reduces their market share from that top level in 1947—where they want to be—back to 9.4 per cent. The Pharmacy Guild opposed the proposed increase on the ground that National Pharmacies should only be given additional pharmacies as their membership numbers grow to enable them to service member demand. National Pharmacies themselves admit that their direct membership is stable but make the point that 20 per cent of their customers are not members and that new pharmacies would help them grow their membership.

In regard to the ongoing Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS) reforms, National Pharmacies make the argument that they need to increase as well. They make the point that, in March this year, 17 South Australian staff were made redundant and that, whatever happens in regard to the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme and potential reduction in income, this affects pharmacies across the board, and the Pharmacy Guild certainly makes that point.

Regarding the view of the United Friendly Societies pharmacy in Mount Gambier, which is the only other friendly society that operates a pharmacy in South Australia, it does not support a transfer of all the unallocated numbers to National Pharmacies. In regard to other Pharmacy Guild concerns, the guild also objects to the increase in the cap on the basis that National Pharmacies should not be allowed to grow because their exemption from the principle that only pharmacists should own pharmacies is the result of grandfathering, which should not be allowed to be perpetual.

The guild's submission would not only mean that the cap should not be increased, but that the participation of friendly societies in the industry should be at least frozen or even phased out. The Pharmacy Guild also claims that friendly societies have unfair tax advantages and receive benefits as wholesalers. Both these matters are determined by commonwealth law and policy. National Pharmacies challenge that alleged tax advantage and refer to material from the commonwealth Treasury. They also point out that many individual pharmacists participate in buying groups.

Regarding the interaction with commonwealth regulation of pharmacies and what happens at the state level, the South Australian government sets pharmacy ownership limits for individual pharmacists and friendly societies and the PBS and Pharmacy Location Rules are regulated by the commonwealth government. A PBS licence is necessary to operate a pharmacy outlet and the Pharmacy Location Rules set out strict limits on where pharmacies are allowed to operate. These restrictions limit the overall number of pharmacies in South Australia.

We do not support this part of the bill passing because the raising of the cap, if this bill does pass, will only lead to new National Pharmacies being established if a pharmacy becomes available for sale or a greenfield opportunity is found. There are national discussions about the impact on pharmacy regulation in the future, including the current commonwealth Review of Pharmacy Remuneration and Regulation. The outcome of these discussions may impact on commonwealth, state and territory laws. We are told that any changes would be unlikely to be implemented until after the expiry of the Sixth Community Pharmacy Agreement, which expires in the year 2020. Whatever happens with this legislation, National Pharmacies are still very keen to have a further increase in their ownership cap, so we need to take note of that.

As I indicated earlier, regarding services to the regions, a pharmacy is a very important part of the total health effort in any community. There have been some changes recently regarding SA Health and its practices in relation to hospital pharmacies, whereby hospital pharmacies are supplying pharmaceutical products to citizens who are not currently patients of the hospital and a centralised supply of pharmaceutical products to hospitals, and this has a direct impact on regional pharmacies.

There are a couple of other amendments in this bill about selling magnifying or ready-made spectacles. They can currently be sold without a prescription, provided that a warning label is attached to the glasses stating that they are not prescription glasses. The bill is seeking to remove the requirement of the manner in which the warning label is to be affixed to the ready-made spectacles. There is another minor technical amendment to give effect to the merger of the CrimTrac

agency with the Australian Crime Commission regarding investigating the potential of any criminal history of any individual pharmacist or health practitioner involved in the field.

We support the minor amendments but, with regard to pharmacy ownership and having major change just to increase their presence, we support competition, we support individual pharmacy owners and wish them to become more competitive in the field rather than giving one of the major players a larger presence in the field of pharmacy ownership. That is our position on the bill, and I look forward to the rest of the debate.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to acknowledge that we have some students from Blackfriars with us this morning, who are guests of the member for Fisher. We have Connor Watson and Thien Nguien and we wish them luck with their Women in Parliament media studies assignment.

Bills

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

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (11:29): I rise today in support of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. The amendment before the house seeks to increase the number of pharmacies that the Friendly Society Medical Association (trading as National Pharmacies) may own in South Australia with a corresponding decrease in the number of pharmacies that all other friendly societies may own.

Pharmacies play a key role in the community. Not only are they in locations where medications are dispensed but they are playing an increasing role in providing general health advice, and immunisations for seasonal flu programs and some preventable diseases. This government recognises that community pharmacies are among the most trusted health resources in contemporary society, which is why we have allowed easier access to vaccinations through local pharmacies. Rather than having to wait for an appointment with a GP, people aged 16 and over will be able to obtain potentially life-saving vaccines from their local authorised pharmacist. By allowing pharmacists to administer these vaccines, we will reduce pressure on GPs and hospitals, and increase accessibility to vaccines, which will go a long way to creating a healthier South Australia.

Under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010, the number of pharmacies an entity may own is capped. The intent of this cap is to ensure that the market is not dominated by a single entity. The cap on pharmacy numbers has been in place in some form since 1947 when pharmacy premises were first regulated in South Australia. Similar provisions apply in other states and territories, although the number of pharmacies an entity may own differs.

Under the current legislation, National Pharmacies may own no more than 40 pharmacies in South Australia. All other friendly societies may own up to nine pharmacies, and a person other than a friendly society, more commonly known as community pharmacists, may own up to six pharmacies. National Pharmacies approached the Minister for Health for an increase in the number of pharmacies they may own on the ground that their market share has fallen since the cap was originally introduced. While the total number of pharmacies in the state has increased, the number of pharmacies that National Pharmacies may own has stayed the same.

As the minister indicated in his second reading speech, the number of pharmacies an entity may own has been the result of compromise between all parties. I note that the Pharmacy Guild is not supportive of increasing the number of pharmacies that National Pharmacies may own. However, the increase to National Pharmacies has been taken from pharmacies allocated to all other friendly societies in South Australia that have not been taken up. So, the total number of pharmacies that all friendly societies may own in South Australia remains capped at 49 pharmacies.

The legislation has been brought forward to the house despite the commonwealth government's Review of Pharmacy Remuneration and Regulation and discussions at the national level about competition policy more broadly. While the commonwealth's review is primarily concerned with remuneration arrangements for pharmacies and the Pharmacy Location Rules, it is unclear whether pharmacy ownership will be addressed as a result of submissions. However, given that the commonwealth government has an agreement with the Pharmacy Guild until June 2020, it is unlikely that any changes will be implemented from this review until this time.

The commonwealth government is also seeking to negotiate national partnership agreements with states and territories on regulatory reform which may affect the regulation of pharmacy ownership. While each state and territory has its own legislation in this area, it may be that health ministers may wish to consider a national approach to reform, which also may take some time to negotiate. Given the length of time that the commonwealth government's deliberations are likely to take, it is appropriate for parliament to consider the proposal relating to National Pharmacies ahead of these national discussions. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:33): Today, I rise to provide a contribution on the Health Practitioners Regulation National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2017. The Health Practitioners Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010 provides the legislative framework for professional registration of health professionals. The act also deals with regulated matters that are not part of the national registration scheme, including pharmacy regulation. Under the act, all pharmacy premises and their owners must be registered with the Pharmacy Regulation Authority SA, primarily to protect the safety of the public. The regulatory provisions include a requirement that pharmacies be limited in the number of pharmacies any entity may own.

A pharmacist can individually own up to six pharmacies, but there is no cap on the number of pharmacies owned by an individual pharmacist in aggregate. Most European countries and all Australian jurisdictions require pharmacies to be owned by pharmacists to uphold the quality of pharmacy services and to protect the sector from damage perceived to have been done by the penetration of large corporate chains in the United Kingdom and the USA.

The amendment bill was introduced on 12 April 2017. Its most significant element is to increase the limits on pharmacy ownership for friendly societies. The 2017 bill proposes to increase the cap for National Pharmacies by five, from 40 to 45—one third of the requested number—and at the same time reduce the cap on other friendly societies from nine to four. There would be no net increase in the cap for friendly societies.

To give a little bit of history, in 1911 National Pharmacies were established with seven pharmacies, which increased to 13 in 1928. In 1947, National Pharmacies' approval to operate pharmacies in South Australia was capped at 26 sites by the South Australian legislation. This was a grandfathering provision to allow operators of friendly society operated pharmacies to continue to serve their members when a requirement for pharmacist ownership of community pharmacies was introduced. In 1961, this was increased to 31 sites. In 2006, National Pharmacies were approved to operate 40 sites. A further nine sites were approved for the use of other friendly societies, should they wish to establish pharmacies in South Australia.

The number of community pharmacies an individual or entity could have an interest in was lifted from four to six. The Pharmacy Guild submits that at the time the South Australian government was under pressure to enhance competition in the pharmacy sector. Today in 2017, the South Australian parliament is to consider the amendment to section 42 of the act to again increase National Pharmacies' approval to 45. National Pharmacies are seeking a further increase by five sites over the next 10 years.

Family-owned businesses are the backbone of the South Australian economy. Family-owned pharmacies are no exception, and they are in essence supported by family-owned businesses. In many regional centres of South Australia, we have a succession plan. A father or a grandfather has owned that pharmacy or pharmacies and passed them to the next generation and so on. There is no better example of that happening than in the Riverland.

Pharmacies are an important part of the total health effort in any community, and the Riverland is no exception. As I have said, small business is the backbone of the economy, particularly

in the Riverland communities. It is estimated that there are around 4,000 small businesses in the Riverland of the 140,000 across the state, employing 249,000 people and contributing around \$34 billion to the economy annually.

We have seen changes to SA Health's practices in relation to hospital pharmacies whereby hospital pharmacies are supplying pharmaceutical products to citizens who are not currently patients at the hospital. There is a centralised supplier of pharmaceutical products to those hospitals. The last thing we want to see is more pressure on those family-run pharmacies, particularly in regional areas such as the Riverland and the Mallee.

I will touch on some wonderful success stories in the Riverland. We do not have any National Pharmacies in the electorate of Chaffey. For example, in 2015 the Waikerie Chemplus pharmacy was awarded South Australia's Pharmacy of the Year for the second time in three years. That is an outstanding achievement for a small, family-run pharmacy in a regional centre. The Waikerie Chemplus pharmacy provides a wonderful service to the Waikerie community, and these types of awards are a great recognition of the pride small towns have around a family business.

The Pharmacy Guild has objected to the increase in the cap on the basis that National Pharmacies should not be allowed to grow because their exemption from the principle that only pharmacists should own pharmacies is the result of grandfathering, which should not be allowed to be perpetual.

The guild's submission is not only that the cap should not be increased but that participation of friendly societies in the industry should be at least frozen or even phased out. The guild also claims that friendly societies have unfair tax advantages and receive benefits as wholesalers, both of which are matters determined by commonwealth law and policy. The alleged tax advantage is challenged by National Pharmacies with reference to the commonwealth Treasury material, and they point out that many individual pharmacists participate in buying groups. Again, it seems that a national identity is having a heavy hand over these small and vitally important pharmacies, particularly those that are family owned and run.

Another great succession story is the John pharmacies at Renmark. Clacker John was very warmly regarded as a great family man, a great pharmacist and a caring, loving man who was always there for the benefit of his community. He was succeeded by his son Paul, who took over that family pharmacy way back when I first went to the Riverland in the late eighties. Sadly, Paul has passed and it is now a Priceline pharmacy.

The Riverland Plaza's Guardian Pharmacy is another great support for the Berri community, as are United Chemists at Renmark to another part of that community and the Berri Amcal pharmacy. These small towns are reliant on these family-owned, pharmacist-owned businesses, such as the Morgan Centre Pharmacy. Morgan is a town where the boundaries have changed and it will be moving into the electorate of Chaffey, and I welcome those constituents.

The Terry White pharmacy at Waikerie is another great story. I was doorknocking the main street of Waikerie only last week and went in to see that it is a well-presented and clean centre that gives great service and is one of the heartbeats of that business community. The Amcal pharmacy and the Cole and Edwards pharmacy in Loxton are also great providers of pharmacy services. I occasionally have to go to the Berri pharmacy in Clarks Arcade for pharmacy supplies, and they do a great job and provide a great service and great outcomes. The Karoonda pharmacy is another great story in a Mallee town, which is a marginal town. Karoonda relies on that service to provide them with pharmaceuticals and medical care.

This is a decision that this side of the house has made a stand on: we will not support an increase of National Pharmacies. I do not have National Pharmacies in my electorate, but what I do have are family-run businesses that are the backbone not only of regional communities but also of the Adelaide metropolitan and the wider South Australian business community. The Pharmacy Guild has contacted me, as have National Pharmacies with their side of the story, and I am backing the Pharmacy Guild. I am backing them because they represent small business in South Australia and they are a great representation of what locals mean to local people.

Pharmacists owning pharmacies is a great working model. I have many letters about all sorts of health issues, all sorts of services that are continually being taken away and businesses that are closing in regional centres. I do not receive any letters with concerns about the level of service provided by our pharmacists. I do not consider that we need to have more pharmacies to provide that level of medical care. I am concerned about what could be in the pipeline in the future, whether it is deregulation or corporatisation.

What I am seeing is that the hospital pharmacies are impacting on small family business chemists, and I see the duopoly breathing down the neck of every pharmacist and every convenience store as it slowly increases what we see as soft medication. Particularly for some of the care products we need, we go to a convenience store. The On The Run stores are another avenue of providing a service. Is that putting more pressure on pharmacies and those small pharmaceutical businesses? Yes, it is. This is potentially the thin end of the wedge. We have continued to see National Pharmacies come in and want to increase the number of their pharmacies, and I think we have to take a stand on this.

We do not see that there is an undersupply of pharmacists. We do see that there is a drop-off in membership within National Pharmacies, so why are we going to increase the number of those outlets? The status quo is presenting itself exceptionally well in South Australia and that is why we on this side of the house will support no increase to National Pharmacies outlets.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:45): I rise to speak to the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2017 and to these important amendments that will help make health care in South Australia for South Australians safer, better regulated and more efficient. Firstly, I will focus on the simplification of the regulation of ready-made glasses, an issue that I have become particularly personally interested in over the past few years as my notes for speeches like this are put into larger and larger fonts and as I hold those notes farther and farther away.

Currently, under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act, glasses or any optical appliance cannot be sold in South Australia unless they have been prescribed by an optometrist, an orthoptist or an ophthalmologist. This includes the sale of spectacle lenses designed to correct any abnormality or defect of sight and contact lenses, whether or not they are to correct any abnormality or defect of sight.

This raises important issues in terms of protecting and promoting eye health for South Australians. Lenses that have not been properly prescribed can cause further damage to an eye, particularly in the case of contact lenses. Glasses that are purely for magnifying, commonly called ready-made spectacles, do not fall within the intent of the legislation. Ready-made spectacles are only designed to magnify objects so that they can be read up close rather than, as I mentioned, having to hold them farther away. These types of magnifying devices do not pose the same risk to eye health.

For most people, the difficulty in reading may be put down to the ageing process, but for others there may be a medical condition, such as macular degeneration or glaucoma. If this medical condition is diagnosed, it may be possible to halt the progress of the condition and the resulting deterioration of eyesight.

This legislation requires that a warning label be attached to ready-made spectacles to advise that they are not prescription glasses and that it is recommended that the purchaser considers an eye examination with an optometrist to determine whether there is indeed a medical condition contributing to their difficulty in reading. However, in drafting a regulation to give effect to this legislation, it was found that the legislation is perhaps too prescriptive. It requires manufacturers or retailers to attach the warning label to the glasses and also prescribes exactly how the warning label should be attached to the glasses.

Previous regulations have prescribed that the warning label must be attached by cotton twine. However, manufacturers or retailers may have a more efficient manner to attach the label to the ready-made spectacles, such as a plastic tie attached to the frames or a sticker on the lenses. Under this amendment, the warning label must only be attached in a manner that means the

purchaser needs to physically remove it and therefore take notice of it in doing so. This amendment simplifies regulation in this state for manufacturers and retailers.

It is, of course, crucial that people purchasing these glasses are aware of the potential risk of purchasing without an eye examination; however, it is unnecessary to specify how the warning label is attached. This amendment provides a balance between care and safety for South Australians needing to access glasses and regulation that is appropriate and enables manufacturers to provide safety messages in an efficient and practical way.

Secondly, I speak briefly to the CrimTrac agency amendment. Under this bill, minor and technical amendments are introduced to reflect the amalgamation of the CrimTrac agency with the Australian Crime Commission, which occurred on 1 July 2016. The CrimTrac agency was previously responsible for maintaining criminal history information for use between state, territory and federal law enforcement agencies.

Under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010, the Commissioner of Police is authorised to share the information collected by CrimTrac with a health profession national board. This is to determine whether an individual is a fit and proper person to be registered to practise in a profession. Persons who are not held to high standards of conduct may pose a risk to the safety of the public and will therefore be barred.

As the name 'CrimTrac agency' is no longer used, there are replacements of references to 'CrimTrac' with the 'Australian Crime Commission' in this bill, which of course removes any doubt about the authority responsible for providing criminal histories for persons seeking registration as a health practitioner in South Australia. This is an important amendment to reflect the new body responsible for providing criminal histories in the process of registration for health practitioners and has no substantive impact on the operation of the act.

Both these amendments are important adjustments to ensure the proper and efficient functioning of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010 and therefore the health and wellbeing of South Australians. I commend this bill to the house.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:51): I rise to speak on the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill, which essentially changes our 2010 act to regulate health practitioners and pharmacies and also to deal with optical facilities, as has been indicated in the debate. Can I particularly refer firstly to dealing with optical product and the need to have a prescription and the need to be able to highlight to any prospective purchaser the dangers of buying a product that is not prescribed by a medical practitioner. Obviously, this bill is designed today to relax some of the provision so that we can accommodate the fact that there are practical aspects of the sale of glasses, in particular, which are used as a reading aid.

For the reasons other members have stated, it is important that people get advice. This area of law is one that did not go national. I just want to highlight the fact that it did not go national because we in South Australia had good law in relation to optical use and, as usual, Canberra does not know the best of everything. So, when the COAGs all got together and decided that they were going to have these national registration schemes to deal with professional standards and the like, and the registration process, optical provisions stayed in our state legislation but were not agreed to at the national level.

The reason that was particularly acute at the time was that there was a new product out called plano lenses. These were little lenses that children could buy at the Royal Show in a show bag. They could make themselves have cat's eyes, or change their brown eyes to blue eyes, green eyes or purple eyes, without any kind of medical advice or treatment or adult supervision. A 12 year old could go along and think, 'I want to get cat's eyes in my bag,' buy them and put them in their eyes. They could get stuck, and next thing you have potentially serious damage to children in the use of these products.

So, there is good reason why we had it, and there is good reason why we kept it, and I just remind members of the importance of making sure that we ensure that we do not go to the lowest

common denominator when we go into a national scheme. Nevertheless, for the purposes of today's amendment, I support the same.

In respect of the amendments to deal with the merger of the CrimTrac agency and the Australian Crime Commission into a new body, this bill needs to accommodate the changes that are largely descriptive of the new name simply because our pharmacists and pharmacy personnel, who are subject to the fit and proper person test, use the CrimTrac agency for the purposes of identifying any historical record of someone who should not qualify. In obtaining the criminal history reports, that needs to be accommodated to ensure that that can continue with the new agency. I have absolutely no problem with that and endorse those amendments.

I come to the third area of reform in the bill, to add in the opportunity for the National Pharmacies organisation to increase its current limit of 40 pharmacies to 43. In his contribution, the minister highlights three things: firstly, the historical background that National Pharmacies, to some degree, has an exemption to the rule that every pharmacy must be owned by a pharmacist. It has, over the years, applied for increases. In 1961, I think it had 30-odd pharmacies. In my time in the parliament—in 2007—it was capped to an increase of 40. For the last couple of years, National Pharmacies have been lobbying government, and indeed some other members of parliament, to seek to increase that again.

In his second reading explanation, the minister makes the point that the Pharmacy Guild of Australia, representing a number of individually owned pharmacies, strongly objects to that. That is nothing new of course; they always have because they represent a different group in the industry. If the government wants to come into the parliament and say that there is a justifiable reason for there being a change of the rules in a fixed pool, then they need to present some evidence to justify it.

It is a bit like having a fishing licence and the right to catch King George whiting. Everybody likes to catch them, especially doubleheaders. As a resource, it is limited and so we have a licensing scheme that gives a certain number of commercial operators the opportunity, exclusively, to have a certain catch. It allows for zones and regions and an opportunity for amateur fishermen, up to a limit, to have a share of the catch. It is managed and if there is a change in the rules then obviously that affects somebody else.

Clearly, if a minister wants to come into the parliament and say, 'I want to change the rules,' then bring the case to do that. The only thing that is disclosed in the minister's second reading is to say, 'Look, National Pharmacies have been asking me for some time to do this. The Guild says no. A reasonable compromise is three.' That is what he says, that is what he tells us in the parliament and he expects us to say, 'That's fine; that's good enough. Tick that box. It's a stab in the dark. We will just add those few.'

I say to the Minister for Health that he has to understand that this has very serious commercial consequences. We are dealing with a limited, protected, regulated market and the minister needs to come in here with a good case. He has told us that there has been a drop in National Pharmacies' market share of the pharmacy world from about 12 per cent to 8 per cent. That may or may not be a good reason to give them an extra share on the basis that they need to maintain their share.

What he should be doing is looking into the Chemist Warehouse-type introduction—I do not mean anything against this particular group—and say, 'There are new players in the field. We need to actually relook at the whole of this area and look at it in a considered way to try to balance the interests of the existing operators, protect the public and ensure that where new players have come in under the door that they are also taken into account with proper consultation, not just some stab in the dark: how do I get National Pharmacies off my back? I will just give them an extra three.'

That is not acceptable. If he wants to present to us some other reason for managing it in this way, then put it in the second reading and tell us what this is really about because at the moment it does not cut it with me and it does not cut it with this side of the house. I oppose that section of the bill.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:59): I will try not to take too much of the house's time on this. There is only one part of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)

(Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill that I find controversial and that is the part that would see the number of pharmacies held by the National Pharmacies group increase from 40 to 45.

As always when I look at a piece of legislation that is brought to the parliament, I ask myself: what is the ill we are trying to cure, and is this a reasonable cure? Does it do what it is purported to do? I have just now reread the minister's second reading contribution, and I do not think he identifies any ill whatsoever. I do not think he even purports to identify an ill, other than the fact that the company or the business—National Pharmacies—approached him and asked for an increase in the number of pharmacies they could own/manage.

There is no ill. What we have in South Australia and, I understand, in other jurisdictions in this nation, is a good working system that provides pharmaceutical services throughout the country and throughout the suburbs. We have a system that is working. We have a system that is providing a service to communities right throughout the state. Why would we endeavour to put that at risk just because one particular operator claims that their business model is suffering a little and that they see that the way forward for them is to increase the cap on the number of pharmacies they can operate?

If it ain't broke, don't fix it—and I do not think it is broke. Some people might think that those of us on this side of the house, because we support free enterprise, also support open slather. That is not the case, and some of us have been very consistent in this. I remember that I was one of the few people in this house at the time who opposed the deregulation of the Barley Board, and I was horrified that the Australian Wheat Board went the same way.

Within our economic system, there is good reason to have regulation of some industries and some sectors of some industries. The regulations surrounding the pharmaceutical industry in South Australia have served the people of South Australia very well. I believe that they have served the pharmacy industry very well. I cannot support any changes to that because all I can see is the potential downside.

A number of my colleagues, the member for Chaffey in particular, talked about the various pharmacies and small businesses throughout their electorates. I am not going to go through in a similar manner and name all the pharmacies within my electorate, but my electorate is well serviced. Albeit that my electorate contains a number of quite small communities, it is well serviced by pharmacists, who provide an invaluable service to those communities.

I would not like to see any changes to the regulations concerning the cap on the number of pharmacies that can be operated by any of the parties, which may threaten the delivery of service in my electorate and, I think, may threaten the delivery of this service throughout the state. There being no ill that needs to be cured, and there being no worthwhile reason for these changes, I find that I cannot support them.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (12:03): I thank honourable members for their contributions. National Pharmacies approached me because they were seeking to grow their business in this state. They wanted to open additional pharmacies to cater for growing demand for pharmacies and the services pharmacies provide, and they wanted to grow their business.

I thought that the Liberal Party in this state supported business and supported job creation. Obviously, I was mistaken in that belief. The Liberal Party in this state wants to cling to some pretty outdated notions about restricting the ability of National Pharmacies to be able to grow their business, and so be it. I have been seeking a compromise in good faith between the Pharmacy Guild and National Pharmacies for about two years now. I have said from the very beginning to National Pharmacies to seek a compromise with the Pharmacy Guild. That was not able to happen.

In consultation with my department, I came up with this formula, which only seeks to increase the cap by five pharmacies. I think the notion that community pharmacies are going to be devastated by National Pharmacies being able to open an additional five pharmacies is frankly absurd. But, nonetheless, I was assured by the lobbyist working on behalf of National Pharmacies that such a move would have the support of the Liberal Party. I will certainly be going back to National Pharmacies and raising with them that perhaps they need to think about their choice of the lobbyist they engage, who seems to promise things he is unable to deliver. But that being by the bye—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: No, it wasn't. I assure you that it was a lobbyist who was a former member of this place from the other side of the house who I would have thought would have a bit more of an idea what the thinking might be within the Liberal Party than he obviously does. I do not want this issue to be an issue of political contention. I thought it was a modest and reasonable compromise, but I would indicate that if this does not have bipartisan support then we will seek to withdraw that particular clause that raises the cap and will do so between the houses—unless of course the Liberal Party in this state changes its mind between the houses. But I am more than happy to have that withdrawn.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: If the opposition have an amendment tabled giving effect to that, which I understand they do not, I am more than happy to go into committee and do it.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr KNOLL: My question merely is to reiterate the fact that essentially we will be opposing this clause and it is a question to the Minister for Health. My understanding is very much that in order for National Pharmacies to increase their business either they need to cannibalise an existing pharmacy or seek out a greenfield site, and given that we have 0.6 per cent population growth, as the Attorney stated this morning, those greenfield sites are going to be few and far between and will be very easily catered for by the existing players and under the existing rules. I would like the minister to present evidence that there is business growth in this space to justify the need for National Pharmacies to increase the number of their pharmacies.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The member for Schubert would be obviously very comfortable in North Korea. Given his remarks, he obviously believes that government should be dictating how many businesses a business owns and whether there is suitable demand.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! The deputy leader!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I think the member for Schubert would have a very different view if this parliament took the position that it knew better about where to open Barossa smallgoods outlets around the state and whether there was sufficient demand.

Mr Knoll: There is always demand for good sausage.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I know the member for Schubert has spent a bit of time trying to sell his smallgoods on the internet, but that is beside the point. I generally take the view that it is for individual businesses to decide whether there is sufficient demand. It is not something that the parliament should be prescribing—whether there is sufficient demand. I would point out that in the outer suburbs of metropolitan Adelaide I would not hold the view that there is a surfeit or surplus of pharmacy outlets. To suggest that five additional outlets by National Pharmacies across South Australia are somehow going to destroy the business model of community pharmacies is frankly absurd.

As I said, I proceeded with this on the understanding that it would have bipartisan support. It is not something I want to make a political issue out of. If the Liberal Party cares to amend the bill to remove that clause, I indicate government support.

Clause negated.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (12:11): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUMMARY PROCEDURE (INDICTABLE OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 18 May 2017.)

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I rise to indicate that the government will be accepting the amendments of the Legislative Council to the bill. This bill represents perhaps the most significant reform to criminal procedure in South Australia since the introduction of the Summary Procedure Act.

This reform has been a very long time coming. It was flagged as a key pillar of the government's Transforming Criminal Justice project, which was announced in December 2014. Since then, significant work has been undertaken in the formulation of the bill that is now before us. Whilst I cannot say that I am 100 per cent satisfied with the final result, 70 per cent is better than zero. We have, no doubt, ended up with a piece of legislation that will significantly change the way that criminal matters move through our criminal justice system.

The decision by the Legislative Council to remove two key elements of this reform, namely, the positive disclosure of any defence upon which the accused seeks to rely and the possibility of adverse comment being made to the jury, is regrettable. These removals preserve the notion, promoted by some in the private legal profession, that a criminal trial is 'not about the truth'. I disagree. The public, if they were asked, would also disagree, and the media, if doing its job, should also.

This is a missed opportunity by my parliamentary colleagues in the Legislative Council to endorse what would have been a very positive reform to criminal procedure, a positive reform that has been undertaken in various forms by New South Wales, Western Australia and Victoria. I do acknowledge at this time that there was significant opposition to these aspects of the bill, particularly from some members of the private legal profession. While I respectfully disagree with them, I do understand these views. Despite the amendments of the Legislative Council, the bill in its final form will greatly improve the criminal justice system.

As I have said repeatedly, the meaningful reform of our criminal justice system requires all the moving parts to work together. This bill represents one piece of the puzzle. There needs to be a cultural shift within the system as a whole, and that goes for all elements of the system—police, Director of Public Prosecutions, defence counsel and judiciary. With that in mind, I am very pleased that the Legal Services Commission is changing its legal aid grants to increase the number of early guilty pleas in criminal matters.

Under a pilot program starting from 1 July this year, defence lawyers will be funded to prepare for and engage in more intensive pre-trial negotiations with prosecutors. An additional fee of \$500 will be paid to the defence lawyer when a guilty plea is entered by their client before the case is listed for trial. This front-end loading of work is exactly what the criminal justice system needs to function to its full potential, and I applaud the Legal Services Commission for this initiative. It will result in better outcomes and significant savings in time and resources.

Additionally, as announced in the last state budget, on 1 July this year the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions will take over country committals, which means that all serious criminal matters in South Australia will be under the control of a single prosecutorial authority in the

DPP. Whilst these reforms mentioned may seem minor, they are excellent examples of the cultural shifts that will enhance the criminal justice system.

I anticipate that the deputy leader will stand up shortly and deride my work in progressing the legislation, possibly claim victory in that the Legislative Council amendments are being accepted and quite possibly describe my conduct with the usual grab bag of pejorative superlatives, such as disgraceful, outrageous, disgusting, reprehensible and so on. Of course, this is par for the course here, but, as usual, she will be wrong.

When the bill was originally debated in this place, I remind members that at the very last moment the deputy leader dropped on us amendments that sought to completely blow the bill up. This was her own version of 'late disclosure'. The amendments were moved under the guise of mirroring the Victorian model, but make no mistake that the amendments were designed to make the legislation fail. The deputy leader critiqued the legislation in her second reading, based not even on the bill that was before the house but on the original consultation version of the bill, which by then had changed significantly.

The version of the bill we now have before us is by no means a victory for the opposition—far from it. This is a piece of legislation that will, despite the best endeavours of some, play a significant role in improving the effectiveness and efficiency of our criminal justice system. On that note, I would like to thank the members who contributed to the debate on this bill. Bearing in mind it is not perfect, perfection must never be the enemy of the good. Accordingly, the government will be accepting the amendments.

I also thank all those people who have spent a great deal of time working on this legislation, in many places, and there are too many to name, but in particular Will Evans, on my staff, who has been living and breathing this project for some time. He has done a fantastic job, so I thank him very much. Tania from legislative services has done an extraordinary job, and I thank all the other people within government and externally who have become engaged and worked on this project. I think it is fair to say that, overwhelmingly, the people with whom we have been engaged in this project have brought goodwill to the process and that there has been, overwhelmingly, a bona fide effort to see improvement.

In a combination of this legislation passing and the other initiatives I have just mentioned, and others to come—including, I am very optimistic to say at this point in time, changes by the courts in how they conduct themselves in terms of the way they manage their lists—all will work together to yield a significant improvement.

Ms CHAPMAN: I indicate that the opposition welcomes the amendments introduced in the Legislative Council, some of which have been tried and failed in this chamber previously, but let me say that, in general, the bill was supported by the opposition at all material times.

Three aspects of this bill were offensive to us and totally unacceptable to those in the community in the legal profession, who represent everyone in South Australia who might be caused to come before a court charged with an indictable offence. People do not realise the gravity of this until they or a member of their family are charged and they look to have a judicial system that will ensure that there is no bias in the prosecution, that there is no defect in ensuring that justice will prevail in the application of the court's determination, that they will have a fair trial and that, where possible, the guilty are found guilty and the innocent are protected.

The areas of concern for us related to the opportunity to have pre-trial disclosure. There was some amendment to that and further discussion in the upper house about that. Ultimately, there was a fair compromise to ensure that there would be the right for pre-trial disclosure via the subpoena power, which had been demonstrated on many occasions to be necessary to ensure that there was full disclosure in these very serious cases.

Secondly, if there is going to be adverse comment given to a judge as a result of defence counsel not disclosing or not providing information in a timely manner and in compliance with the rules, they would be the subject of adverse comment. We found this to be of concern given that the government had said that it is necessary to ensure that there is some punishment if people do not do the right thing. That is fine, but it should apply to the prosecution as well if there is going to be disclosure all around. Obviously, we had to raise these points with the government.

Perhaps of most concern was the introduction of a regime of disclosure and early disclosure of the defence's case, rather than concentrating on the disclosure of evidence that needed to be produced for the purposes of fully informed advice being given to an accused by their counsel. There are a number of reasons why serious cases in our criminal court system haemorrhage into dysfunction and delay.

One is that in the District Court there has been a paucity of judges and vacancies not filled. 'No judge available.' We can read it in the annual report every year. A second is that there is no court available. Third, there is late disclosure and late guilty pleas. We find time and time again in these cases that applications are made because there has not been full disclosure—not necessarily deliberate or wilful concealment, but a situation where there has been a failure to disclose.

I have said this in the parliament before: it can be as simple as information being obtained from a witness at police station X when subsequently the case is operated out of police station Y. The material that is accumulated at station Y is made available but later down the track, in the final preparation, they find that there is a witness statement or a piece of evidence that is brought forward from police station X. Of course, unsurprisingly, the people representing the accused say, 'We don't know anything about this. Obviously we need to get instructions and prepare our case to deal with it.' If it is pivotal to a potential plea, then hopefully at that stage, late as it might be, there would be some sensible resolution on that basis.

We have at all times said that we will work with the government to ensure the efficient and timely progressing of fair and just trials in the criminal justice system, and we do not resile from that, but those on the upper house crossbenches obviously took the view that we were right and that there needed to be amendment and that, notwithstanding that the Attorney-General has his new, shiny 'SC' after his name, he is clearly not as smart as those who actually operate in this field as criminal counsel.

With that in mind, I thank those who have put representations to us powerfully and persistently to ensure that this parliament does not throw out time-honoured protections to ensure fair and just trials in its haste to try to convince the public of South Australia that these reforms will actually produce some major change and efficiency. The government needs to do a lot more if it wants to make the criminal justice system more efficient.

In particular, I acknowledge the contribution of Mr Tony Rossi and the Law Society; Mr Ian Robertson SC, representing the President of the South Australian Bar Association; Mr Bill Boucaut SC—I cannot think of anyone in the current bar who has had more experience, other than perhaps Michael Abbott QC—and Mr David Edwardson QC, a leading counsel at the criminal bar. These people understand what happens out there in the real world, and I thank them sincerely for, where necessary, even publicly making comment to alert South Australians to the ill that was about to befall them if the government got its way.

One of the things the government has done—which appears to have been very effective already, and we supported them on it—was to introduce a system several years ago of amending the law to give higher discounts on sentencing for early pleas. It is a reward system and we supported them in it. With that amendment came the supergrass law, where some extra penalty can be taken off if you squeal on someone else.

If you have an existing sentence, for the same reasons you have an opportunity to get that discount. It was a good idea and we supported it. It was reviewed, and the reviewer said, 'It's a bit too early to say whether it's actually been effective or not, but there's good early signs.' We said to the government, 'Give this a bit longer as a go and have it looked at again.' But, oh no, they had to say that this was to be the panacea of reform.

Secondly, on the retirement of the chief judge of the District Court, the government appointed Michael Evans QC. In his time, before one dot of this reform had taken place or had been implemented, in the six or eight weeks that he has now been the Chief Judge, to my knowledge it appears that only one case has needed to be adjourned. That tells us something perhaps about his administration. It may be that it happened that there were other judges on deck or it may be the nature of the cases, but at this stage his administration is showing very great, significant signs of

success in this area. Whatever he is doing, he needs to do more of it, and we are very pleased to see it.

Thirdly, the government announced today that it will increase the fee available to representatives of legal aid clients by \$500, which is to top end the representation fee. I suppose this works on a bonus system. You are saying to counsel, 'Look, if you can get the client to plead guilty early, then you'll get extra money at this point and you don't need to go on and get a paucity of money to continue in the trial,' so there is some incentive to solicitors and/or counsel to get the guilty plea early because they will get not much after that.

I understand how that works. I would say that it is about time the fee level for counsel in this area is increased anyway, not just as an extra bonus but because it has taken so long to do it. I say to the government that, if they expect the Legal Services Commission to pick up the fee for this without some funding in this year's state budget, they need to think again because, clearly, there will need to be more funding for that and I expect that that needs to come with it.

While they are at it, the Attorney-General might go into cabinet and reverse the \$6 million cut his government gave to the Legal Services Commission over four years in previous budgets. Do not come here on 22 June and have the Treasurer stand up in a grandiose way to tell us what a good bloke he is by allowing some extra money to go to the Legal Services Commission. If it is not above \$6 million and above the cost of this initiative, then there will still be scum in the financial position that they will be put in. I say, with early caution, that I think this is a welcome initiative, but it needs to be funded and it ought not be required to be taken out of existing budgets.

As the Attorney reminded us, the DPP will take over country committals. This was an initiative announced last year. We are yet to see whether that works. It may work, and obviously I hope it does. There was some money (I think \$1 million) allocated over a few years to accommodate the cost of that and video link-ups for country committals. We are yet to see whether that will work. There are things that can be done to improve the efficient progression of cases through our court system. When they are good, we will continue to support them. When they are designed to cut out the rightful entitlements of an accused in a trial process, particularly when their liberty (up to life imprisonment) is at risk and compromised, we will continue to oppose them.

I will conclude by saying that one of the biggest sticking points in relation to the accommodation of a model of disclosure, which the government has now accepted in the period leading up to a trial listing, has been the resources of the DPP. The government continuously rejects sufficiently funding the DPP to ensure senior prosecutors are employed, which in turn ensures that there is early management and the capacity to enter into serious negotiations with cases. This must occur, and it can only occur if people are employed at a senior level.

I understand, from information provided in the course of this debate, that there is some extra money for the DPP, but it is to appoint people other than senior prosecutors. These other people may be important and they may fill important gaps. There are plenty of them, as we know, because we had a major review of the DPP office provided to us and, clearly, they are struggling. The impediment to properly ensuring the new model that is now in this bill will work requires the government to ensure that there are senior people in those positions to make those decisions early on. You simply cannot have a fairly junior prosecutor in a position to negotiate the important aspects of both plea bargaining and discussions about the merits of the evidence and cases to be put for the purpose of reaching a sensible compromise.

As I say, where the government have important initiatives that are workable or useful, we will support them. In this case, they had a good start but there were some serious defects. I welcome the Attorney-General's final but nevertheless conclusive acceptance of those amendments, and I thank the upper house for their contributions.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (MENTAL IMPAIRMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's message No. 177:

The Legislative Council insisted on its amendments Nos 1 and 2 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

(Continued from 18 May 2017.)

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

That the disagreement to the amendments of the Legislative Council be no longer insisted upon.

I rise to indicate that the government will be accepting the amendments made by the Legislative Council, rather than sending the bill into deadlock and further delaying important reforms that are contained elsewhere in the bill. These reforms largely include legislative changes that were recommended by the Sentencing Council in their investigation of part 8A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. These reforms include provision for the continued detention of a defendant on licence, the streaming of court processes for people seeking to be dealt with under part 8A and changes to the way in which the current administrative detention scheme works.

This will provide for a fairer, more dynamic and more efficient scheme under part 8A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. The part of this bill that is being deleted by the Legislative Council is centred around the government's election promise that persons who are suffering from self-induced intoxication cannot access part 8A. This election promise was made by the government at the last election. We have sought to progress it as part of this bill. It has been defeated by the opposition and crossbenchers in the other place. This is an extremely disappointing outcome.

I hope that our friends in the media pay attention to this. Next time an outrage is perpetrated upon innocents by a drug-addled felon and he does not face the consequences of his crimes, I trust that the fourth estate will not trouble me with responding to the inevitable and justifiable public outrage. The opposition has had its way and now let the cards fall where they will.

Ms CHAPMAN: I welcome the government's ungracious acceptance of the amendments from the Legislative Council. The Attorney-General's rather reckless suggestion that these amendments are going to give some solace to some drug-addled offender is both inaccurate and completely inconsistent with what is being considered here. Nevertheless, given his inexperience in this area of law, it is not surprising that I hear such a statement.

The Legislative Council has obviously worked very hard to try to protect the innocent and ensure that we do not inadvertently catch, for example, someone with a disability. They have worked very hard in this area, and I think it is most ungracious of the Attorney, in his juvenile and immature way, to make such a comment. Nevertheless, I welcome the indication of support.

Motion carried.

SUMMARY PROCEDURE (SERVICE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 May 2017.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:39): This is a bill that was distributed for consultation last year. It comes as a sequel to other legislation that was previously passed to amend the Summary Procedure Act, in particular in relation to electronic transactions.

The sticking point, I suggest, in relation to service obligations that will be able to be undertaken electronically, even in criminal matters, has the qualification of not being able to be applied in a circumstance where someone does not have access to an electronic medium to receive it. With that protection, for the reasons we have previously debated on this matter, this aspect of the reform incorporated in this bill has the consent of the Liberal opposition. With that, we indicate that we support the bill.

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) (12:40): I thank the deputy leader for her indication of support for the bill.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL POLICING INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND SERVICES)
BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 May 2017.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:42): I rise to indicate that the opposition will be supporting the bill. It amends the Children's Protection Act 1993, the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007, the Disability Services Act 1993 and the Spent Convictions Act 2009. Essentially, we know that the commonwealth has merged CrimTrac and the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission, effective 1 July last year; in fact, we have just dealt with the health practitioner regulations to also accommodate that change. That bill accommodates the importance of ensuring continuity of access to CrimTrac, in particular.

Wherever we have the need for some historical criminal record of a party, whether it is to determine that they are a fit and proper person to operate a pharmacy or to apply for a job, we obviously need to have access to this. So, it is an important initiative that this bill accommodates. We are told that, in the last 11 months, the accommodation of continued access to this information has been utilised by regulation, and that has ensured the unimpeded short-term application of access in the scheme. I confirm our appreciation of the SAPOL and AGD representatives who provided a briefing in respect of this matter—promptly, as requested—and we were able therefore to proceed to support the same.

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) (12:44): I thank that indication from the deputy leader.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:44): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to acknowledge some visitors to the house today in the gallery from Mount Gambier High School who are the guests of the member for Mount Gambier.

Sitting suspended from 12:45 to 14:00.

*Bills***SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION (VETERANS' ADVISORY COUNCIL) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today members of the South Coast Veterans Association, who are guests of the member for Finnis.

*Petitions***YORKETOWN HOSPITAL**

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Presented a petition signed by 2,049 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the state government to maintain the current range of surgical services at Yorketown Hospital, upgrade and properly maintain the infrastructure of the Yorketown Hospital and to direct County Health SA to engage the community of Southern Yorke Peninsula in the planning of its health services before decisions are made, not after.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Remuneration Tribunal—

Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 4 of 2017—Report 2017—Annual Review of Remuneration for Members of the Judiciary, Members of the Industrial Relations Court and Commission, the State Coroner and Commissioners of the Environment, Resources and Development Court

Report in relation to Determination No. 4 of 2017 Report—2017 Annual Review of Remuneration for Members of the Judiciary, Members of the Industrial Relations Court and Commission, the State Coroner and Commissioners of the Environment, Resources and Development Court

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

Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007—Annual Compliance Audit Report
12 December 2015 to 3 February 2017

Summary Offences Act 1953—

Dangerous Area Declarations pursuant to Section 83B Report for Period
1 January 2017 to 30 March 2017

Road Blocks pursuant to Section 74B Report for Period 1 January 2017 to
30 March 2017

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Bills of Sale—Fees. No. 3

Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration—Gender Identity

Community Titles—Fees. No. 3

Real Property—Fees No. 3

Registration of Deeds—Fees No. 3

Strata Titles—Fees No. 4
Worker's Liens—Fees No. 3

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Development—Electricity Generators

By the Minister for Consumer and Business Services (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—Fees No. 3

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. G.G. Brock)—

Local Council By-Laws—
Alexandrina Council—No. 7—Clause 4 Modification

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close)—

South Australian-Victorian Border Groundwaters Agreement Review Committee—Annual
Report 2015-16

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Roads (Opening and Closing)—Fees No. 3
Valuation of Land—Fees No. 3

Ministerial Statement

ARRIUM

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would like to further update the house on the sale process for the Arrium Group and our ongoing efforts to secure the thousands of jobs that rely on the Whyalla steelworks and the iron ore mines of Upper Spencer Gulf.

In March, the administrators, KordaMentha, working with investment bank Morgan Stanley, short-listed two bidders for Arrium Australia. Those bidders are seeking to buy the company in one line, which is to say the Whyalla and east coast businesses and associated entities in their entirety. The outcome of this stage of the sale process is for bidders to lodge unconditional bids so that the administrator can then evaluate the offers and identify a single preferred bidder. The deed administrators will report to the creditors on the outcome of the process shortly after the process is finalised by 30 June 2017.

Given the confidential nature of the process, KordaMentha have not publicly identified the short-listed bidders or the potential return to Arrium's creditors. However, I can confidently say that the short-listed bidders are reputable international companies that both intend to invest in the long-term future of Whyalla should they become the new owner of this business.

This government is on the record as offering a co-investment of \$50 million with the new owners into projects that improve the commercial viability of Whyalla and secure the long-term future of steelmaking in South Australia. We have urged the commonwealth to commit to support investment in the long-term viability of steelmaking in this country as a nationally strategic industry. The commonwealth has committed at this stage of the sales process to consider financing projects

through EFIC and the Clean Energy Finance Corporation. In fact, EFIC last year provided a \$49.2 million concessional loan to buy machinery used to produce higher grade iron ore.

This government, through the Steel Taskforce, has been working hard to support the people and businesses of South Australia's second largest regional centre. We believe that the best outcome for the workers and suppliers who rely on Arrium for their livelihood is to support the successful conclusion of the ongoing sales process. Once a single bidder is identified, we will continue to work with that company and the commonwealth to identify the next steps required to support steelmaking in this country.

As KordaMentha has indicated, it wants to conclude the bidding process by 30 June. We have the next 4½ weeks to work with all those involved in this process to secure a successful outcome that can be accepted by the creditors. I am confident that with goodwill on all sides we can meet that objective. Federal industry minister Arthur Sinodinos and I are in regular contact, and we are committed to ensuring that we will do all we can to secure Whyalla's future. I remain optimistic that Whyalla's best days are still ahead of us and that we can secure the investment required from a successful bidder to entrench a long-term future for our steelmaking industry in this state.

We continue to support the people of Whyalla by offering a range of financial and counselling services and concessional loans so that the many businesses that rely on Arrium can continue to trade. We will continue to urge all governments, state and federal, to adopt our procurement policies that support Australian standard steel and we continue to advocate for effective trade remedies to ensure fair competition in the local steel market.

I look forward to further updating the house with more information as this process to secure the jobs and the future of Whyalla's workforce continues. The people of that city need a solution quickly. I hope that the commonwealth government continues to say the right things about supporting this sale process.

RIGNEY, DR ALICE

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:11): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I wish to pay tribute to Dr Alice (Alitya) Rigney PSM, who passed away recently. The family of Dr Rigney have been kind enough to give me permission to use her name in public. Dr Rigney, also known as Aunty Alice by many, dedicated her life to education, was a strong advocate for Aboriginal people and believed in bringing all people together as part of a journey towards reconciliation.

Dr Rigney was a Kurna and Narungga elder from Bukkiyana on the Yorke Peninsula. After pursuing a career in nursing, marrying Lester Rigney, who unfortunately also passed away recently, and having her first child, Dr Rigney pursued her interest in education. She worked in kindergartens and schools before receiving her teaching qualification and being appointed to a mainstream primary school. A pioneer educator who paved the path for others to follow, Dr Rigney became the first female Aboriginal principal in Australia, was one of the first Aboriginal people to work for the education department and became principal of Kurna Plains School in 1986.

Dr Rigney also had an immense dedication and passion for the revival of the Kurna language and worked together with other Kurna people, teachers and linguists to reawaken the Kurna language. She was instrumental in including the Narungga and Kurna language into South Australian schools. She travelled to Germany to see letters in the Kurna language that had been written by Kurna children in the early days of European settlement. The letters were originally sent to Germany by missionaries who had been teaching the children in the 1840s at Pirtawardli (the 'possum house'), an Aboriginal school on the banks of the River Torrens.

In total, we estimate that Dr Rigney taught over 5,000 Aboriginal students in her lifetime. In recognition, she was awarded an Australia Day Public Service Medal for services to Aboriginal education in 1991. In addition, Dr Rigney, who was a graduate of the University of South Australia's De Lissa Institute, was awarded an honorary doctorate from the University of South Australia, in

1998; a Gladys Elphick Lifetime Award for outstanding contribution to education, in 2011; a Unesco Adelaide Chapter award for outstanding leadership in education, in 2013; and a Zonta Outstanding Women of Achievement Award for education, in 2017.

In 2006, Dr Rigney was made an ambassador for the commonwealth Department of Education Science and Training's National Indigenous English Literacy and Numeracy Strategy. In Dr Rigney's words:

The teaching of children is our single greatest story of hope for a reconciled Australia.

My condolences and thoughts are with Dr Rigney's children, Eileen, Irabinna and Tracey. A memorial service to celebrate her life will take place at 2 o'clock on Wednesday 7 June 2017 at the University of Adelaide, Bonython Hall, North Terrace.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:14): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: I rise to provide the house with an update on the progress the state government is making in closing the Makk and McLeay wards at Oakden and relocating residents to the Northgate aged-care facility. As I have informed the house previously, I made the decision to bring forward the closure of Makk and McLeay wards following further abuse allegations being raised.

I can inform the house that works at the Northgate facility are progressing well and are expected to be completed in the coming days. Two cottages are being converted so they each have eight bedrooms, combined living spaces and enhanced safety features. As a new service, Northgate House will be developed according to a nurse-led, residential aged-care model, with specialist skills in managing BPSD and mental illness.

It is essential that the staff skill mix reflects a balance between nursing staff with extensive aged-care experience and training, with particular reference to BPSD and also the Australian Aged Care Quality Agency standards, and nursing staff with mental health training and/or experience. Additional allied health staff will include senior occupational therapists, social workers, physiotherapists, clinical pharmacists, dietitians, dentists and speech pathologists.

Residents will begin to be transferred to Northgate subject to a full clinical assessment and the wishes of their families. The transition will be completed by mid-June. In regard to residents who are relocating to the private aged-care sector and other facilities, I can inform the house that so far seven have been successfully transitioned. I can also inform the house that a panel has been established to oversee the full implementation of the Chief Psychiatrist's recommendations, and it will be headed by Mr Tom Stubbs. Mr Stubbs has extensive experience in the health and aged-care sectors, and over recent years his roles have included chairing the boards of Education Services Australia and ECH, as well as a number of risk and audit committees within the health and education sector.

An interim model of care has been developed and is in place at Oakden. This interim model of care will be replaced with a permanent model which will be established in consultation with the appropriate clinicians and the families of residents. I can also update the house that the mental health facility audit announced by SA Health CEO, Vickie Kaminski, is also progressing. It will be completed over the coming months, and we will release the findings when it is done.

In terms of staffing, as of today a total of 10 staff are currently suspended pending further investigations, one staff member's employment has been terminated and another has resigned. In total, 26 staff members have been referred to AHPRA. I can also inform the house that a dedicated helpline for families and carers has so far received 49 calls.

Today, the South Australian ICAC commissioner released the terms of reference of his inquiry into Oakden, which the state government welcomes. In addition, there is also a joint committee of inquiry into elder abuse, and a commonwealth review of AACQA has been announced by the federal minister, Ken Wyatt. We also welcome Senator Nick Xenophon's efforts to have the

Senate look into the failings of the commonwealth's Australian Aged Care Quality Agency's ongoing accreditation of Oakden. Of course, these inquiries come on top of the Chief Psychiatrist's in-depth report into the failings of Oakden, which I commissioned in December last year.

I believe the move to the Northgate aged-care facility offers a new start for residents of the Oakden Older Persons Mental Health Service. The refurbishment and the new model of care will provide more options for appropriate therapies and ensure residents are treated with the dignity and respect they deserve. I am continuing to meet with families about the individual concerns and to support them while their loved ones transition to Northgate and other facilities.

Parliamentary Committees

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:19): I bring up the 28th report of the committee, entitled 'Interim report into the referral for an inquiry into the Return to Work Act and scheme'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

MINISTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Will the minister stand down while the Independent Commission Against Corruption conducts its investigation into the Oakden failings?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:20): That is a matter for me. No, she won't be asked to stand down, and the important work of making sure that the deficiencies in this facility are remedied is the thing that the minister is focused on. It is precisely what she should be doing.

MINISTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): Supplementary, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Hartley and Morialta are called to order. Leader.

Mr MARSHALL: A supplementary to the Premier: does the Premier agree with the comments made by the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption's to the select committee last week when he suggested that somebody needs to take responsibility for the failings at Oakden? If he does accept—

The SPEAKER: The leader will be seated. He has asked his question. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:21): Yes—and I have. I have accepted responsibility. The buck stops with me. The responsibility for this disgraceful set of circumstances that exists at Oakden has been accepted by both the minister and me, and our responsibilities having been made aware of the awful circumstances there are to take urgent and assertive steps to remedy the situation.

As at 29 May, there are 26 people who have been referred to AHPRA; five people who have been referred to SAPOL; 10 are on paid leave, pending investigation; and there has been one termination and one resignation. What we won't be doing is taking precipitant steps to terminate somebody's employment only to have that decision overturned because we haven't taken the proper process. If that is the absurd proposition that is being advanced by those opposite, then I would be very interested to hear it. But I am also interested to hear what the leader's standards are about ministerial or frontbench responsibility. What are the standards that are going to be applied to his front bench?

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, let's see. We'll test that.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: the Premier doesn't get to ask the questions. If he wants to ask questions, he can come and sit on this side.

The SPEAKER: The following members are called to order: the members for Unley, Hammond, Mount Gambier, the deputy leader, the leader and the member for Wright. The deputy leader is warned for that outburst, and so are the members for Hartley and Morialta, who continue to interject, and the member for Morialta is warned for the second and final time. Leader.

MINISTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary, sir, given the Premier's answer: is he satisfied that his Minister for Mental Health has fulfilled her obligations under section 86 of the Mental Health Act?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:23): I have confidence in the minister.

MINISTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Can the Premier perhaps give some evidence to the house how his Minister for Mental Health has fulfilled her obligations under section 86(f) of the act, which specifically requires the minister to develop or promote effective systems of accountability for persons delivering mental health services in South Australia?

Mr Knoll: Just keep saying sorry.

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:23): The minister commissioned the very inquiry that has been the subject of public debate. There were no questions that were asked in this house that precipitated her commissioning of this inquiry. There was no media inquiry that precipitated this inquiry. The very—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The report which has found these awful failings at this facility—a report I might add that was produced by the Chief Psychiatrist, who himself had been walking around this facility six months earlier, and then the previous three months before that an aged-care accreditation agency had given a clean bill of health to this very facility across a number of different domains, including all of the very issues that are the heart of the complaints that are now made about this facility, that is, the aged-care accreditation agency.

So here we have two bodies that exercise accountability in relation to the facility, the Chief Psychiatrist and the aged-care accreditation agency, and a third body that this government has put in place, the community visitor program, which means that people go into the facility and look and see what happens. Fortunately, belatedly, it revealed material which ultimately led to this inquiry.

There is no getting away from the fact that this is an appalling state of affairs, or that the fact that it hadn't been revealed for so long, hadn't been detected, by serious accountability measures such as the Chief Psychiatrist and the aged-care accreditation agency is, I think, a legitimate matter that should be properly explored. We are anxious to understand the answers as much as anyone else.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): A supplementary: how can the Premier stand by the minister's claim that she acted immediately when we now have evidence, in the form of the letter from the Principal Community Visitor to the minister dated October last year, that she was asked by the community visitor to set up the investigation? How can he now state to this parliament that it was, in fact, at her instigation?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:25): There are about three or four different formulations of that question, so I will address the question in the broad. What the

minister did, as soon as she received the letter from Mr Corcoran, the community visitor, was that she asked for that to be considered and investigated. That directly led to the commissioning of the inquiry only two months later. So the most significant inquiry that has actually occurred in relation to this issue occurred within two months of the matter being drawn to her attention after she sought proper advice about it. That is precisely what you would expect the minister to do—to get proper advice and then to put in place a thoroughgoing process of review.

Obviously there was a series of considerations had to be gone into before the Chief Psychiatrist could be commissioned to do that, including consideration given as to the nature and scope of the review. It is a substantial step to go from a complaint, a series of complaints, even serious ones, to a suggestion that the service entirely is one that needs such a dramatic action. The fact that the minister reached that conclusion is proper, and it has ultimately led us to the position we are in today, where we are now looking deeply into issues that had not been revealed in the past.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Given that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption has indicated that his investigation into the Oakden older persons mental health facility will deal with matters back to 2007, will the minister now acknowledge that limiting the terms of reference of the Chief Psychiatrist's review into Oakden to only 2016 was an attempt to hide the failings of this government?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:27): The question is transparently a nonsense because the Chief Psychiatrist didn't limit his inquiry in relation to the matters that occurred in relation to the incident in October. He undertook, as he was charged to do, a thoroughgoing investigation and was not limited to the incident itself but looked back to the whole history of the management of the institution. The minister sought to embark on a broad inquiry which was always going to be public and made public. It is a nonsense to suggest that her actions were in any way directed at limiting the inquiry. Indeed, the inquiry itself is the complete negation of the proposition that has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley ought to be aware that the Speaker is still sore about the result at Norwood on Friday night.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Can the Premier provide any plausible explanation for why matters concerning the psychiatrist's review were limited to just 2016, given that the government had plenty of warning on issues relating to Oakden going back to 2007?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:29): Well, it rather begs the question. Perhaps if the Leader of the Opposition would reread the ministerial statements before he comes into this place asking questions about Oakden, he would see the answers set out in very clear terms.

In 2011, the then minister for mental health, minister Hill, received a briefing from the agency, which said that the three-year contract that ACH had been brought in on to manage Makk and McLeay had come to an end and, in broad terms, the institution had been given a clean bill of health. By then I think, it was the—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, no, that's a different question. I am answering the question you asked, not the question you wish you had asked because you didn't do your work—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —not the question you wish you had asked if you had done your homework. This is the thing.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is the thing—if you don't—

The SPEAKER: The leader will withdraw those words unconditionally.

Mr MARSHALL: I withdraw those comments, sir.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. So, we do know that the institution, at least as far as the minister was concerned, was put on a proper footing by about 2011. We now know, with the benefit of hindsight, that wasn't the case, or hasn't been found to be the case by virtue of the findings that have been made by the Chief Psychiatrist, but at that time that was what was understood. Ministers were obviously entertaining particular cases as they arose as matters of individual concern, not necessarily raising broad concern that had been indicated as far back as 2007. So, that's the context in which the minister was conducting her duties in relation to this matter.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): A supplementary: given that concerns regarding the Oakden facility were raised by the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists going back to 2013, why did the government narrow its focus just to 2016?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:31): It didn't. The truth is that the inquiry was a broad-ranging inquiry. The fact that it used a particular incident as the starting-off point to actually undertake a broad review of this institution is not difficult to understand. Of course you start with the relevant incident. It's the very thing that the community visitor raised. It would be inappropriate not to start at that point, but of course he looked more broadly. It's difficult to understand the point the Leader of the Opposition makes. The report itself is a thoroughgoing review of all the issues—

Mr Marshall: But limited to 2016.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —associated with Oakden—

Mr Marshall: Limited to 2016.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —back to 2007.

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: If he wants to make the detailed lawyers' points, he should leave it to his deputy; she is much better at it.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is to the Premier. Given that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption has indicated that he may seek access to cabinet documents as part of his investigation into Oakden, will the Premier ensure that all submissions sought by the commissioner will be provided?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:32): No, there will be no release of cabinet documents.

Mr Marshall: What? What are you talking about?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No cabinet in the Westminster system releases cabinet documents. It simply won't—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, he will be able to ask ministers whatever questions he asks—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and they will be giving full answers, but there will be no discussion of cabinet matters. There is plenty of material which doesn't go to cabinet which will assist him to understand all the relevant issues, but we won't be breaching cabinet confidentiality. No cabinet in any Westminster parliament does, and we certainly won't be now.

Ms CHAPMAN: A supplementary?

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order.

Mr Marshall: You are just like a hopeless little schoolboy.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a question to the Attorney-General, if I may, sir.

The SPEAKER: I will intervene to defend lawyers but not schoolboys.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you, sir.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Can the Attorney-General then advise whether the government has received any summons relating to any documents from cabinet?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:33): As I understand it, Mr Lander—just to correct those opposite—is conducting an investigation in a substituted capacity as the Ombudsman and is using the provisions of the Ombudsman Act in that regard and therefore is not operating as the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption in this particular matter. So, Mr Lander, acting as the Ombudsman, to the best of my knowledge, made some announcements today about some terms of reference.

I have not been advised so far that there has been any specific request by him for any particular documents. The Premier has made it clear and the government's position clearly is that if, in the course of that investigation, he wishes to have access to documents or speak to individuals, then the government will cooperate.

One matter that the Premier has explained very clearly, I think, is that cabinet documents are essentially documents that inform a person about the conduct of discussions in the cabinet room, which are obviously not for distribution. Aside from those discussions, the government is ready, willing and able to be of assistance to Mr Lander in his inquiry. From the brief opportunity I have had to read the terms of reference, the inquiry appears to be potentially an extremely broad-ranging inquiry, and we have every intention of being cooperative.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Supplementary to the Premier: will the Premier now issue a directive that no minister or their staff shall delete any emails or destroy any documents relevant to the investigation, to ensure that there is no repeat of the circumstances that occurred in respect of the Debelle inquiry?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:36): No, I won't be doing that because there will be full cooperation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Because it would be unnecessary—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right—and, I must say, completely unrewarding given the capacity to retrieve any document that now exists through electronic forensic material. What an absurd—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Is this the new line of attack? I haven't heard this one before. This is the new line of attack. Very interesting.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health is called to order and the leader is warned for the second and final time.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): Supplementary to the Attorney-General: given that Commissioner Lander in his report to the parliament has warned in respect of the destruction of emails and the importance of securing government business on government emails and not private emails, will you as Attorney-General issue a directive to ensure that none of the Oakden documents are destroyed pending this inquiry?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:37): I thank the honourable deputy leader for her question. The law presently requires a number of things to occur. Some of those things, to mention but a few, include compliance with requirements about record keeping. They also require people to comply with the law about acting with honesty and integrity in one's role as a public officer. They also require people to be cooperative with reasonable investigations by the public sector agencies, which include of course the Ombudsman, in which circumstance we are now talking.

If the deputy leader, if I am to understand her correctly, believes that adding my voice to the body of law, statute and common law, that requires people to obey the law, I say now in the parliament before the deputy leader, before you, Mr Speaker, most importantly, and others: all employees of the state government should observe the law. They should all act according to law. The law is there to bind them as it is to bind the rest of us. I expect, and the government expects, that all of them will act lawfully. If they do not, the law already provides for appropriate sanctions in the circumstance of them breaching the law.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): Supplementary to the Attorney-General: has the Attorney-General made any inquiry or is he satisfied that no-one in respect of the Oakden matter has been using private email facilities?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:39): Again, thank you for that question. At the moment, if we just take stock for a little while, we have a joint select committee of this house and the other place which is looking at the broader question of elder abuse and, in particular, as I understand it, is currently considering an amendment specifically to enable that joint house committee to inquire into matters arising from the publicly noted matters of grave concern regarding Oakden.

Secondly, again, as I am advised through the media, the Coroner is presently conducting an inquiry into a particular matter and it remains to be seen whether the Coroner determines in due course whether other matters require his attention. We have, as recently as the last couple of weeks, noticed that the commonwealth government has sought a partnership with the states in a broader inquiry into the question of appropriate treatment of older people.

At a meeting of attorneys-general a couple of weeks ago, at my request that was broadened out to include questions such as accreditation and audit, which specifically were directed towards aged-care facilities of a type such as Oakden. The South Australian government is cooperating fully in that and, indeed, is co-chairing with the commonwealth in relation to that particular inquiry.

We had the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, who is acting in this instance as the Ombudsman, announce today that he is conducting an inquiry. We have the Hon. Stephen Wade in another place who wishes, it would seem from the *Notice Paper*, to replicate the inquiry of the joint

house committee in relation to elder abuse by in effect lifting an element of that inquiry—namely, the element to do with Oakden—and dealing with that as a stand-alone proposition, notwithstanding the fact that, as I understand it, the Hon. Mr Wade is in fact a member of the joint house committee.

They are the ones that pop into mind presently, although I do understand that there was some talk this morning about the possibility of a federal royal commission or possibly yet another inquiry by the Senate to be directed towards, amongst other things, Oakden. In those circumstances, it seems to me that it would be prudent for me as the Attorney-General to offer such cooperation and reasonable assistance to those respective inquiries as I possibly can.

It would probably be both counterproductive and potentially, in the minds of the suspicious amongst us, most of whom sit over there, that my being involved in any way was in some way attempting to muddy the waters. I am not going to give anybody that satisfaction. We are not interested in muddying the waters. We are interested in cooperating. As best I can tell, as currently advised, there are something like five inquiries into this matter going on.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: All triggered by us.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Triggered by us or this parliament, with the federal parliament being involved with us as recently as a few days ago, offering our assistance to the commonwealth to participate.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: So, I don't think I should be adding any further confusion to what might conceivably be quite a concoction of multiple and overlapping inquiries.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is called to order and warned a first time.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): A question to the Attorney-General: will the Attorney-General be providing funding for legal representation for the victims and the families of the Oakden facility in respect of the investigation?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:43): The position about funding—as the deputy leader would be aware, the circumstances in which members of the public sector and members of the public are funded, supported or indemnified in respect of matters relating to inquiries—is in general terms dealt with by public sector circulars relating to indemnity or support for funding.

Those various circulars provide for particular circumstances in which indemnity or funding will be provided and they are quite detailed provisions which are administered by the Crown Solicitor. The Crown Solicitor deals with each application on its merits, and my expectation would be that the Crown Solicitor would receive any and all applications for assistance, however they might be brought forward, and that she and her department would apply the circular that has applied for many, many years in an impartial and objective fashion.

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:45): My question is to the Premier. What were the outcomes from the joint meeting of the South Australian and Northern Territory cabinets in Alice Springs last week?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for his question. This was an historic moment. As members would be aware, in 1911 we relinquished our Northern Territory—a sad day indeed. Last Wednesday, I executed a strategic partnership agreement with the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory signalling a new era of cooperation. This transcends the usual cooperation that occurs between states and territories that occurs from time to time. This is a comprehensive strategic partnership which covers a range of domains.

A joint meeting of the South Australian and Northern Territory cabinets, which I understand was an Australian first, was used to discuss our vision and ambition for the new partnership and to endorse the strategic plan, which outlines some of the specific projects over the next 12 months. One of the projects is the further development of the South Australian and Northern Territory central trade corridor, with the aim of expanding freight flows into and out of Asia.

I must say I was disturbed to see, if the reports are accurate, that the federal government knocked back a proposition by the Chinese government to establish a one belt, one road link between the Northern Territory and South Australia. If that is indeed true, it is disappointing we were not consulted and it is inconsistent with the very things we are seeking to achieve.

Another project is renewing the iconic driving experience from north to south, the so-called Explorer's Way, and expanding tourism products, services and experiences to immerse visitors in lots of Indigenous experiences. Between us, we really own the outback. Most of the tourist outback icons are shared between us, and there are some fantastic marketing edges that we could involve ourselves in. As I said at the time, you can be eaten at both ends of the continent—by a crocodile at one end and a shark at the other. That's a rare experience—in fact, unrepeatable.

The other opportunity is supporting our vulnerable and disadvantaged children through programs and services targeting improved participation for children and their families. There are a lot of opportunities there for us to cooperate, in particular in the cross-border areas where we share the Anangu peoples who roam between the various states and territories and, indeed, into the Western Australian areas of the state.

Also our governments have agreed to develop joint long-term National Disability Insurance Scheme implementation strategies to focus our collective efforts on maximising employment, especially in those remote regions. The NDIS is a massive employment opportunity, not only here in Adelaide but also in our remote regions, and if we get this right it could be a fantastic win for local communities.

The South Australian and Northern Territory governments have had a memorandum of understanding in place since May 2015 that has been the catalyst for some important work in relation to cross-border policing, the development and promotion of shared tourism assets and the improvement of shared infrastructure networks. The cooperation around policing is really important. We know that a lot of perpetrators move between the jurisdictions to evade detection. We know that lines of drug running and alcohol breaches of the dry zones do move between various states and territories, so it is crucial that cooperation occurs.

This new partnership is a foundation for what we think is a new idea in the federation—interjurisdictional cooperation. There are many wonderful reasons why we would collaborate together. There are many differences between us and the territory, but our differences also give us wonderful opportunities for collaboration.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:49): My question is directed to the Minister for Investment and Trade. What is the expected impact of the accommodation guarantee for international students studying in South Australia?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:49): I thank the member for Ashford for her question because international education is South Australia's number one service export, with the latest ABS statistics showing a 12.5 per cent increase in value in 2016 to \$1.13 billion. The government aims to have 35,500 international students starting here by the end of this year—a target we're on track to achieve.

To put the number in perspective, the number of international students living in Adelaide is more than the population of Mount Gambier, Mount Barker or Whyalla. It's a city within a city. The growth in the value and volume of international education services as an export is another reason why official figures from the ABS show that South Australia is exporting more than ever, with total exports reaching a new high of around \$15 billion in the 12 months to December 2016.

I know that such good economic news is difficult for those opposite to understand, but the facts are that we are doing well for those who can accurately read the facts and the statistics in the ABS. Despite enormous global headwinds in traditional manufacturing and resources sectors, we are resisting the doom and gloom predicted by those opposite. The end of the world is not nigh. In fact, the future looks bright. The leader told us all in November 2015 that 'double-digit unemployment is inevitable'—'inevitable', he said.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: by going down this path, the minister is clearly debating in contravention of standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: The question was about the impact of the accommodation guarantee for international students.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It's very important for jobs. Increases in international student numbers have in fact helped across a range of sectors, as have our investment attraction initiatives that have delivered more than \$1 billion of capital investment and around 5,200 jobs, and education is a part of that. That is why I want to talk about the accommodation guarantee to continue that upward trend in international students. That guarantee is there to ensure that there is sufficient supply of quality accommodation that is easily accessible to students.

A new website, the Adelaide Student Housing website, was launched last month and will enable students to better access student accommodation. Students can search for accommodation that suits their requirements through that website developed by the government and StudyAdelaide. The website lists purpose-built student accommodation offerings by property type, location and campus. It also provides links to further information on quality private rental accommodation at competitive rates close to the city fringe and surrounding university campuses.

The accommodation offer guarantee demonstrates that supply, quality and access distinguish South Australia as the only state with an accommodation offer guarantee for international students that is working well. This is another step in our ongoing improvement of the Adelaide offering to international students. It's another reason why the latest services exports value figures for South Australia for the 2016 calendar year just released show an 11 per cent increase to \$2.657 billion that services exports above the national average of 9 per cent.

South Australia is batting above the national level of performance, and that's why 72,000 jobs in South Australia are related directly to selling our goods and services—72,000 meals on the table every night—and that's why the government's export programs concentrate on sectors that create more jobs. To give you an example, Mr Speaker, the South Australian Chinese students were a focus of the recent China business mission. The mission involved study destination and StudyAdelaide, and the Amazing Ambassador campaign. There were 150 million views of this campaign and more than 7,400 applicants. That's the strength of interest in the South Australian offering.

In the trade and international engagement arena, South Australia's success is further proof that our efforts to prove wrong the double-digit doomsayers are working. We have higher aims, and we are getting on with the job.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. When the minister received the letter from the Principal Community Visitor, dated 14 October 2016, complaining about her department's four-month delay in responding to concerns of Oakden families, why did she send it to the very same department and wait another two months for a response to wander back?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health is warned, and the member for Unley is warned for the second and the last time. Minister.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:55): When I receive correspondence from the community visitor, it is natural for you to go back to the local area health network that involves that complaint. My first step was to contact the CEO of NALHN and trigger a briefing. We now know that that set in train a series of events that has led to a document becoming public, which is the Oakden review that the Chief Psychiatrist undertook. The fact-gathering stage started at that point in time.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): Supplementary: given the Principal Community Visitor's advice in his letter of October 2016 that the Spriggs family wanted a meeting with the minister to 'share their story with you personally', why didn't the minister immediately ask for a meeting to be organised?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:56): I needed a briefing to be able to successfully undertake a meeting and that is what I did: I sought a briefing from the relevant local area health network.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): When did that meeting take place?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:56): Once the full inquiry into Oakden took place, I met with the Spriggs family the day that we publicly released that document.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): Given that the request came to you on 14 October, how many months elapsed between the request and the granting of the meeting with the Spriggs family?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:56): We know that important—

Mr Marshall: How many months?

The SPEAKER: The leader has asked his question. Minister.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: It is very important that once an independent review is put in place it is allowed to run its course. Once that document, the Oakden review, was taken to cabinet, we fully released it and we adopted the full six recommendations. We are in the process of assiduously implementing that at the moment, and I have updated the house about that today.

What we do know is that it is a testament to the Spriggs family that they had the courage to come forward and tell people the story that they did with the support of the community visitor. Without them coming forward, we still potentially do not know what we wouldn't have if they had not stepped forward. I am not going to interfere with an independent review. I didn't in this case. It came forward, we went to cabinet, we have adopted all six recommendations and we are getting on with fixing up Oakden and moving people to Northgate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Kavel and Finnis are called to order. The house and the public will make up their mind whether the question has been answered. The member for Kavel will not offer an opinion other than in accordance with standing orders. Leader.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): How does the minister reconcile evidence given to the Select Committee on Transforming Health on 12 May by the CEO of NALHN, Jackie Hanson, that she was first made aware of the Spriggs case, and I quote, 'towards the end of November' when the Principal Community Visitor's letter to the minister of 14 October 2016 clearly states, and I quote:

...despite numerous follow-ups to Oakden and NALHN management by our office, we have still not received a formal response in over four months.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:58): Ms Hanson has given evidence. I am not going to comment on her evidence. We know there has been an inquiry, it has taken place, we are implementing the six recommendations and very shortly the residents of Oakden will have a new home at Northgate.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): Is it credible whatsoever that the chief executive of NALHN wouldn't know about the Spriggs case in November if the Principal Community Visitor was raising these questions regarding Oakden with NALHN as far back as June of last year?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:59): This is now subject to an Ombudsman's inquiry, and we are welcoming that opportunity to release all the information that's relevant in that space. I look forward to cooperating with Mr Lander—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta and the deputy leader are both on two warnings. Leader.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): In what way can the minister claim any responsibility or any credit for the Chief Psychiatrist's review into the Oakden scandal when there is now overwhelming evidence that the review was called for by the Principal Community Visitor and was in fact authorised by the CEO of NALHN?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:59): Can I say that there's been much misrepresentation about this whole idea of credit. I was asked—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta will withdraw from the chamber for the next hour as a repeat offender under the sessional orders.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I can understand their defensiveness, sir. They tacked in on this question after it was a public issue, after we had launched the inquiry. When this was put on the public record back in 2007, there were shrieks of silence in the upper house when we actually identified the problems there, very little remarked about. The minister conducted this inquiry—not a question in this house—but, true to form, they read the newspaper and they realise, 'Oh, we're late to the party. We had better jump on board. This looks like fun.' That's the truth of it. That is the truth of this feigned interest in this issue.

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order: I ask that you bring the Premier back to the substance of the question, that is, providing evidence as to the minister taking credit for the instigation of the investigation.

The SPEAKER: Yes, well, the Premier is addressing the question of who has claimed credit for this inquiry.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, I was just making a general observation about claiming credit. Those opposite were seeking to jump on board. When I returned from leave and was asked about—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: When I returned from leave, I was responding to the very trenchant criticisms that were made of the minister during the period when I was on leave, and I was asked to address them when I returned, and I addressed them immediately upon my return from leave, so my remarks should be seen in that context.

Mr Marshall: You didn't even read the report while you were on leave.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, I did read the report while I was on leave.

Mr Marshall: You made no public comment for three weeks. You were sitting 20 metres away from the report—

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I know the Leader of the Opposition is embarrassed that he is late to this issue and he seeking now to make some mileage of it, but I think he will be judged. He will be judged for playing politics with vulnerable people, just like he was judged in the lead-up to the last election over child protection, which I notice he wants to drag up again. There is a recurring theme here in the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He does nothing, reads the paper and realises he's got to get out of bed and actually make a media statement. This is the modus operandi of the Leader of the Opposition, and most people are finding him out. That's why there are so many glum faces on the other side: because there's talk. We've heard the talk; it wafts over here. The context of my remarks was a trenchant—

Mr Marshall: You won't even let her answer the question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Because much of the misrepresentation seems to have arisen from my remarks, and that's why I want to deal with them. My remarks were on the basis that the minister was being criticised—

Mr Marshall: Where's the evidence?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Allow me to complete my point, and if you listen you might get an answer. I was responding to the criticisms of the minister. What I said is that proper credit—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier seems to have ceased being provocative, so the leader can cease interjecting.

The Hon. P. Caica: Yes, please.

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The minister on advice has commissioned a broad inquiry which has led us to the Oakden report. They are the facts of the matter. I said that she deserves credit for shining a light on this most difficult issue. Of course, it was also instigated by the Spriggs family, who of course escalated their concerns to the community visitor, but they are the facts of the matter.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Has the minister offered her resignation to the Premier?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:04): No, she hasn't.

Mr Marshall: Well, why don't you let her answer the question?

The SPEAKER: The leader is on two warnings. The leader is fully aware that it has been the practice of the house and the mother of parliaments at Westminster that any minister can answer the question. He knows that.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: If she offered her resignation to me, I am likely to have been aware of it. I would have thought that that is axiomatic. It is proper—

Mr Marshall: Are you going to give a straight answer?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, I can, and the answer is no.

JOHN H. GIBBON JR AWARD

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the house about this year's recipient of the John H. Gibbon Jr Award?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:05): I thank the member for Fisher for her question. She will be very interested in the answer. The John H. Gibbon Jr Award is an international award representing the highest honour in the medical field of perfusion. The award is presented to those who make outstanding contributions to the science and practice of extracorporeal circulation. I think the member for Fisher is probably one of the few people in this chamber who would actually be able to tell us what that is.

For the layperson, perfusion is undertaken by highly trained and skilled medical specialists and involves the use of the heart-lung machine during cardiac, cardiothoracic and other surgeries. This technique temporarily takes over the function of a person's heart and lungs, maintaining the circulation of blood and oxygen through their body. Put simply, the technique keeps the patient alive while operating on their heart or lungs.

I am very pleased and proud to inform the house that the recipient of this year's John H. Gibbon Jr Award is South Australia's—and, most importantly, the Flinders Medical Centre's—own Professor Rob Baker. The award is named after John H. Gibbon Jr, an American cardiac surgeon, who invented the heart-lung machine. The machine has allowed cardiac surgery to grow to the specialty that it is today.

The award was established over 40 years ago and recipients include international innovators and leaders in the field of cardiac surgery. Of significance, Professor Baker is the first ever Australia-based—and, indeed, South Australia-based—clinician to be awarded this highest of international honours in this field. He is a founding member of the Flinders Medical Centre's cardiac surgery department, which commenced undertaking cardiac surgery in 1992. He has been the Director of Cardiac Surgery Research and Perfusion in the Flinders Medical Centre's Cardiac and Thoracic Surgical Unit for more than 20 years, working to achieve better outcomes for patients undergoing cardiac surgery.

The unit undertakes around 600 cardiac and 200 thoracic procedures each year for patients from South Australia and the Northern Territory. It is widely recognised both nationally and internationally for its cardiac surgery program and it has particular expertise in cardiac surgery for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander patients. The unit's research team, led by Professor Baker, has worked collaboratively on the local, national and international stage to achieve better outcomes for patients undergoing cardiac surgery.

Professor Baker is a worthy recipient of the prestigious John H. Gibbon Jr Award. I commend Professor Baker for his dedication to improving and advancing his chosen medical field, contributing to saving the lives of countless patients. We are lucky to have him, along with his clinical colleagues, at the forefront of this medical specialty, working at South Australia's own Flinders Medical Centre.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. When did the minister first speak to the Principal Community Visitor after his letter of 14 October 2016?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:08): I see the community visitor quite regularly and I will have to double-check my records on that. But he and I do meet regularly, as we do with many of the other statutory officers.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:08): Supplementary: minister, why didn't you immediately take up the Principal Community Visitor's offer in his letter to discuss the issues with you in person so that he could provide additional information to you as he outlined?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:08): I have already answered a similar question in this chamber today about this. It is appropriate to seek a briefing on these matters before you meet with people directly. In this instance, I then asked NALHN, the relevant health network, to provide me a briefing on this matter, and I do regularly meet with all of the statutory officers.

LANDS TITLES OFFICE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:09): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer inform the house if the government goes ahead with the commercialisation project concerning the business of the Lands Titles Office, will the Registrar-General still be responsible for all complex transactions? What is his definition of a complex transaction? What percentage of all transactions are complex transactions likely to be?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:09): I thank the member for Florey for her question and for her interest in the lands titles commercialisation program. I will get her a full briefing on the exact definitions—

Mr Marshall: Commercialisation program?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do note that the Liberal government of New South Wales has conducted a similar approach to lands titles services. It is interesting to note that the Leader of the Opposition bemoans that process that other Liberal governments are progressing. However, I will get the member a full briefing on all these matters. I invite her to speak to me after question time and I will get her a full briefing from the project team.

LANDS TITLES OFFICE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:10): A supplementary question: what sort of 'utilisation of data' acquired under this contract is, and I quote again from the minister's press release of 7 July last year, 'extremely valuable to the property sector'?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:10): We sell data now. People can walk into the Lands Titles Office and purchase data relating to other people's properties as we speak. What we are seeking to do is to commercialise that data. We think that it is of value to the taxpayer. It is sitting there dormant and we should be using every weapon we have in our arsenal to maximise returns for taxpayers while, at the same time, protecting people's privacy.

We see people using data in many ways: to assist them in purchasing a property, or understanding valuations, or understanding demographic sheets. This data has value to a whole number of groups and organisations but, again, I would like to give the member a full briefing. The truth is this: the lands titles service is not an essential utility. It's not electricity and it's not water. These are simply processing facilities and, as far as we are concerned, I'm surprised that members opposite actually support the idea of a government monopoly continuing to run commercial operations.

CRIME PREVENTION

Mr GEE (Napier) (15:12): My question is to the Attorney-General. How is the government interacting with state and commonwealth ministers to ensure cooperation with respect to crime and community safety matters?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:12): I thank the member for his question. Recently—in fact, on 19 May this year, only little while ago—the first Law, Crime and Community Safety Council meeting for 2017 was held in Melbourne.

Ministers from New Zealand, the commonwealth and each state and territory with portfolio responsibilities for law, justice, police and emergency management were gathered there to discuss topical issues of national interest. Four separate and distinct meetings were held. First, there was a STAG meeting. For those who might be a bit intrigued by that, it is an acronym that stands for State and Territory Attorneys-General—so settle.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: So what do you do at the dinner? Is that the STAG night?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: There is a dinner, a STAG dinner, but it's a very sober affair. At the STAG dinner, the state and territory attorneys-general gather and discuss matters of mutual interest. What then follows the next day is a joint meeting of attorneys-general, justice ministers and police and emergency services ministers. Invariably, heads of the respective departments, police commissioners and suchlike are there at that meeting. Of course, minister Malinauskas was also there in his capacity as police and emergency services minister. Many topics were discussed, including national security, revenge porn (which is something this parliament has a ready taken steps in respect of) and issues facing emergency services.

In relation to the law enforcement area, there were some particular matters of note that were discussed, and I will just touch on a few of these. The first one was precursor chemicals. Everybody would be aware that the manufacture of amphetamines in this country is predicated on the access these manufacturers have to the chemicals used to create the amphetamine in the first place. What follows from that, if you are able to regulate the flow of the precursor chemicals, is that you should be able to deal with the supply of the chemical at least from domestic sources.

This builds on some important discussions coming into the work of the ice task force. One of the key issues, obviously, with methamphetamine in Australia is the availability of the precursor chemicals in different jurisdictions. The South Australian police minister is, it appears, to be the head of a multijurisdictional group creating nationally consistent provisions—

Mr Knoll: Being the lead legislator worked so well for electricity!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Your mob would know all about that—they thought that up. The nationally consistent rules in respect of precursor chemicals, I think, is a very important initiative and one that South Australia is leading.

Also, there was some discussion regarding the question of community legal centre funding, which is a matter of grave concern to all the states and the territories. Each one, including South Australia, has had to deal with significant cuts to the community legal centre following upon not the most recent federal budget but the budget before that. Following the procurement process yesterday, I announced the centres that would be delivering community legal services in this environment of reduced federal funding. In late April, the commonwealth announced that they would be providing some return of some funding to community legal centres, but of course it's a significantly lesser amount and it's tied to particular purposes.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Given that concerns over staffing at Oakden were raised with the minister in a letter from the member for Makin in April 2015, why did the minister wait until receiving a letter from the Principal Community Visitor, 18 months later, before taking any action?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:16): The letter was to me. It was responded to on my behalf by the now minister, and it was dealt with entirely appropriately. The letter did not raise any specific allegations: it raised issues with regard to the staffing levels at the facility. The inquiry was made with the

department of whether the staffing levels were adequate, were sufficient. The answer came back yes and, on my behalf, the then parliamentary secretary responded.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:17): My question is again to the Minister for Mental Health. After being told by the Principal Community Visitor in his letter of 14 October 2016 that an investigation into the complaints of Mrs Barbara Spriggs about her husband's care had been undertaken by the consumer liaison officer, did the minister immediately seek information about this investigation and, if not, why not?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:17): As I have outlined to the parliament today, when I had the letter arrive from the community visitor I asked for a briefing. That briefing I expected to be comprehensive and covering all the areas that I would need to be able to think about, and make a decision about, this matter and the seriousness that it potentially would bring.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:18): A supplementary: will the minister table in parliament any report the consumer liaison officer made about the investigation of complaints by the Spriggs family?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:18): We now know the Ombudsman is having an inquiry in this space, and we will fully cooperate with him and with all investigations that are on the table across the country in this space.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:18): A supplementary: just confirming that the minister won't provide to parliament any report by the consumer liaison officer in relation to the Spriggs family?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:18): He is very good at that. I have made it clear that we will cooperate with all inquiries that are underway. We will obviously provide information to all those people who are conducting inquiries around the country into Oakden—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: —and the broader aged-care sector.

The SPEAKER: The leader will stop talking over the minister's answer.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:19): Supplementary, sir: minister, why did you not instigate a review immediately after being told by the Principal Community Visitor in his letter of 14 October 2016 that Mr Robert Spriggs had subsequently passed away?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:19): I sought a briefing from the relevant local area health network. I have said that several times today. That is what a minister does in an appropriate set of settings. It also took a while for the briefing to come back to me because there were a number of matters that the CE of that health network had to undertake. What we now know is that, if it had not been for the Spriggs family and the Chief Psychiatrist being able to give them the space to tell their story and other families coming forward, we would not be at this space today and we would not be in the position to have the honest discussion we are now having.

Grievance Debate

HISTORY FESTIVAL

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:20): I rise today to discuss South Australia's History Festival and the many outstanding events that have been hosted in my local community. As many in the

house would know, May is the festival month. It is an opportunity to discover the hidden gems in our communities, explore heritage trails and learn more about the history of South Australia. The first SA History Week was held in 2004, before becoming a month-long festival in 2011. It has since grown to be one of the largest community events in South Australia. The growth is a testament to the efforts of the History Trust and the thousands of dedicated volunteers.

In my own community, the first European settlement in the area was around Coromandel Valley, owing its name to the circumstances connected to the ship *Coromandel*, which arrived in Port Adelaide in January 1837. The *Blackwood Times* of 1914 reports that the crew:

...were so attracted by the accounts they heard of this 'New Land of Promise' that, when the time was approaching for the departure of the vessel, some of them resolved to abscond and hide in the bush until after it had sailed....

Taking hammocks and a good supply of provisions, they proceeded in a body to the hills above Brownhill Creek, where they formed a camp.

So, the history of white settlement of the Mitcham area goes back to the 1830s. In 1840, Mitcham Village was established, and by 1853 Mitcham was proclaimed the first district council in South Australia. In the 1880s, suburban living accelerated with a rapid growth in land subdivisions, driven in part by the introduction of horse-drawn tram services from Adelaide, which made it easier for local residents to commute to the city for work.

Each year, the History Festival provides a fantastic opportunity to explore this rich history, get involved and learn more about the origins and growth of the Mitcham Hills. I thank all those who have helped make it such a success in 2017. The City of Mitcham hosted several events, including a day of games and activities to celebrate the 125th anniversary of the former Mitcham police station, as well as guided walks through Belair Village, Brownhill Creek and the Mitcham Anglican and general cemeteries.

In addition, the council supports the Mitcham Heritage Research Centre, which provides local history services and maintains an extensive collection of documents, photographs and research relating to the history, development, environment and culture of the district. Staff and volunteers work year round to help individuals or groups learn more about our local history.

The tireless members and volunteers of the Blackwood Action Group are incredibly committed to the preservation and promotion of Blackwood, and they were once again very busy throughout the History Festival, leading several walking tours that explored the history and changing face of our community. The Mitcham Historical Society and the Brownhill Creek Association together presented the Brownhill Creek and Ellison's Gully history walk. The walk provided an opportunity not only to enjoy the stunning scenery of Brownhill Creek but also to learn about the crew of the *Coromandel* and the fascinating local history of the valley.

I would like to acknowledge the involvement of historic Carrick Hill, which hosted several guided tours and exhibitions; Flinders University; the Friends of Glenthorne Farm, who help unlock the secrets of that heritage precinct; and the Flagstaff Hill Golf Club, which celebrated 50 years of golfing history at its unique golfing estate.

Deputy Speaker, you do not have to wait until May 2018 to explore and enjoy the rich history of the Mitcham Hills. Visitors are welcome year round at Old Government House in Belair National Park, Gamble Cottage, the beautiful Wittunga Botanic Gardens of course, as well as Urrbrae House and the Waite Historic Precinct, which are perfectly and diligently looked after by the Friends of Urrbrae House, the Friends of the Waite Arboretum and the Friends of the Waite Conservation Reserve.

Finally, there is a history in our community that is very important and one we should never forget, and that is on the site of the Colebrook Reconciliation Park. Of course, this part of our history is a memorial to the Aboriginal children of the stolen generation and their families who resided at the Colebrook home, which served as a home from 1924 until 1942. The park incorporates the poignant *Fountain of Tears* and the *Grieving Mother* statue, sculpted by Sylvio Appony.

Last Sunday, the Blackwood Reconciliation Group and the Blackwood Uniting Church offered the community a chance to walk for reconciliation. Despite the inclement weather, it provided a welcome opportunity for the public to support reconciliation in our community.

NATIONAL RECONCILIATION WEEK

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:25): I rise to speak also about Reconciliation Week, an incredibly important week in our national calendar. Every year, Reconciliation Week runs from 27 May—the anniversary of the 1967 referendum to enable the government to make laws for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and to recognise them in our national census—and 3 June, the date that commemorates the High Court of Australia's landmark Mabo decision in 1992, which legally recognised that Aboriginal people have a special relationship with land, a relationship that has existed for tens of thousands of years and still exists today. Of course, this decision paved the way for native title.

These were momentous steps along our nation's reconciliation journey and this year we mark 50 years since the referendum and 25 years since the Mabo decision. This week and every week, we must deeply recognise Aboriginal people, their ownership of country and acknowledge that their culture is the oldest continuing culture in human history. For us to achieve true reconciliation, we must all participate and take steps in our nation's reconciliation journey. Reconciliation must live in the hearts, minds and actions of all of us. When it does, when everyone makes decisions that have regard to the impact on Aboriginal people at the front of our minds and hearts, reconciliation will be achieved.

I am very happy to speak today about some of the ways local community members are working towards reconciliation. Over the weekend, I had the pleasure of working with our Southern Football League, together with the O'Sullivan Beach Lonsdale Football Club and the Christies Beach Football Club, to run a Reconciliation Round. This round saw both these clubs have local artists, Kelly Roe from Christies Beach Football Club and Doug Clinch Senior from O'Sullivan Beach Lonsdale Football Club, design guernseys for the round, with Junction Australia as a sponsor for a set of these.

Local elder Aunty Georgina Williams very generously welcomed us to Kurna land, Isaac Hannam gave a beautiful digeridoo performance and Chris Coomer spoke with us about what reconciliation means to him. This day brought our football community together to have a conversation about how we can each reflect on past injustices and be sorry for them and take steps together towards reconciliation.

I was thrilled also yesterday to be part of the local Christies Beach Primary School Reconciliation Week assembly. It was heartening to see every child in that school expressing their thoughts and their intended actions to achieve reconciliation through art, storytelling and music. Thank you to each of those children and the staff and leaders at that school for so deeply exploring what they can and will do together to contribute to our reconciliation journey. These local community conversations and the commitments to actions that come from them are so important in considering our own roles in reconciliation, in ending racism and in securing equality, dignity and respect for all Aboriginal people into the future.

The theme for Reconciliation Week this year is 'Let's take the next steps'. It is not enough just to talk about reconciliation and justice. As a government and as a community, we must take active steps towards removing systemic discrimination. Twenty years ago, the Bringing Them Home report was tabled in the Australian parliament. For the first time, Bringing Them Home formally recognised the full extent of the suffering, pain and absolute devastation that forced removals brought upon Aboriginal children, families and communities over many decades across this nation.

We acknowledge that we must continue saying sorry as long as the suffering continues in any part of our community, in any family and in the heart and soul of any individual. In 2008, prime minister Rudd apologised to Australia's Indigenous people for the indignity and degradation inflicted on them and recognised the pain, suffering and hurt they have suffered. At that time, we were urged to look to the future and to set the goal of a truly equal partnership based on mutual respect, mutual resolve and mutual responsibility.

We must each accept responsibility for working towards this aspiration and making it a reality. It is a journey of many steps and I am proud that our state government has taken some important next steps. In 2015, we launched our Stolen Generations Reparation Scheme to provide both individual and whole-of-community reparations to people and communities affected by forced removals. The individual payment scheme enables government to provide some redress for South Australian stolen generation people. It also provides Aboriginal people opportunities to tell their stories—an important, crucial part of the healing process for individuals and communities.

But it is important that we continue to acknowledge that nothing—nothing—can take away the pain and suffering of those who were removed from their families as children. Nothing can mend the family, community and cultural bonds that were destroyed, in some cases never to be repaired. In this Reconciliation Week, it is integral that we all accept the solemn responsibility for working together in the direction of healing.

In December 2016, we also proudly announced that we would begin treaty discussions with Aboriginal South Australians. Conversations with Aboriginal communities across South Australia that would inform the elements of a possible treaty model are now happening. I congratulate my friend, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Kyam Maher, in the other place on his work in this area and on his deep commitment to achieving treaty.

ICE ADDICTION

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:30): I rise to make a contribution for a mother in my electorate of Mount Gambier called Sharon Stafford. Sharon came and saw me the other day and has actually seen me a number of times about the subject of ice. She asked that I read this out in parliament, which I said I would do. I have also put this in writing to the Minister for Substance Abuse and sought answers on the record.

Dear Member for Mount Gambier, Troy Bell,

I submit to you information and ask for help that relates to the ice epidemic, not only in South Australia but Australiawide. I ask that you, the member for Mount Gambier, present and deal with the issues below. I'm asking for your help in dealing with the ice epidemic here in Mount Gambier and to scrutinise the South Australian government as to why the South Australian Ministerial Ice Taskforce asked for public submissions that closed on 7th April concerning 'help to find an effective statewide solution and wanting ideas about how to prevent take-up, how to intervene early and what treatment works for different levels of dependence'.

I applied myself to this submission only to find out that the government of South Australia had already passed legislation on blocking legislation for mandatory treatment orders 'that would allow for mandatory rehabilitation centres where addicts can access help in a safe place that is not a prison'.

My question to you and the South Australian government is this: on what date did the Controlled Substances (Youth Treatment Orders) Amendment Bill get passed in the South Australian parliament and on what date did the ice taskforce ask for submissions to crack the ice epidemic?

Yes, I put in a submission to the ministerial taskforce via Tony Pasin's office on 5 April 2017 and asked if his office would pass my submission on as I don't have internet and there was no other address to send my submission to as part of yoursay.sa.gov.au/decision/ice-taskforce.

Having left Tony Pasin's office, I decided to buy *The Border Watch* and on that day read in the paper that on 5th April the South Australian government had already decided on no mandatory treatment orders for ice addicts when there were still two days left for submissions to be received. What sort of government is this that can do such a thing? I know now that submissions to government are a waste of our time. Government for the people, by the people, no longer exists for me. However fruitless, I now ask for these questions to be answered by the South Australian government:

1. What is the cost to keep an ice addict attending court time and time again because ice/drug addicts are let out on bail?
2. What is the cost for an ice addict/drug addict to seek legal aid?
3. What is the cost to keep an ice addict/drug addict in prison?
4. What is the cost to print books issued by the state government telling people about ice and drugs?
5. What is the cost to run community recreational centres in order to deal with ice/drug addicts?
6. What is the cost to run/maintain drug and alcohol services/mental health services?
7. What is the cost to families when their loved ones are addicted to ice/drugs?

That number I can answer and it is this: debt, divorce, violence and death. One can get a restraining order and call the police only they get there too late to be of any help. The damage is already done. When your loved one is locked up in prison, the magistrate asks the parents to provide bail for the ice addict/drug addict. No, I've had enough.

That is from a mother, Sharon Stafford, whom I have met on numerous occasions in my electorate. She has a son addicted to ice and has lost another son through ice. She is feeling let down that there is no common place for her to go to seek help and that the system is failing her and her loved one in this instance. On behalf of Sharon Stafford, I submit that to the house.

LIGHT ELECTORATE SCHOOLS

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:34): While parliament was not sitting last week, I had the opportunity to visit some schools in my electorate and to catch up with school leaderships and with students to gauge how they are going and to hear about the plans and ambitions of the students at those schools.

The first school I visited was Mark Oliphant College where I met with students from the junior primary and senior years. I spoke to the senior students about their ambitions and what they propose to do next year following their graduation, and I asked them how school was going. I received very positive feedback from the school, and I must confess that the students from Mark Oliphant College looked rather splendid in their school uniform.

I put on the record that I fully support the school leadership, the schoolteachers and the governing council to have a school dress code in place. I think it is important, and I fully support it. Whilst I am not in a position to say what is the right dress code, I do think dress code is important for the area. It is important for schools, and schools are about having pride in your school, pride in yourself and pride in your community. So, I fully support the actions of the governing council and the school leadership team at the school, and I know that the teachers support it as well.

When I was a student some decades ago in the mid-1970s, the school dress code went out of fashion for a period of time, but I was not one of those people who thought it was a great idea. I thought there were a lot of practical reasons why dress code was very good for students, for the school and also for the families. As I said, students at Mark Oliphant had a really positive attitude towards their school and also towards the community at large.

The other school I visited was the Adelaide North Special School, which is adjacent to Mark Oliphant. I would like to put on record my thanks to the school leadership and the governing council at that school who do an enormous job in providing learning and pastoral opportunities for students who are living with a disability. Special schools are for those students who, for whatever reason, cannot attend a mainstream school or even a special education unit in a school. These are students who require additional support, and I really would like to commend the teaching staff and the leadership team for treating these students with great dignity and giving them opportunities to learn with dignity.

I had the opportunity to visit Trinity College, and I met the head of the college, Nick Hatley, and the college captains and prefects. I was taken on a tour of the new school pavilion, but I was unable to attend the official opening. Trinity College offers a whole range of programs to students and families in the area and provides wonderful educational opportunities for students who choose to attend that college, including sport, arts, academic and cultural opportunities. The school offers a very broad program to its students, including vocational education, and they do a wonderful job in developing wonderful young graduates.

I also visited the Gawler District College, an R-12 school, and met students in the junior primary and senior years. I also had a discussion about the special focus on STEM subjects at the college, and the school is doing a wonderful job. Since it integrated the preschool, primary school and high school, it has gone gangbusters and now is full to the brim. The school is doing really well in terms of providing public education to students and their families in the area.

I was also fortunate to be invited to the official opening of Playford College, which is just outside my electorate. Some families from within my area would go there. I met the chair of the governing council of this new college and the principal, Rainer Mayer. I must confess that it is a bold and wonderful journey that this new college is undertaking. It is a college in the Muslim faith, in the Shia tradition. What impresses me about this particular school is the lengths it is going to make sure

that it is integrating with the local community. At the opening, it was very clear that while it has a Shia tradition (no different from the Catholic tradition or other traditions), it is very keen to make sure it becomes part of the community at large and welcomes students from other faiths as well. I also attended Munno Para school governing council, which I will talk about next time.

Time expired.

KANGAROO ISLAND AIRPORT

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:40): I am delighted to be here this afternoon to announce to the house that Qantas Airways is moving into Kangaroo Island. How would you know that, you may well ask. Last week, Qantas announced on their website that they are commencing a passenger service to Kangaroo Island. This is fantastic news for Kangaroo Island. The website states:

Qantas have announced that they will commence flights year around from Kangaroo Island to Adelaide return and Kangaroo Island to Melbourne return in December and January only. This will present some great opportunities for travellers to easily travel to Kangaroo Island direct from Melbourne in the busiest tourist months of the year and will also give locals more accessibility to transport options on and off the island.

The Federal Liberal coalition government along with the state government and Kangaroo Island Council have all had a part to play in the ongoing redevelopment of the Kangaroo Island Airport. Qantas is a longstanding carrier and a reputable company. The opportunities presented with the additional transport carrier will provide exciting times ahead for the island.

This information was all available on the Qantas website up until late last Friday, and I will come to that. It has now been replaced by a different announcement. However, at this time there are no links available to book future flights.

While I welcome the proposed Qantas service, they must be sustainable and we do not want to see them cease after a short period, as they did some years ago, leaving people in the lurch. In addition, if there are incentives, whether they be council incentives or state government financial incentives (and we will find that out), if they are being offered to Qantas they must also be offered to the current carrier, Regional Express, which has provided a longstanding reliable service to the island. Kangaroo Island is an extremely difficult destination as far as profitability goes, and it is important that the growth in passenger numbers continues so that the desired outcome can be achieved.

It is interesting that it would appear that the government's agent, Wendy Campana, belled the cat at a meeting early last week and let the news out. I am sure that the tourism minister was out there to make a great big announcement when the country cabinet circus goes to the island next weekend; however, the problem is that I have let it out. I can announce it to the world. On top of that, I am sure that he knows and that the Kangaroo Island Council CEO knows. Do the councillors know? No, they do not know. They have not been told, except one who was there when the cat was well and truly belled. It is most interesting. I presume the mayor knows, but I am not sure.

Do not let me be too cynical here because it is a good announcement. Suddenly, there was a rushed Kangaroo Island special meeting last week to give the CEO permission to offer incentives to airlines to come into Kangaroo Island, which included landing fees and such. We will have to dig around a bit further, but it absolutely bewildered me that elected members of the Kangaroo Island Council—and the council owns the airport—were never told and still have not been told. As of 10 o'clock this morning, they still did not know.

I am sure that the bells and whistles, the government, the cabinet and the tourism minister were going to play havoc with this next week and that this was going to be a major announcement while they were on the island. Well, sorry to say, your government agent, Mrs Campana, has let the cat out of the bag. Qantas has changed its website now to say that, yes, you can travel to Kangaroo Island via Adelaide and then travel on Regional Express.

My view would be that someone in Qantas got a very stern rap over the knuckles. The message is out and they have been told to hurriedly pull that off the website and put up this new message. My quotes were directly off the Qantas website of last week. They were up there for three or four days. It makes a complete mockery of the tourism minister and the government that this has got out. It came to me late last week. I had a look at the website on a number of occasions to make sure that what it said was right. It was correct.

Let me say again that I am delighted that Qantas is going to fly to and from the island. It is terrific news, wonderful. It will be interesting to see whether they fly from Sydney to Kangaroo Island, from Melbourne to Kangaroo Island or whatever. At the end of the day, they must have the passengers on the aeroplanes to make it pay, or it will be just another case of good news going bad. I welcome Qantas coming to Kangaroo Island.

WASTEWATER TREATMENT

Mr GEE (Napier) (15:45): Today, I wish to speak about water, waste, vegetables and the future economic growth of our state. If you are wondering what the relationship is between those four things, it is the Virginia Pipeline Scheme and the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme. It is a big move. The Virginia Pipeline Scheme takes water waste from the Bolivar wastewater treatment plant, filters it and then pumps it to the food bowl surrounding Virginia, Angle Vale and Two Wells.

I had the privilege of touring the Bolivar wastewater treatment plant last week and the dissolved air flotation and filtration plant. It was quite an interesting experience. You are greeted by beautiful gardens and a pale brown dust. You would be interested to know that every item over three millimetres in size, including goldfish, are removed at the start of the process in order to prevent damage to equipment at the plant. The water then moves through a number of processes until it is suitable for discharge into the ocean or to head to the filtration plant. There are five different stages, which take a number of weeks to complete.

The plant receives over 140 million litres of water per day, which is the equivalent of 56 Olympic swimming pools per day. The plant runs 24 hours a day and sees two peak periods, one about four hours after people wake up and the other about four hours after they arrive home after work. The Bolivar plant serves Adelaide's north and takes about 70 per cent of Adelaide's wastewater. The other plants are located at Glenelg and Christies Beach. The plants are run mostly by computer these days, but about 35 people still work at the plant. My father used to work at the plant on night shift when we first came to Australia, back in 1963.

I want to thank Nick Swain, the manager of wastewater, performance and optimisation, from SA Water and Scott Reynolds from That Science Gang, who made the tour very interesting and enjoyable. After visiting the wastewater plant, we then travelled almost to St Kilda to view the dissolved air flotation and filtration (DAFF) plant that puts the wastewater that has been through the plant through a further process prior to its distribution to the food bowl. Currently, 19.5 gigalitres per annum of recycled water are contracted through the Virginia Pipeline Scheme, which distributes the water to approximately 400 horticulture growers. A further 20 gigalitres per annum of recycled water has been allocated to the NAIS project.

The Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme will secure large volumes of affordable, high security, recycled water for intensive, high-tech food production. The South Australian government has applied to the Australian government's National Water Infrastructure Development Fund for \$45.6 million in funding to construct the infrastructure for the NAIS. A decision on the federal funding is expected to be announced mid-2017.

If the funding is approved, the state government, through SA Water, will co-invest \$110 million in the NAIS project. This will see the upgrade of infrastructure at the Bolivar wastewater treatment plant to produce an additional 12 gigalitres per year of recycled water suitable for irrigation. It will also see the building of core recycled water distribution infrastructure to the area north of the Gawler River and enable a major new irrigation area to be constructed, including high-tech, high-value and intensive food production.

South Australia's produce from the Northern Adelaide Plains is in great demand, with mushrooms, tomatoes, cucumbers, lettuce, potatoes and much more, being transported across the state, the nation and overseas. I am fortunate to have visited two of our successful businesses on the Adelaide Plains in recent weeks. Several weeks ago, I had the pleasure of visiting SA Mushrooms.

Thanks to Nick Fermia and his team for hosting me and taking me for a tour of their high-tech facility. It was interesting to see the mushrooms in the grow rooms and hear about the growing process and the needs of the business. I found out that mushrooms, unlike all other plant life, breathe oxygen and exhale carbon dioxide like humans.

Last Friday, I visited Perfection, previously known as D'Vine Ripe. It is again another high-tech facility that produces tomatoes in the largest greenhouse in Australia. The company supplies Coles, Woolworths and Aldi across Australia with a range of tomatoes. I wish to thank Troy Topp, the general manager, for showing me the facility.

Bills

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRANSPORT ONLINE TRANSACTIONS AND OTHER MATTERS)
BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 April 2017.)

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:50): I am the lead speaker for the opposition. Thank you so much for the opportunity, Madam Deputy Speaker. The opposition supports the bill. The bill, of course, is a government bill that makes numerous changes to the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, the Road Traffic Act 1961, the Highways Act 1926, Heavy Vehicles National Law (South Australia) Act 2013, and the Harbors and Navigation Act 2013. It also amends these acts to remove gender-specific language, reflecting the government's policy on gender, identity and equality.

The main focus of the bill is changes to the Motor Vehicles Act to modernise customer-governed online transactions by removing barriers to the use of online processes so that, for example, vehicle registration transfers and notices of vehicle sales can be recorded online rather than in paper forms lodged in person. These new online options via EzyReg will continue in conjunction with the existing paper form methods. The EzyReg app has been available for some years now, and my understanding is that this is an expansion of the use of the app that many South Australians have taken up.

The government visualises potential for an extra half a million transactions to be made online each year under these amendments. Customers will also be given the option of receiving communications electronically rather than by post. Licence renewal applications will be able to be made over the phone. The department advised me in the briefing they provided that, in addition to standard online registrations by clients using EzyReg, there are now 275,000 accounts set up by customers on EzyReg which allows them to use direct debits for payments. About 60,000 people use this option, as well as view their registration and demerit details.

This also amends the act's provisions for the accident towing roster scheme whereby holders of tow truck certificates will no longer be required to affix the certification to their clothing. The Road Traffic Act will have the definition of bicycles updated and remove unicycles and scooters from this category. This will also achieve consistency under the Australian Road Rules. Also, it does not mean that you do not wear helmets with those two means of transport.

Amendments to the Highways Act will address the ambiguity that has arisen on the road being treated as a road or a public road. The Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Budget 2012) Act incorporated amendments into the Highways Act to provide for certain roads to vest in the Commissioner of Highways so as to enable the commissioner to enter into contracts to promote commercial activities on these roads. I suspect that is things like service stations, for example, or perhaps even car parks for sightseeing if it is in the country. This has led to some ambiguity as to whether these roads will be treated as roads or public roads.

The amendments to this bill will clarify that and also that the commissioner has the same powers with regard to these roads as councils, which was intended in the 2012 budget act. Shareholder groups that I consulted, including the SAFC, SARTA, the CCF, the MBA and the Bicycle Institute of SA, raised no issues of concern with the bill. Consequently, the opposition will support the bill.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:55): I rise to support the bill and also to support the fantastic work that the people at Service SA in Mount Gambier contribute to our community and to many of these matters. If you go to Service SA during lunchtime on any particular day, the line-up is out the door. Having spoken with a number of constituents in that workplace, the common theme is around

workload, so I am in favour of anything that can support people doing more online, as well as extra services for online access and administration.

The staff at Service SA in Mount Gambier are a very hardworking, patient, diligent lot. On many occasions I have witnessed the extreme workload they are under, so anything the minister can do to lighten that load would be really appreciated by the wonderful staff at Service SA. With those few remarks, I conclude.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:57): I rise to speak to the Statutes Amendment (Transport Online Transactions and Other Matters) Bill 2017. What is happening here with this legislation is that the government is making quite a few small changes to the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, the Road Traffic Act 1961, the Highways Act 1926, the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013 and the Harbors and Navigation Act 2013. As has been indicated by the shadow minister, the member for Unley, the bill amends these acts to remove gender-specific language, reflecting the government's policy on gender identity and equality, evidently. From my count, in regard to gender-specific language there are 215 changes taking out 'his' or 'her' or 'he'; you will either be a 'person' or a 'commissioner' or something else.

The main focus of the bill is changes to the Motor Vehicles Act to modernise customer-government online transactions by removing barriers to the use of online processes so that vehicle registration transfers and notices of vehicle sales can be recorded online rather than with paper forms lodged in person. These new online options, via EzyReg, will continue in conjunction with the existing paper form methods. The government has estimated that there will be an extra 500,000 transactions made online each year under these amendments, and customers will also be given the option of receiving communications electronically or by post.

Licence renewal applications will also be able to be made over the phone. In a briefing received from the department, they advised that, in addition to standard online registrations by clients using EzyReg, there are now 275,000 accounts set up by customers on EzyReg, which allow them to use direct debit for payments—about 60,000 people use this option—as well as view their registration and demerit details.

In regard to what happens to the accident towing roster scheme, the bill also amends the act's provisions whereby holders of tow truck certificates will no longer be required to affix certification to their clothing. In regard to the Road Traffic Act, the definition of 'bicycle' will be updated to remove unicycles and scooters from this category. This will also achieve consistency under the Australian Road Rules.

There will also be some amendments under the Highways Act, which will address ambiguity which has arisen on a road being treated as a 'road' or a 'public road'. The Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Budget 2012) Act 2012 incorporated amendments to the Highways Act that provided for certain roads to vest in the Commissioner of Highways so as to enable the commissioner to enter into contracts to promote commercial activities on these roads. This has led to some ambiguity as to whether these roads are to be treated as 'roads' or 'public roads', and amendments in this bill will clarify that the commissioner has the same powers with regard to those roads as councils, which was the intention of the 2012 budget act.

Groups have been consulted in the transport sector, including the South Australian Freight Council, the South Australian Road Transport Association, the CCF (SA), the MBA and the Bicycle Institute SA, and no concerns were raised with the bill. I think it will certainly be a step forward to make it easier for registration processes online.

As was indicated earlier by the member for Mount Gambier, there can be very long queues outside registration offices. They are under Service SA now, so there are many complex arrangements that need to be dealt with. At times it can be frustrating, but I must say that, in my own arrangements around registration and certainly in the last couple of years with some personal matters I had to sort out, they were all very good and very keen to get the right result, which was good to see. With those few words, I support the Statutes Amendment (Transport Online Transactions and Other Matters) Bill.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:03): I would like to speak briefly in support of this bill. The Statutes Amendment (Transport Online Transactions and Other Matters) Bill 2017 amends

various pieces of transport legislation, including the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, the Road Traffic Act 1961, the Highways Act 1926 and the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013, to better provide for online transactions and other improvements to efficiencies of existing transport legislation.

The bill proposes changes to the Motor Vehicles Act (the act), which aim to better serve the public by providing options for more online services under the act. The changes support government priorities, particularly digital by default and simpler regulation, and complement other important reforms involving the act, such as the proposal to enable digital driver's licences contained in the Premier's simplification and repeal day initiative.

The changes include introducing the capacity for registration transfers and changes in vehicle ownership to be recorded online, instead of lodging or mailing paper forms, and also the option for licence disqualification acknowledgements to occur online rather than having to personally attend at service centres. Other amendments in the bill enable the capacity for greater electronic communications with the public. The legislation is worded in general terms so that electronic services may evolve over time without having the further need to change the act unnecessarily.

These online services are anticipated to greatly assist the public in meeting their requirements under the act more conveniently. Existing paper-based procedures will remain to maximise choice for all in our community. This is a very important point. For those people who have access to online services, those choices will be available, and for those people who are perhaps not so comfortable with online services the existing paper mechanisms will still prevail.

The registration changes amount to some 430,000 transactions per year and the licence disqualifications amount to 17,000 transactions per year. Once the changes are implemented, Service SA estimates that a significant portion of these 500,000 or so transactions per year will shift from requiring service centres visits to the online environment. For many people, particularly in outlying areas, this will be a boost because they often have to travel long distances to get to a service centre and often they are quite busy.

The increased efficiency of service delivery is expected to result in administrative savings and contribute to the achievement of governmental budget targets. There are other miscellaneous changes to the act proposed in the bill, including allowing licence renewals to be applied for by telephone and introducing a ministerial delegation power. This bill also makes a number of minor and technical amendments to the Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013, the Road Traffic Act 1961 and the Motor Vehicles Act. These changes serve to amend definitions, clarify provisions and optimise operation of the legislation resulting from the introduction of the Heavy Vehicle National Law in 2014.

The Road Traffic Act is amended by the bill to update the definition of a bicycle and also to clarify the minister's powers in section 175A, varying or revoking average speed point to point gazettal notices. The bill clarifies amendments made to the Highways Act 1926 as part of the commercialisation changes effected by the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Budget 2012) Act 2012. This ensures that roads vested in the Commissioner of Highways under the commercialisation provisions are to be treated as public roads. All in all, this bill improves the capacity of the government to provide a better service to people in South Australia.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:07): Mr Acting Speaker, I take the opportunity to congratulate you on your elevation to high office. I am sure *The Border Watch* will report on it.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): It will be in the paper tomorrow, don't worry about that.

Mr WILLIAMS: I rise first of all to indicate my support for the Statutes Amendment (Transport Online Transactions and Other Matters) Bill. I certainly support the ability to transact matters with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles online, but in my business, which I will say my wife runs, we have a significant number of vehicles registered, and most farmers would find themselves in the same category.

Our farm has a number of 4WD vehicles that are used principally on the farm, as well as motorbikes, tractors, trucks, trailers and a range of other vehicles which are registered. I would not hazard a guess at how many registrations there are, but I do know that my wife has complained for

a number of years that, when it comes to registering, because we have a common registering date, they all fall due—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: That's an expensive day.

Mr WILLIAMS: It is indeed. I find that our business is a significant contributor to the coffers of the state through that alone. The reality is that, even though we have a common date to register, on that particular day, which is late in January, my wife finds it impossible to do it online because she can only do one at a time. Notwithstanding that we have a number which should identify our business to the department and identify all the vehicles we have registered and which would indicate that all the registrations fall due on the same date, there is no facility within the software the agency uses to allow her to tick this one, that one, the next one and the next one, add up all the amounts and pay the relevant amount of money. She goes on, registers one and then the site basically closes down and she has to log back on and do them one at a time, which she finds incredibly difficult.

A solution was suggested to her by the good people that you, Mr Acting Speaker, talked about in the office in Mount Gambier. I am aware of this because I was given the task of doing this back in January one day when I happened to be going to Mount Gambier. My wife handed me a folder with all these registrations that were due and said, 'Can you call around to the Service SA office, stand in the line and hand these to one of the people behind the counter?'

I walked up to the window and the lady said to me, 'I've been watching you in the line. You've got a big folder there in front of you and you look like trouble.' I said, 'Not at all. My advice is that I am to deliver these to you, you are to take them from me, you will process them and I will come back sometime next week or whatever. You will give me a phone call and I will drop back in and pay the relevant amount.' No, I had to give her a credit card number, I think, so that they could withdraw the relevant amount. Sure enough, I got a phone call about a week later saying that they had all been processed. Subsequently, I am not too sure whether it was my wife, my son or me, but one of us picked them up. That was the process that we had to go through.

I hope that the minister and his agency will take that on board. I can only assume that a significant number of businesses that operate in the state have to go through the same process that our family business had to go through. I would suggest it is thousands, if not tens of thousands, where there are multiple registrations to one business. I suggest that they collect them all together on one date. I would like there to be a facility whereby we could simply register them all electronically at our convenience, at any time during the day. I think that would make life better, certainly for the operators of such businesses and probably even better for the agency that handles them.

There is another matter that I also find tiresome, to say the least. Again, in the business of running a farm from time to time our business purchases a piece of machinery, whether it be a tractor or a truck, that needs to be registered. When you go in to register it, you take in the previous registration number that identifies the vehicle and then you are asked for all the specifications of the vehicle. Again, about 12 months ago I bought a truck. The truck was registered, I drove it home to my farm and then I went to transfer the registration into my name or the name of my business.

I actually had to go online and use Google to find the make and model of the truck—this is a Volvo truck. I had to go to the manufacturer's specifications, which gave me the wheelbase, the track, the weight and all those details. I then had to go in to the service centre, again in Mount Gambier, fill out all these details on a form and give them to the people working there so they could transfer the registration into my name.

The agency already had all that data. It already had it all, but I had to go to a fair bit of effort. I could not determine the weight of the vehicle because obviously, from the manufacturer's specification, the weight was the cab chassis, whereas when I purchased the truck it had a tray on it. It also had another fuel tank on it. I had to estimate the weight of the tray and the fuel tank. I estimated it and said to the lady there that I had filled it out. She looked at it, looked at her screen and said, 'I think we'll change that to such and such.' I was out by about 150 kilos. I was most thankful because I have had the experience of being told that I had to go to a weighbridge and have it weighed, which again is a great inconvenience because you have to go to a public weighbridge, pay for it and then go back with the exact weight.

My late father-in-law explained this situation many years ago when he purchased a tractor from a clearing sale near Murray Bridge. He went into the office at Murray Bridge and went through the same thing. They asked him for the tyre size and he guesstimated it. They said, 'No, the tyre size is supposed to be such and such.' He said, 'These are not the original tyres. They have been changed.' He had to put the height of the tractor. He guesstimated it but, no, that was wrong. He said, 'It's had a two-way radio fitted and it's got a little antenna that I've added on.' Every measurement he got wrong, but he had a reason why his was different from the original specification. He got the registration at that point but, to my mind at least, this points out the nonsense.

I am sure that the good folk you referred to in the office in Mount Gambier, Mr Acting Speaker, and their colleagues in other offices around the state are doing what they have to do, but surely the regulations could be changed to simplify those sort of processes. I have another truck and trailer on my farm that 12 months ago I changed to a farm permit because we only use it on the farm, but we have to cross the road from one part of the farm to the other. We were able to get a farm permit for that truck and trailer.

Recently, we wanted to use it for another job, so we registered it for three months. My son did it, and he tells me that if at some stage in the future we want to change it back to a farm permit we again have to go through the process of identifying all those measurements—all the specifications of that truck and trailer—to satisfy the regulations. I think that is a nonsense. It will not be a change of ownership, just a change of the status of the registration, but it makes quite a deal of work to go through the process and get all those details.

When I have done it, I have just googled the manufacturer's specifications and copied them down. I have had the experience, when I went over to the shed in the first instance with a tape measure to measure the wheelbase of the truck, of thinking there was something seriously wrong because the wheelbase was longer on one side of the truck than it was on the other. I then realised that the wheels were not parallel with the truck. There was a bit of a turn on it and it made a difference of a few centimetres, but it had me scratching my head for a few minutes.

Those are a couple of things that I will put to the minister whilst he is trying to simplify the processes, and I congratulate him on doing that. I am aware of a couple of other areas—and I am sure other members are aware of some others—that would certainly make life easier for businesses similar to the farm business that I operate in a different life. With those words, I commend the minister for going so far. I am urging him to go a little bit farther.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:18): I rise very gladly to speak to this bill. As has already been indicated by our lead speaker and others, it is a bill that we support, and I think it is a major step towards bringing Service SA and the transport industry into the 21st century. What a boon it will be to allow online transactions for everybody in this state, particularly those who live in more remote parts of the state.

The bill makes numerous small changes to the Motor Vehicles Act and other acts, including the Road Traffic Act, the Highways Act, the Heavy Vehicles National Law (South Australia) Act and the Harbours and Navigation Act. It also amends those acts to remove gender-specific language, reflecting the government's policy on gender identity and equality, which is most important.

The main focus of the bill is in relation to changes to the Motor Vehicles Act and to modernise customer-government online transactions by removing barriers to the use of online processes. For example, vehicle registration transfers and notices of vehicle sales can be recorded online rather than with paper forms lodged in person. These new online options via EzyReg will continue in conjunction with the existing paper form methods. The government envisages the potential for an extra half a million transactions to be made online each year.

I alluded to those customers in more remote parts of the state. In fact, as the local member, I have been contacted often by those constituents. The electorate of Flinders extends from Port Lincoln, and I highlight Port Lincoln not just because it is the largest urban settlement or population centre in the electorate but because it is the home of the only Service SA office in the electorate.

That means that people who live in communities in the north-east, as far as Darke Peak, and who live in the north-west, as far as Ceduna and beyond—and, in fact, there are farming communities

that exist at Coorabie, Nundroo and a small settlement at Fowlers Bay—have up until now had to drive all the way to Port Lincoln, and that is 550 kilometres one way from Coorabie. It is a 1,100-kilometre round trip to register your car. It is a long way, and imagine if you forgot one of the pieces of paperwork. You can imagine the frustration of some of my constituents.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bell): The wife wouldn't be happy.

Mr TRELOAR: Exactly—why wouldn't you take them with you? But you know how it is. It is a long, long way to access a government service, and for that reason I took it upon myself to do some lobbying on this, and I thank the minister for allowing his staff to meet me and to put to them some of the issues that surround this. I would like to think that in some small way that lobbying effort of our electorate office and other members on this side has helped to bring about these changes.

Customers will also be given the option of receiving communications electronically rather than by post, and that brings another issue to the table. In fact, we are discovering on Eyre Peninsula that Australia Post is becoming slower. The turnaround time for a letter posted on Eyre Peninsula to Adelaide and back has extended out by some days. It used to be a couple of days, but it can now be a week—it just seems to be the way of the world. Once again, it is pleasing to see that the government has moved into the 21st century.

In their briefing, the department advised that, in addition to standard online registrations by clients using EzyReg, there are now 275,000 accounts set up by customers on EzyReg, which will allow them to use direct debit for payments. About 60,000 people are already using this option to view their registration and demerit details, which is always a point of interest. All these services are becoming more accessible. The member for MacKillop mentioned lining up for a long time with a stack of papers, and I cannot remember whether he said with a chequebook or a credit card, but either way he was up for a big bill.

The bill also amends provisions in relation to the accident towing roster scheme, whereby holders of tow truck certificates will no longer be required to affix certification to their clothing. These are small but important changes. The Road Traffic Act will also have the definition of bicycle updated, to remove unicycles and scooters from the category. This will also achieve consistency with other Australian road rules, so it is part of the harmonisation process we are seeing in transport across the board. Heavy vehicles is another example where harmonisation is occurring, and we have discussed that legislation in this place already.

Amendments to the Highways Act will address ambiguity that has arisen from a road being treated as a road or a public road. The Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Budget 2012) Act 2012 incorporated amendments to the Highways Act that provided for certain roads to vest in the Commissioner of Highways so as to enable the commissioner to enter into contracts to promote commercial activities on these roads. Understandably, this has led to some ambiguity as to whether these roads are to be treated as roads or public roads, and amendments in the bill will clarify that the commissioner has the same powers with regard to these roads as councils, which was the intention of the 2012 budget act.

There has been extensive consultation, and all the main players who were consulted—SAFC, SARTA, CCF South Australian branch, MBA and Bicycle Institute of South Australia—raised no concerns with the bill. Rather than having concerns, I am pleased to support it for all the good things that it will bring to constituents in my part of the world. As the member for MacKillop alluded to, there is still more to do and there is plenty more within the transport sector that can be done. The minister and the department have undertaken what is known as a 90-day project in regard to heavy vehicle transport and farm machinery in particular. I would suggest that the 90 days has extended beyond that.

It is a bit like walking through wet cement sometimes, but those involved in the primary industry sector, be it fishing or farming, have the feeling that as legislators and as the government we are not keeping pace with the technological advances being made in the sector and that the size and capacity of the machinery are moving way beyond where the legislation is at the moment. I think we need to make a concerted effort as legislators to allow modern and efficient operators to do just that.

I talk about efficiency particularly because, as I have said in this place before, our primary producers are competing in a global marketplace. They are competing against the Canadians, the Americans and the Ukrainians and they do not need a disadvantage, and some of the regulations we are faced with at the moment bring about a disadvantage by undermining the efficiencies that could potentially be there. I encourage the minister and the department to continue that work and, hopefully, get to a point where they have streamlined the transport of heavy vehicles and farm machinery.

Once again the member for MacKillop highlighted that many of the businesses operating in rural areas have a number of vehicles on their inventory—cars, trucks, tractors, trailers and motorbikes—and managing their registration should, as a result of the bill, be so much easier. With that, I thank the government and the minister for bringing this bill because it is probably one of the few in this place that I support wholeheartedly. I look forward to the swift passage of the bill.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (16:28): I thank the speakers who have contributed to the second reading on this bill. I will not reiterate all the things the bill seeks to do because the speakers preceding me have done that quite well. They have also taken the chance to highlight some of their personal experiences of navigating the various interactions that the government, the Department for Transport and Service SA require South Australians to have with them when seeking to transact in relation to themselves as licence holders or in relation to their vehicles or for other purposes.

I often like to say, particularly around this time of the year in the lead-up to the budget, that transport is the one area of government that people use just about every day. Fortunately, people do not need our police force every day, children do not go to school every single day, with weekends and school holidays, etc., and, touch wood, people do not need our hospitals every day, but people do rely on our transport networks. It did not take me long to realise, occupying my portfolio responsibilities, that because just about everyone uses our transport networks every day they have strong opinions about them and how best they might be resourced, managed and superintended.

Although this bill seeks to make a collection of, by themselves, relatively minor changes, it will deliver some significant benefits to those people who interact with our transport agencies. You do not need to think too deeply when you are looking at the acts that are being amended by this bill, some of them having been written in excess of 60 to 80 years ago, that sometimes the way in which we provide for South Australians' interactions with our transport agencies can be pretty outdated. Certainly, they are paper based, they are heavily reliant on rules and, in many cases, they are personal interactions with government agencies. That is time consuming, cumbersome and, for some people, expensive, particularly for those people running businesses.

As technology has developed, particularly over the last 20 years, and as the take-up of that technology has become more prevalent throughout our community, it has been the role of government—and not just this government but governments around Australia and the world—to try to adapt their systems and processes to make best use of advances in technology and alleviate some of the burden that complying with our laws can place on individuals and on businesses.

I think that at least for the medium term there will always be a reasonably significant group in our community who will still feel most comfortable interacting with our transport agencies by personally presenting to a Service SA centre. You only need to attend a bank branch, dwindling in number though they may be, at any time of the day on the days that they are open to get an appreciation of the sorts of people who feel more comfortable involving themselves in transactions in person. They tend to be the more elderly in our community, those people who have become used to and comfortable with a particular system or process over many years and they would like that to be continued.

Just as that is the case with people's interactions with their financial institutions—their banks and credit unions—it is also the case for many people with Service SA centres. However, there is a constantly growing number in our community who feel just as comfortable, perhaps even more comfortable, not having to deal with people face to face and being able to transact just about exclusively online.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: In the upper house, yes, that is right, is the interjection from the member for Unley. Of course, we can speak about them, but will they hear? For them, it is exceedingly late in the day and they may not still be here, but I speculate about that.

There will always be people who feel more comfortable going into a Service SA centre, and that is why it is important that we continue to provide for them. However, every transaction we can take away from a face-to-face interaction and move to an online system, whether it is on a computer, a smart phone, an iPad or something similar, not only speeds up that process for the person using one of those online portals but it also provides more capacity in a Service SA centre for those members of our community who still want to go in there and interact in person.

That may well be the case, for example, for the member for MacKillop. He spoke about getting one of his trucks registered. Who would have thought the member for MacKillop would be a Volvo driver? Apparently, he is. I will not speculate further what that means; I will leave that there. He spoke about some of the difficulties and some of the time-intensive processes that he has experienced in making sure that he can continue registering his vehicles and keep them compliant with our laws and our regulations.

The more we can ease that burden on the member for MacKillop, the more we will be easing that burden on those people who have a similar experience to his—people who run businesses, particularly businesses in regional areas, for whom a trip to a Service SA centre can be additionally time consuming and may eat into other productive time that they could be spending elsewhere on their business. That is why these bills are so important.

I think it is critical for us to continue thinking about our transport systems, and particularly our road networks, as a service that we can provide to the community as efficiently and as beneficially to South Australians as possible. The member for Flinders made mention of one of those initiatives, those processes, that we have been going through in recent times and that is what we call the 90-day project, the modern transport system for the agricultural sector, to try to give people a better service out of the roads, particularly for people in regional areas to allow them to use higher productivity vehicles, higher capacity trucks, perhaps moving from a semitrailer to a B-double or a B-double to a road train or a road train to a triple and so on. In that way, as it saves them money, it means that they can move their goods more efficiently and more quickly either to port or to market, and then we serve them better with our transport systems. That is what we are trying to achieve here.

Of course, the member for MacKillop was also correct. This is not by any stretch of the imagination a job entirely done. This is something that needs to be continued for some time until we are delivering the sorts of benefits that South Australians feel truly satisfied with. They are making best use of their own business or private time and they are minimising the amount of time they have to spend interacting with government agencies.

In addition to these sorts of interactions, we have also announced a digital licensing initiative that will help people using a device like a smart phone, similar to mine here—not that that was a display to the house, I should add. It was a momentary allusion to a smart phone. It will enable people to store a series of licences or permits securely on their smart phone and be able to produce that as a verified form of identification to some form of authorised officer, whether it be one of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure's marine safety officers who might ask a boat operator to see whether they have their current boat licence with them or whether it be a real estate agent to make sure that they have all of the necessary accreditations that they need as well. That will continually be rolled out.

Of course, the big one to include is the regular driver's licence and all the different iterations of the driver's licence, whether it is a regular car licence, an R-date licence for motorcyclists or a heavy vehicle licence as well. Perhaps those younger members of the community will also be very keen and interested to hear that it includes a proof of age card as well. These are important innovations because they provide flexibility for people who need to carry with them these sorts of licences or permits or validations of their identity.

We can do it in a safe and secure way that will give them flexibility rather than carrying around what so many of us to date have had to carry around with us, and that is an enormously bulky wallet or purse—or, in the case of the Speaker, a clutch or portfolio—to ensure that we are always fully

furnished with all the documents and accreditations we may need. I feel I have only but begun to talk to the merits of this particular bill, but I understand that we may have some questions in the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr PISONI: I have some general questions. There were reports today about the need for physical licences to continue to be carried for ID; some venues, for example, will not have the facilities to validate digital licences. I suspect that would be more common for venues and proof of age. Can the minister give the committee some indication as to what the process is for a venue to purchase the equipment to validate electronic licences using apps, what the waiting period is once the application is made and what the set up costs may be?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My understanding is that it is an app-based system, both for the licence holder and for the person who is, for want of a better term, checking, or trying to verify the details of that person's identity—their age, for example. Perhaps a good example is a doorman or a bouncer at a nightclub trying to verify someone's age by their app-based proof of age card. I use that example rather than the driver's licence because the driver's licence has not yet gone live.

My understanding is that the app that has been produced is free to download for the user who seeks to hold their details, proof of age card or other permit or licence, as the case may be, within the app, and the person seeking to verify that also has an app that scans the other person's barcode—I am using the term 'barcode', but I am sure it is not as rudimentary as a barcode—with their smart phone or similar device, also using the same app. That will give them verification as to whether what they being presented with is the correct and true document and not some sort of falsification.

Mr PISONI: Can the minister advise how people's bona fides are confirmed? How do you get your information onto the app in the first place? Currently, with a driver's licence, you show ID at a Service SA centre and pose for a photograph. The photograph is then transposed onto a plastic, credit card-sized licence, so all the evidence is there that the person who has the photograph taken is the licence holder.

Will you need to go into a Service SA centre in order to set your settings for your ID and, later, for your driver's licence when that comes online, and what is the process for the licence holder? Can they do it from home, for example, or does it need to be done in a Service SA centre?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am advised that the system, as it has been designed, is to migrate existing licence holders into a regime where they can retain their existing card but also make use of the app-based system. It is essentially the same as the EzyReg app-based system. We are talking hypothetically because we have not done the drivers' licences, but let's assume that we have for the purposes of the example.

A licence holder would already have a profile, or they would already have the details within the government document system, in a similar way to our vehicles when we seek to have them registered on the EzyReg system. You are able to provide a level of bona fides in there to enable you to bring up the facts of your identity and your account, which can then be represented on the screen of the smart phone or similar device.

When a user seeks to show themselves or another person the bona fides of their licence, permit or whatever it may be, that triggers, in real time, a connection with the TRUMPS online database, which is used by the government to manage all of this, and that is then verified on the screen of the phone in real time. That is important because it ensures that there is not an old, lingering presence or image on that smart phone of somebody's details at some point in the past. It represents the current status and bona fides of the user in real time at this point in time, and ensures that there can be no misrepresentation of whether they are of age or appropriately licensed, etc.

Mr PISONI: If you have moved from interstate and you want to transfer your licence, or if you have just recently got your licence either as an adult or as an 18 year old, do you first need to get a physical licence and then go through the process of having an app-based licence? Similarly, with your proof of age licence, do you need to get the physical licence first or can you go straight to an app-based licence?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: At this point in time, yes, you still need to go through the process of getting a physical licence—a card or a bit of paper—and that existing licence or permit then migrates to the app-based presence on a smart phone. There is a desire in the future to try to reduce those interactions in order to achieve the licence or permit in the first instance, but what we are talking about at the moment is just migrating existing licences.

To draw a parallel, the EzyReg system can be accessed for vehicles that already have registration or are already in the registration system. I do not believe that you are able to register a vehicle for the first time via EzyReg. You still need to go in and undertake an interpersonal process, order plates, be able to receive them, etc., and similarly at this point in time that process will still be necessary for the licence. Trying to migrate some of those processes involved in getting a licence onto an online platform is work for the future.

Mr PISONI: Will this enable the complete elimination of paperwork for, say, the transfer of a motor vehicle registration? Can it be done entirely with the seller and the buyer using only their mobile phones?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My understanding is yes. It can be either. You can still use the paper-based system if that is your preference, but for the first time, through these changes, that can be done online either by the purchaser or by the vendor. I should draw the distinction that the changes we are making here are about those sorts of interactions—transfers of registration, acknowledging disqualifications, etc. These are not the changes that are necessary to the Motor Vehicles Act to enable the app-based licensing.

Mr PISONI: Is it instant? If the money changes hands, the keys change hands and the transaction is made online to transfer the registration to the new owner, and the new owner is then done for speeding five minutes down the track, who gets the bill?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am told it is done in real time. If you were the purchaser of the vehicle using the online transfer of the registration, in your example of a road traffic offence being committing, the purchaser, having gone through that online process, would be seen by the system as the new registered owner. It is probably also worth saying that, of course if there are any fees or charges like stamp duty on the purchase of a vehicle, then you would be asked to do that via a credit card payment, basically, just like you would when you renew your registration at the moment through EzyReg.

Mr PISONI: I think this is the last question. Are there instances where, even if they have the app to read a mobile device, police or hotel staff would insist on the physical proof of age or the physical licence? What does the law say? Does the law say that having it on your phone and being verified through the real-time process is enough? When police pull you up on the side of the road or when you are dealing with someone who is responsible for ensuring that under-age people do not enter nightclubs or drink, is it one or the other, or can they insist on the old system, even though the new system is up and running?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am advised that the changes to the bill provide that it is a legal document, so it is sufficient to satisfy legal requirements. For example, when the police pull over somebody who is on their Ls or Ps and they are required to be carrying their licence, legally this will suffice. Obviously, there is likely to be a period with the police when, as with all other law changes, officers will need to have their attention drawn to the fact of these changes and become used to seeing this out on the road. However, for the purposes of that sort of legal interaction then, yes, it is a fully legal document.

That is not to say that that answer carries as neatly for people manning the doors of a nightclub or a pub, for example, because they still may choose to exercise their discretion, and refuse entry if they so wish, because it is a private premises. However, for the purposes of a police traffic stop then, yes, it is a fully legal document.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 41), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (16:56): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL

Conference

The Legislative Council agreed to grant a conference as requested by the House of Assembly. The Legislative Council named the hour of 8.30am on Wednesday 31 May 2017 to receive the managers on behalf of the House of Assembly at the King William Room on the first floor of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council agreeing to the time and place appointed by the council.

Motion carried.

Adjournment Debate

LITERACY GUARANTEE

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:58): It is a very great privilege that I have the opportunity to talk about some important policy initiatives and their benefits to South Australian people. Last week, the Leader of the Opposition launched what he has committed to if we form government after the election in March, and that is a literacy guarantee for South Australian students and families. Literacy is fundamental to everything that we seek to do in the education system. Frankly, the Liberal Party position can be summed up very simply: we want our schools to be the best in the country and we want our education system to be the best in Australia. To achieve that, we need to deliver a literacy guarantee.

Most of our schools in South Australia and most of our teachers are doing a great job and they are doing very well; however, the NAPLAN standardised test scores show that we need to do better as a system. Eighteen of the 20 categories by which the NAPLAN test results are judged show South Australia is coming fifth or sixth. We are below the national average in 19 out of the 20 categories and this is not good enough. We have to be doing better.

One of the most important ways we can do that is by looking at improving the pedagogy by which some schools are engaging in literacy in the early years and by supporting teachers and families through a range of measures that I propose to detail shortly. One of the quickest ways we can improve literacy standards for the whole community is also one of the most important ways to improve wellbeing in the community, and that is to identify how we can best help those students with dyslexia and other learning difficulties who face special challenges as they learn to read and write. In supporting those students, we can support all students.

We have identified a range of reports that show different estimates on how many students in our system have dyslexia and other learning difficulties, but even the most conservative estimates show that one in 10 students has dyslexia or some other learning difficulty as they go about their schooling. One in 10 South Australians has dyslexia or another learning difficulty, and that presents significant challenges to them learning to read. If you do not have the capacity to effectively read and write (functional illiteracy), that has enormous impacts on your life, your future opportunities and how you get about. Supporting these students who have persistent difficulty with reading, spelling and other parts of their schoolwork is a way that we can really help.

We have done a great deal of research into the most effective ways of teaching students with dyslexia and other learning difficulties. We have spent a great deal of time on this and it has been an interest of mine long before I came to this place. The scientific research has increasingly backed up some of the work that was done at a national level as far as back as 2005 that identified systemic phonics as being a key part of the early years in teaching literacy and the best way to go about it.

This is not necessarily something that should attract controversy across the chamber from the Labor Party. This is a matter about which I asked a series of questions for probably 20 minutes in estimates last year. When we were asking whether phonics was a key part of the government's approach to literacy, the Minister for Education at that stage, who is the current Minister for Education, claimed that it was. We were particularly concerned about whether teachers in our system had sufficient levels of support in their capacity to teach phonics.

One of the things the minister said I thoroughly agreed with. She said that, fortunately, the things you want to do for students with dyslexia and learning difficulties actually work well for all students and that systemic phonics is not only the best way for students with dyslexia and other learning difficulties to learn how to read but it is also the best way for all students to learn how to read. What you do well for one group will work well for all in this case.

Unfortunately, whole language learning was the approach that was very trendy in Australia for a number of years. In the university curriculums, those teachers who went through their training at certain times were not grounded in an effective way of phonics instruction. Whole language was much more compelling for a number of the academics for a number of years. We believe that it is important to give support to those teachers who did not have that in their formal training and who have not had professional development in the teaching of phonics in the years since.

Our schools simply must deliver the best possible literacy programs that meet the needs of students with dyslexia and other learning difficulties, whether it is ADHD, dyscalculia or dysgraphia or others. The staff in our schools must have an understanding of learning difficulties. We have an expectation that all students, regardless of whether or not they have a learning difficulty, must be able to achieve a strong learning outcome.

Our plan involves a range of measures. Firstly, we will look at hiring literacy coaches who will be part of our literacy guarantee unit in the Department for Education. They will be led by a widely respected educator with expertise in dyslexia and other learning difficulties, and those coaches will provide direct support to teachers, both inside and outside the classroom. It is very important that some of this work is delivered inside the classroom so that those teachers can get immediate feedback on how they are going and the way they interact with students can be identified, and they can get that direct personal support. Our model will see more than 500 teachers around South Australia upskilled through this professional development opportunity every year.

We will support the federal government's rollout of phonics checks for all year 1 students in South Australia. While our literacy coaches policy has not been supported by the government, as identified by the minister last week, I am pleased to say that phonics checks are something that the government is piloting in 50 schools later this year. That is welcomed by the opposition, and we will ensure that is rolled out to all schools across South Australia. It is not a burden or an imposition, as suggested by some teachers. It is a five-minute check that will improve pedagogy and help to check that those students are not falling behind.

We will also provide funding to non-government organisations to ensure that dyslexia parent workshops can be rolled out across South Australia. There are a number of opportunities for parents, particularly those who live in the city, to engage in workshops if their children have dyslexia and how they can best support their students. We will ensure that those workshops are significantly expanded, particularly in regional areas that currently lack those opportunities.

We will also put on conferences, particularly in the midyear break, so that the teachers at schools who have not yet been able to receive direct assistance from our literacy coaches are able to access professional development opportunities in the most up-to-date evidence-based pedagogies and the most up-to-date evidence-based ways of supporting students with dyslexia and

other learning difficulties in particular, but also to improve their professional development regarding literacy as a general factor.

Our fifth aspect is in terms of parental engagement. We will roll out a range of measures to improve parental engagement between parents and schools. We know that parents want to help their kids' educational development. That is something that is or should be universal, but sometimes there are barriers to achieving the best possible outcomes—whether through lack of confidence or through issues between the parents and school. We will provide resources to help parents understand how to most effectively engage with their children's education, if they lack that confidence, and we will ensure that all schools provide avenues for parents to engage with teachers about their child's education.

We will recognise the innovative work already being undertaken in some schools in this area to improve parental engagement, and we will roll out that best practice across the state. We will introduce that along with ACARA proficiency standards for our NAPLAN tests so that we are relying not just on the national minimum standards, which are not an impactful and insightful measure of how a student is performing. We will raise our expectations.

We will ensure that literacy and numeracy testing is in place for teaching graduates. The government has it only for those starting their teaching degrees this year. We will not employ a new graduate unless they can pass those literacy and numeracy tests. We will provide support in the early years to address intergenerational disadvantage, through non-government organisations, and we will conduct a review of how SACE exams are conducted for students with learning difficulties. We will make sure that every school that needs one in South Australia is able to access a breakfast program. These are important measures that will improve the outcomes for South Australian students.

LIGHT ELECTORATE SCHOOLS

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (17:08): Earlier today, I discussed some of the schools in my electorate, and I visited some of them last week. I would now like to continue those remarks. There were a couple of other schools I visited that I have not have the opportunity to discuss, and one of those is Xavier College, which is a Catholic college in my electorate. It is a year 8 to 12 school in the Salesian tradition, and there I met a number of students and we had a discussion about their plans for the future. We discussed their school and the facilities at the school.

I was given an opportunity to visit the new student hub, which is part of a recent investment in facilities at the college. The student hub is a resource centre, a library and a whole range of other facilities in a learning space for students, and it is quite an impressive building. I also visited the remodelled chapel at the college, and they have done a wonderful job there. It is a place that is of obvious spiritual importance to the college. I also looked at their native gardens and agricultural centre.

I mention these things because it was obvious to me from visiting these schools—not only Xavier but Trinity, Gawler and District College, Mark Oliphant College, Northern Adelaide Special School and Playford College—that they all take a very holistic approach to their students' wellbeing. Xavier, for example, has a special emphasis on wellbeing. They have a student group that promotes wellbeing amongst peers and a group of young people who are involved in developing programs for their peers. For example, Trinity College is part of the resilience movement, and their teachers have undertaken training and are building resilience in their students.

Gawler and District College is establishing a wellbeing program as well, and I had a chat with the staff member in charge of that program. Mark Oliphant College has put a lot of time, effort and resources into making sure that not only are students' academic requirements being met but also their cultural, spiritual and pastoral needs. All the schools in my area put an emphasis on the pastoral care of their students to grow the students not only academically but also as human beings and citizens of our state. I commend and congratulate all the schools in my area on the very good job they do.

In addition to attending those schools, I also attended a governing council meeting at Munno Para Primary School, a school that faces a number of challenges. It is situated in an area that

unfortunately has not received a great deal of investment from either the private sector or government and is only funded at this point in time as a level 2 school. I have taken that matter up with the Minister for Education because, given the level of disadvantage at that school, I think it should be funded at a higher level. I understand that the minister, through the department, has asked for that funding to be reviewed.

Approximately 30 per cent of the school's students have some sort of learning difficulty or are living with some type of disability. That is quite a high number, so it is disappointing that, because of the ranking or the level of the school, it does not get more resources to assist with that. The principal, Belinda Kopania, is doing a wonderful job with the resources she has, and the teacher body at the school is really A1. They are working with a lot of NGOs to support their students and the parent body.

The school is innovative, in the sense that they pool resources from a whole range of locations and institutions in the area to make sure that their students do not miss out. They run a number of programs to make sure that the young people in this area get a fair go, get a good education and get a fair start in life. One thing that Munno Para Primary School faces, (and to some extent Munno Para preschool as well) is that they are in a community with a high level of welfare and very few resources. For example, it does not even have a local shop. However, I would like to commend Life Church, a Christian church in the area.

Life Church does an amazing job providing a whole range of services to the community, including a kids' playgroup and a group for mothers. They also run a teenager program and a men's program, and two days a week they run a food program for people in need. The church does all that work in the community without any support from the government. They raise money through their own resources and congregation and the donations they receive. I would like to commend Life Church for what they are doing.

I would also like to mention the work that Renewal SA is doing in terms of renewal in that area. The department has started to look at the area as a possible renewal project and they are playing their part. It is good to see a whole range of institutions in the locality, including the Playford city council, which put up its hand, work together to improve the quality of life of not only students and young people in that community but also residents and families in general.

There is another group I would like to mention in the context of schools. I am a member of the Northern Mens Wellbeing Network. This is a network of men and women who provide support and services to men and boys in the community. For example, the Smith Family is an organisation that is part of the network. They provide a number of scholarships to children in Munno Para Primary School and in other schools in the area. I know, for example, that Centacare and Anglicare provide services to students in schools in this community. The City of Playford also provides a number of supports to this community through its men's health programs and other community programs.

Despite the challenges faced by these communities, they are doing very well. They are building resilience and also trying to take control of their future. In closing, I would like to congratulate the school leadership teams and the governing councils in my electorate on doing such a wonderful job preparing our young people for the future not only academically but also as citizens of our communities.

At 17:17 the house adjourned until Wednesday 31 May 2017 at 11:00.