

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 21 June 2017

Parliamentary Procedure

SPEAKER, ABSENCE

The CLERK: I advise the house of the absence of the Speaker. I call the Deputy Speaker to the chair.

The Deputy Speaker took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

The DEPUTY 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.

Bills

PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL

Conference

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (11:02): I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE NEONATAL UNIT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

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

That the 568th report of the committee, entitled Flinders Medical Centre Neonatal Unit Redevelopment Project, be noted.

The Neonatal Unit was established at the Flinders Medical Centre over 30 years ago. Since then, there have been significant changes in technology and the provision of models of care Australia-wide for neonates. In particular, and in addition to medical advances, there has developed with time the recognised value of support and encouragement by family members of those in need, which has led to a natural increase of family involvement in the care of these high-needs babies. This, in turn, means that we need extra space for every crib, not only to accommodate supportive family members but to ensure privacy at this very stressful time.

While highly experienced and skilled clinicians and management have ensured these advances in technology and caregiving have been retrofitted into the current facility with due care and professionalism, necessary changes to the footprint of the nursery must be made to continue to facilitate the best possible care.

The current Neonatal Unit is located over two floors. The main unit is on level 3, with a 12-bed satellite overflow nursery established on level 4. This has resulted in neonatal staff and resources being shared between the two floors. While they have always made this work, the opportunity has arisen, with this proposed upgrade, to consolidate services onto one floor, bringing with it efficiencies recognised and identified by the clinical staff and management. This redevelopment is in line with the revitalisation currently occurring at the Flinders Medical Centre. It is now an appropriate time to co-locate the clinical neonatal services in one area and upgrade the facilities.

The upgrade to the Neonatal Unit will deliver a 50-cot unit over approximately 1,700 square metres, all located on level 3 of the hospital. The redevelopment will provide for family-centred care and the level of acute care facilities will increase, with 16 neonatal intensive care unit cots including four negative pressure and/or isolation cots. These are all level 6 acuity care cots for the more

seriously ill infants. In addition, there will be 10 high-dependency cots, including two physical isolation cots, and 24 special care cots, making 34 level 4/5 acuity care cots.

The neonatal clinical care area on level 3 will also provide baby treatment spaces; consultation, counselling and support spaces for parents and families of admitted babies, as well as three overnight rooms for parents; clinical work and support spaces including medication, equipment stores, milk storage and utilities; and reception and public waiting facilities. This clinical unit has been specifically designed with multiple zones to best manage infection control, privacy and safety. The most acute care cots will be placed farthest from the entrance to minimise foot traffic that can cause disruption to patient treatment and patients' families and minimise infection for the most seriously ill babies.

The neonatal administrative and clinical support unit, that is, the non-clinical neonatal activities, will be located on level 4. This will include workstations for clerical activities, non-clinical work areas for senior clinical staff and clinical research staff, training facilities and meeting and seminar facilities. This area is located within a 45-second walk of the clinical area, should an emergency arise requiring additional staff.

To accommodate the Neonatal Unit on level 3, the Department of Anaesthesia non-clinical support unit will be relocated to the newly refurbished accommodation on level 2, where doctors can undertake non-patient activities associated with patient care, including training in clinical skill development. The department will maintain its telemetry connection with the operating theatres, an important aspect of this move, as clinicians will be able to monitor the theatres and respond promptly, should the need arise. The department is located within the critical travel distance to the operating theatres, being within a two-minute walk.

The committee was informed that there has been extensive consultation with clinical and non-clinical staff. A working group has been established to ensure the design of the new units meets the needs of the staff, as well as the support services and those they are taking care of. Consultation will continue with both staff and other stakeholders throughout the construction phase of this facility to ensure the best possible outcome.

The total cost of this project is \$17.5 million (GST exclusive), with works due to commence this July. The construction will be staged in order to manage the ongoing operations of the unit and should be completed by September 2018. These works are in addition to the Flinders Medical Centre upgrade health project that is continuing at the moment.

As a local member of parliament with constituents who utilise the Flinders Medical Centre services, I have been and will continue to be a strong proponent to ensure this nursery at Flinders Medical Centre, catering for all levels of neonatal care, will not only endure but in fact receive this much welcome upgrade. During the hearing of this project, some committee members raised the previous misinformed discussion on the relocation of level 6 services, which they confused with the apparent total closure of the entire neonatal nursery. This was simply a falsehood and a fearmongering campaign—nothing else. I repeat that at no stage was closure part of the plan of this much-needed and loved neonatal nursery.

As the local member for Elder, and a former practising midwife, I enthusiastically welcome the reconfiguration and upgrade of this very important nursery to those in the south and also country patients. I wish to thank my fellow committee members for considering this project and the due diligence that we all undertook: the members for Colton, Torrens, Finniss and Unley, and I also thank the staff for their assistance.

Before I finish, I would like to say special thanks to the member for Finniss for his work on the committee. For those of you who are not aware, the member was appointed to the Public Works Committee on entering this house in 2006 and has been a member of this committee ever since. That is 11 years of continuous service with one committee. It must be a record. He has considered nearly 330 projects over this period, been on countless site visits—and I have to say is always enthusiastic for site visits and I am grateful for that—and has outlasted several executive officers.

The committee is generally a very harmonious committee that progresses projects with bipartisan support. However, there have been times when we do have disagreements and the member has prepared a number of minority reports over the years. I thank him for his passion in

recent times for the Kangaroo Island airport project, keeping us abreast of what is happening there and ensuring good governance of that project.

With that, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the redevelopment of the Flinders Medical Centre Neonatal Unit and associated works.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (11:10): I also rise to speak to this report. As the Flinders Medical Centre is in the heart of my electorate, I support the works that are going on at the moment. Better late than never. It is 15 years in the making, but it is good to see some progress happening. It is a wonderful investment in the Flinders Medical Centre. Of course, we have seen the government make a few announcements this week in regard to further upgrades at the Flinders Medical Centre with the creation of two new operating theatres for about \$3.5 million, taking the number of theatres from 10 to 12. This is part of the \$1 billion investment in public hospitals announced in the state budget. It is good to see some really good investment in the Flinders Medical Centre.

As the member for Elder talked about in her report, it is good to see the local MPs getting behind projects. I see the member for Fisher is really proud of the \$12 million proposed to be spent in Noarlunga and I know the member for Lee is very excited about the investment in The QEH. Obviously, he was a bit worried about what was happening with The QEH in terms of his community and polling and he convinced the government to spend some money.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DULUK: Investment in local hospitals is most important and it is very important that we are investing in the Flinders Medical Centre. We have seen an upgrade to Modbury Hospital, Deputy Speaker, through your hard work. There is one hospital in my community that is not receiving any money, and that is the Repat. The Repatriation Hospital in my community is not receiving any money in this budget at the moment.

Ms DIGANCE: Point of order: we are actually talking about the Flinders Medical Centre, specifically the neonatal nursery unit.

Ms Chapman: You talked about the Kangaroo Island airport.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am going to listen very carefully to the member for Davenport and I am trying to be very fair. Happy birthday, member for Bragg.

Mr DULUK: Thank you, Deputy Speaker, for your protection. I am talking about my role as the local MP, as the member for Elder talked about in her contribution in her role as the local MP. The Flinders Medical Centre is a fantastic hospital in my electorate. When the Flinders Medical Centre is at capacity and overcrowded, it sends the bulk of its patients down Ayliffes Road to the Repat. On Monday, there were about 206 inpatients at the Repat.

Ms DIGANCE: Point of order: relevance.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think we went into numbers.

Mr DULUK: Numbers are—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We do not need to know numbers.

Mr DULUK: Numbers are very important when it comes to public works, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, but not daily figures.

Mr DULUK: Of course, in terms of investment in the Flinders Medical Centre, which is most important—and we are seeing an extra \$3.5 million to deal with the operating theatres—and the expansion of the Flinders Medical Centre and with the Neonatal Unit at the moment as well, the question is: where is capacity going to be generated at that site to deal with what is happening at the moment with the closure of the Repat? I suppose I can say that I know my community is very concerned—

Ms DIGANCE: Point of order: neonatal care is not performed at the Repatriation Hospital. I think we need to be clear on that. We are talking about the Flinders Medical Centre neonatal nursery care unit.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am going to suspend ruling up the book and listen to you full time now.

Mr DULUK: If the member for Elder is unhappy—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, get back to the report.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Get back to the report.

Mr DULUK: At the moment, we are seeing a fantastic investment in the Flinders Medical Centre and we are seeing an upgrade of the Flinders Medical Centre. As part of the government's \$180 million spend over the last couple of years in the Flinders Medical Centre, they are talking about increasing parking. A huge issue at the moment for many of my residents is access to the Flinders Medical Centre, as the member for Ashford knows, getting around.

One thing people love about the Repat is that it is very easy to get a park, and my constituents are saying to me, 'Sam, what is going to happen when the Repat closes? How am I going to get a park at the Flinders Medical Centre? How am I going to get around? What is the mix going to be between Flinders Private and the Flinders Medical Centre?' Another really big issue people come to me with and say is, 'Sam, they are closing Ward 17 at the Repat—

Ms DIGANCE: Point of order: this is a public works project on the Neonatal Unit at Flinders Medical Centre. No neonates are treated at the Repat.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elder is raising relevance. I must admit, listening closely to you, that parking at the neonatal centre might be the issue, but let's try to focus on the neonatal centre.

Mr DULUK: Point of order: the member for Elder in her contribution talked about the new upgrade of the Flinders Medical Centre, as am I.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: True, but I am not sure—

Mr Pengilly: Talk about Modbury. You would be allowed to do that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That is just 'she said, you said' dobbing. Part of your problem, I suppose, is that the member for Elder's contribution was not quite so wideranging.

Mr Knoll: What? Because it wasn't attacking the government?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: She covered areas, but I think you have had a fair bash at that bit. Move on to the next bit you are going to have a go at. I think that is part of your problem.

Mr DULUK: Thank you, Deputy Speaker, for allowing me to move on to talk about older person's mental health at Flinders which—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No.

Mr DULUK: As part of the current development—

Ms DIGANCE: Point of order: when I spoke about the Flinders Medical Centre, I did a generic—

Mr Knoll: What is the point of order?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Relevance, again.

Ms DIGANCE: The point of order is relevance. This is about the neonatal—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down. Everybody just take a break. We are still going to listen very carefully. Try to focus on this report, if that is possible. That would be good.

Mr DULUK: Of course, the member for Elder in her report talked about consultation with clinicians and obviously how it is very important to work with clinicians to get the right footprint at the Flinders Medical Centre. We are seeing some of the services move from different levels, which is most important and of course, in a more broader sense, there would have been consultation across the board with other clinicians and other areas of the hospital to make movements for the changes to accommodate the new neonatal centre.

One thing I would like to put on the record is the consultation between government and SALHN. The Flinders Medical Centre is within SALHN and the Neonatal Unit is obviously within the Flinders Medical Centre. The Repatriation Hospital is another hospital that is in SALHN. Recently, in evidence given to the committee into Transforming Health, which is to do with SALHN and the Flinders Medical Centre and the Neonatal Unit within that, was the future use of Ward 18, which of course is the geriatric unit within the Repat, which is within SALHN, which is within Flinders Medical Centre with the neonatal centre right there.

Ms DIGANCE: Point of order: relevance. No neonates go to Ward 18. They never have.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DULUK: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. If the member for Elder will listen to me then she will—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have not said anything yet. It is only 20 past 11. It is going to be a very long day if we have to keep stopping every five seconds for a discussion on a report like this. Please keep concentrating on the actual report, which is on the neonatal care unit.

Mr DULUK: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. If the member for Elder is listening, I was talking obviously about relocating services across the Flinders Medical Centre, which has happened as part of this public work inquiry into neonatal services, so there had to be some rejigging of services and where they were located. As part of the relocation, we are seeing some new investment at the Flinders Medical Centre for an older persons mental health service within that. I am not sure what levels were being switched—levels 4 or 5—but I am sure that the member for Elder will be able to tell me if I am wrong.

In terms of making room at the Flinders Medical Centre for the new neonatal centre, discussion with SALHN would have to have occurred with regard to what is happening in Ward 18 at the Repat. Recent evidence to the select committee on 9 June 2017 states:

ACH to date has had no discussions with government about potentially using Ward 18 post-settlement as the facility—

Ms DIGANCE: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. Member for Davenport, point of order on my right.

Ms DIGANCE: ACH do not care for neonates.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Relevance. Before you keep going, it would be best to perhaps realise that my role in the house is to prevent arguments between members, within standing orders of course, but it would be fair to say perhaps that you are going out of your way this morning to perhaps not concentrate as much as we would like on the Neonatal Unit. Is there going to be any part of your contribution about the Neonatal Unit?

An honourable member: Probably not.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Probably not? No, I did not think so. Let's hear you out. You might say something about the Neonatal Unit in a minute. Off you go.

Mr DULUK: Deputy Speaker, this is all about the Neonatal Unit. Actually, this is about where, two years ago—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are being very naughty, now.

Mr DULUK: —the government actually wanted to close the Neonatal Unit at the Flinders Medical Centre. This is all about the Neonatal Unit, this is all about a huge hospital in my electorate. This is all about health care in South Australia. This is all extremely relevant, and if those opposite do not want to hear about what they have been doing across the board to destroy health care and the provision of health care, especially in my community—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: But, you see, within your contribution now you are not actually talking about the Neonatal Unit at all.

Mr DULUK: I am coming back to the Neonatal Unit.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Great, let's hear it.

Mr DULUK: Two years ago, the government wanted to close the Neonatal Unit, as you well know, Deputy Speaker.

Ms DIGANCE: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Ms DIGANCE: No, the government were not going to close—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Listen! The member for Elder did cover part of that in her contribution, which is on the record, so we are going to listen to what the member for Davenport has to say and then we will see.

Mr BELL: Can I get a point of clarification, Deputy Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr BELL: In October last year, when the Natural Resources Committee handed down a finding on fracking in the South-East, the Treasurer came in here and deviated wildly from the substance of that report. You ruled, I think quite correctly, that there was a broad scope within the report to make comment on it, so if the scope is health—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay. Sit down now. I am sure that on that day I took advice as well, and I am taking advice this morning. Let's move back to the report. I am sure other members have other things to say as well. I am trying to be as fair as I can.

Mr DULUK: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I would have finished by now if I had not been interrupted so much by the member for Elder. Two or three years ago, the community rallied to keep services at the Flinders Medical Centre. I recall being there on a Sunday with the leader, the member for Mitchell and the member for Bright. I did not see the member for Elder there at the community protest, but the community in southern Adelaide, in SALHN, which includes the Flinders Medical Centre, the Repatriation Hospital and Noarlunga Hospital at the moment, was disgusted about what the government wanted to do to the neonatal services at the Flinders Medical Centre. That is a fact.

It is a disgrace that those opposite even contemplated reducing services at that site, as it has been a disgrace that they have been reducing services across the board, across all South Australia, in recent years, only then to reinstate them and build them back up as they are at the moment. This is the cynical nature of the government at the moment when it comes to health care. What we saw in the way they were treating the neonatal facility two or three years ago at the Flinders Medical Centre we have seen repeated across the board. We have seen it with cardiology at The QEH and we have seen it in the hospital in your area.

The neonatal centre at the Flinders Medical Centre is a very important, much-loved part of the Flinders Medical Centre. Obviously, there have been adjustments at the moment in terms of its positioning, and it is fantastic to see that in my community the neonatal services will continue through the hard work of the community lobbying, and keeping this government accountable, and of all of us on this side of the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It reminds me a bit of the time when we were discussing the privatisation of the Modbury Hospital, but I wouldn't say that, would I? The member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:24): I will try not to be too controversial.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is your last contribution as a member of the committee.

Mr PENGILLY: Well, that is right. We could get back to that. I might do that later on today, actually. This indeed is a much-needed project, but it is worth noting that, yes, the government was going to close it down and degrade it; there is no question about that whatsoever. The member for Davenport is quite right. I also hope, with the introduction of this new facility, that the member for Davenport might work quite hard to fill it up.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What? Hang on. Is that in the biblical sense?

Mr PENGILLY: We are still waiting and it is too much information. The opposition members were supportive of this project, as indeed they were of the KI airport project, which the member for Elder raised during her speech. It is a much-needed project. It is a major concern, with the declining population in the state, that we wonder where we are going to have to go with all these medical facilities, but the neonatal unit that was presented by government officers was a well put forward project.

I know that the member for Davenport pushed very heavily and lobbied to have it done, so congratulations to him on that. He is an outstanding local member up there and in due course he will make a good local member for the seat of Waite, I hope, but that is another story. There was not any great degree of opposition from anyone on this. Indeed, a number of questions were asked from across the committee and we supported the project.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:26): I would like to thank the members for Davenport and Finniss for their contributions, but I do want to highlight the fake news they have talked about, that the unit was going to close, because it never was going to close. There was discussion about the level 6 part of the care of that unit, but it was never going to close, so that was fake news over there. Bipartisan support was unanimous on this project. It is seen as a very valuable project for those in the southern area and also for country members. I recommend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: UPPER YORKE PENINSULA REGIONAL ROAD NETWORK UPGRADE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:27): I move:

That the 569th report of the committee, entitled Upper Yorke Peninsula Regional Road Network Upgrade, be noted.

As part of the \$39 million upgrade program for the road network in the Upper Yorke Peninsula region, three projects were referred to the Public Works Committee for consideration. In no particular order, they are: the upgrade to the Bute to Kulpara road, which will include pavement rehabilitation and the sealing of the shoulder for approximately 10 kilometres; safety improvements on the Copper Coast Highway between Kadina and Paskeville, which includes shoulder widening and sealing, pavement reconstruction and resealing and 17 kilometres of audio tactile line markings; and safety improvements along the Yorke Highway, incorporating hazard reductions, shoulder sealing and intersection upgrades.

These improvements to the Yorke Highway will allow the section of the road between Ardrossan and Port Wakefield to be used by 36.5-metre road trains, which have previously been restricted from using this section of the Yorke Highway. It will allow for efficiencies in transport in exporting goods from Yorke Peninsula. It is understood that these road improvements will address the number of regional road crashes, reducing the number of fatalities and casualties on our roads, as well as reducing the general wear and tear on vehicles.

The committee was informed that local councils, the general community and local MPs impacted by these upgrades have been consulted and that they are generally supportive of these

much-needed upgrades. The member for Goyder did raise concerns with the committee regarding the proposal to construct a roundabout at the intersection of the Yorke and Copper Coast highways. I thank the member for his time in presenting to the committee.

The proposed roundabout is an attempt to manage the long queues of traffic trying to enter the Copper Coast Highway from eastern Yorke Peninsula after holiday periods and long weekends. I am sure that many of us are familiar with that particular intersection. The concern is that the solution proposed will divert the problem into the Copper Coast Highway, restricting traffic entry from the western side of the peninsula, hence addressing one issue but creating another.

Although this project was not being considered by the committee at this time, we were grateful that the member raised the matter as it is very important to consider and be aware of the issue, and it was timely to bring it to the attention of the relevant departmental staff who were present at the hearing. The construction work for some of these projects has already commenced. The works will continue over the next 12 months, and there will be ongoing consultation throughout the program of the works.

I thank my fellow committee members: the members for Colton, Torrens, Finnis and Unley, as well as our committee staff for their diligence and assistance with the projects that come before us. Given this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:30): I thank the committee Chair (the member for Elder) for presenting the report, and I was also very grateful for the opportunity to make a presentation to the committee about it. I have stated in this house, and I have put on other forms of public record, my appreciation of the investment that is occurring. It is one that is highly appreciated across the electorate, and it serves more than just Goyder. Indeed, there are some boundary areas where the member for Frome will also benefit from an infrastructure upgrade that is occurring there.

This investment has been needed for many years, and I do not think anyone would deny that, but it is not the end of the investment that needs to occur, and I know others will probably also speak about that. There is a variety of infrastructure areas that need to be upgraded, and this is an important start. It is one for which I am thankful, and it is one which I was grateful to have the opportunity to present to the committee.

At the time of being invited to the committee, the specific projects to be considered were not defined to me, so I went there with the intention to, yes, express my appreciation of the investment, but also to put my concerns about the one particular project at Federation Corner. The committee Chair (the member for Elder) has been good enough to outline that in her presentation this morning.

I still hold those concerns, and they come back to a meeting that the Minister for Transport was good enough to attend here in Parliament House on 19 October last year where the mayors or CEOs in the alliance of Yorke Peninsula councils—being Yorke Peninsula Council, Copper Coast, Barunga West and Wakefield regional councils—met with the minister and me. They put their concerns, particularly about Federation Corner, and the worry that, while the design is an improvement, there is a concern that it will still not cater for that peak travel time. While the project costs nearly \$4 million, it is slightly under that threshold figure for projects that the Public Works Committee has to consider, but the committee was good enough to consider my concerns.

I have only just received correspondence from the Minister for Transport earlier this week that responds to the concerns that I put in writing in the follow-up to that meeting from 19 October confirming that, indeed, there will not be a redesign of the roundabout. The request from the alliance of councils and me was for a slip lane, to use another term, that would enable Copper Coast traffic heading south to travel to the east of the roundabout and then join on the southern side of the roundabout.

The concern is that, at the moment, the design principles seem to indicate to those who have looked at it and those who travel through it often that it will take away the current challenge of Yorke Peninsula traffic that attempts to get onto the Copper Coast Highway, because it has to give way to the continuing traffic heading south from the Copper Coast. The challenge will become that the Copper Coast traffic will have to stop and wait for Yorke Peninsula traffic entering the roundabout to go around first, and it will just create the challenge in another direction.

We put this approach quite seriously to the minister in the belief that we want the investment to occur. It is nearly \$4 million, but we want the investment to have long-term benefits for the community, and that is what the focus has to be. We do not want there to be a fix that has to occur after this. We do not want it to be a political argument, but it is likely to be that because the concern is that the solution, as proposed, will not fix it.

I can give some practical examples. At peak holiday times—having travelled on it deliberately a couple of times to check how bad the travel issues were—those who are familiar with the area will know that if you are coming from the Yorke Peninsula side, there is an old railway line crossing, which is about two kilometres west of the Federation Corner intersection as it is now. It took me 33 minutes to travel two kilometres and then, joining the Copper Coast traffic heading towards Port Wakefield to the intersection of Highway 1 and the Copper Coast Highway, it took me another 27 minutes to do about eight kilometres and get around that corner. That is an hour or so to do 10 kilometres.

This roundabout is an important component of a fix opportunity, where multiple areas of investment need to occur to improve traffic movement approaching Port Wakefield and through Port Wakefield, but the real concern is that this investment will create problems. I am grateful that the committee listened to it. There were several questions put, and officers confirmed that they were not there to speak about that particular project, which was rather frustrating. I want to put on the record that I have had concerns for some time.

It was probably in August of last year when the community suddenly became aware of the investment. It was not part of the post-budget announcements, which I found particularly interesting. Nearly \$36 million was to be spent on road infrastructure, but it was not loudly trumpeted that this investment was to occur: it came out later in a very soft media release. The investment is appropriate, and I want to make sure that we get the best possible bang. The projects that the member for Elder has highlighted, which are part of the report, are fantastic—there is no doubt about that. They will improve the road network and make the travelling community much happier about the conditions they face.

For the permanent residents, it is an issue that they adjust to—they do not like it and they want it to be improved—but my concern has always been that, for a very popular tourist area in particular, we have a potentially fickle travelling public, and I do not want them to be challenged about where they intend to be. That is part of the reason why I want the infrastructure to be the best, to ensure that people who choose to come to our area, or consider coming to the area, have good traffic conditions at all times and good road conditions at all times. If they do not get that, they might choose to go somewhere else, and then the reason I have the opportunity to represent the area will be challenged because we will not get the economic drives that come from tourist visitors.

It is really important to get the investment right. I am grateful for the opportunity to talk about it. I still call upon the minister, even at this very late stage, to review what the plans might be to get a better outcome. Part of the response that came back from the minister earlier this week talked about the fact that the slip lane proposal, which I have talked about at length in several forums, is suggested to come at a cost of about \$1½ million. There was no detail behind that pricing. The minister enforces again that the traffic model around which the design is based seems to highlight that the maximum wait distance will be about 70 metres from the roundabout for any vehicle approaching at any time. I hope it proves to be that, but I have grave concerns that it will not be. I commend the committee on the report.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Schubert.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:37): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Can I say that purple is your colour.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It will not work, whatever you are going to say.

Mr KNOLL: I rise today to speak to the Upper Yorke Peninsula regional road network upgrade project and wish to do so by saying that, as we consider these reports, sometimes plenty of testosterone flows. In fact, the colour purple is supposed to suppress testosterone.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am taking it off at once. I want you to be yourself, member for Schubert.

Mr KNOLL: As a proud scholarship holder to Christian Brothers, I know that purple was used everywhere, including in the drama theatre where I spent a lot of time away from the cool kids. What I want to do this morning is acknowledge the investment that the government is making into the Upper Yorke Peninsula regional road network around the Bute to Kulpara road and the Copper Coast Highway upgrades on Yorke Peninsula.

What I want to put on the record are some of the local concerns about roads around that area. Next month, I am due to go out and take a firsthand look at that road network. Concerned local citizen and resident of Kadina, Fraser Ellis, has invited me to come up and have a look because it is an issue that he is extremely concerned about. In fact, in every conversation I have had with him when we talk about issues that he has in his local community, this is the issue he raises first and foremost.

We do note in the RAA's recent state of the roads report that seven of the 10 worst roads were in regional South Australia, and that makes this investment all the more important. Issues that have been highlighted to me by Fraser so far, which I hope to look at, are issues between Port Wakefield and Kadina on the Copper Coast Highway, particularly in front of the Paskeville Field Day site, which is a huge showpiece that brings a whole heap of people to the area. This stretch of road is quite embarrassing, as it is around the Port Wakefield corner, which I am told is colloquially known as 'crash corner'. This is really the worst nickname that an intersection can have. I look forward to visiting and understanding the concerns that exist there.

It looks like the issues around the Bute to Kulpara road will be covered as part of this redevelopment, and that is extremely welcome. Another patch we need to consider is the stretch between Arthurton and Minlaton. That is not included as part of this project and is something that is missing. I have travelled through a lot of country South Australia and there are a couple of patches of road in my electorate that I have been fighting for, in particular one on the Stott Highway, which the government has agreed to fund. It has taken a bit of time to get there, but I trust the government when they say it is still going ahead.

I have to concede that the worst roads exist on Yorke Peninsula. It really is a blight and an indictment and needs to be fixed. Certainly, this is a welcome investment, but this cannot be the end. More needs to be invested in that area, especially now. Yorke Peninsula is a huge grain-producing region. We do not have trains anymore; we have trucks and a road network. The largest export out of South Australia, especially in good years, is grain. If we are to look after this huge export industry, we need to make sure that we have an efficient road network that supports that.

If we put aside communications, access to a quality road network is one of the main ways that we can help to keep our communities connected. If we want to help keep regional South Australia vibrant, keep people in our regions and keep our regions productive, then investment in keeping people connected, either through communications or, in this case, through road infrastructure upgrades—or at least maintenance—is extremely important.

I would like to thank Kadina resident Fraser Ellis for continuing to bring these issues to my attention. I look forward to catching up with him to see firsthand the various spots that he has identified, especially the ones that do not relate to this project. I look forward to the current member for Goyder continuing to lobby on behalf of his community and for local residents out there to make sure that their voice is heard and heard more loudly against what are often the deaf ears of a very city-centric government.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:43): I have very little to say about these projects. The member for Goyder came into the hearing and had a few words to say and put forward some ideas, which were taken on board by departmental officers who were there, but it was really a no-brainer—we supported the project. It was good, for a change, to see the government spend some money in regional areas.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:44): I thank the members for Goyder, Schubert and Finniss for their contributions to supporting this project. With that, I recommend the project to the house.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2017-18

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:44): I move:

That the 95th report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2017-18, be noted.

The Economic and Finance Committee has an annual statutory duty to inquire into, consider and report on the Treasurer's determinations in relation to the emergency services levy. The committee has 21 days to report on the written determinations after it is referred to the committee.

This year the committee received the Treasurer's statement on 30 May. The Emergency Services Funding Act requires the statement to include determinations in respect of the amount that needs to be raised by means of the levy to fund emergency services, the amounts to be expended for various kinds of emergency services and the extent to which the various parts of the state will benefit from the application of that amount.

Just so we are clear on the services funded by the emergency services levy, the definition given to the 'emergency service' in the act is very specific. It means a service provided by the South Australian Country Fire Service, the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, the South Australian State Emergency Service, Surf Life Saving South Australia, a member of Volunteer Marine Rescue SA or a service provided by South Australia Police related to, assisting with, or incidental to those organisations I have listed.

On 7 June, the Economic and Finance Committee held a public hearing. We invited representatives of the Department of Treasury and Finance, SAFECOM, the MFS, the CFS and the SES. These witnesses provided the committee with details on the proposed levy for the 2017-18 year. On 20 June, the committee tabled its report to meet the 21-day requirement. I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the tremendous work that all our volunteer and paid emergency services responders do, which the community relies upon and for which we are extremely grateful.

In light of that, the committee notes that the total expenditure on emergency services for the 2016-17 financial year is estimated to reach \$291.7 million, which is \$2 million more than was originally projected, largely due to extraordinary costs associated with the extreme weather event in September 2016. The committee notes that the total expenditure on emergency services is projected to be \$302 million in the 2017-18 financial year. This will be funded by the emergency services levy component of \$291.5 million.

This target expenditure is \$10.3 million higher than the 2016-17 estimated outcome. The committee was told that this reflects growth in base expenditure, funding provided for the enhancement of SES and MFS call response systems, the purchase of new protective clothing for MFS firefighters, and training delivered to Volunteer Marine Rescue members and SES volunteers.

The committee notes that there will be a decrease in the prescribed levy rate for owners of fixed property in the 2017-18 financial year, and the effective levy rate remains unchanged for eligible concession holders. The committee also notes that cash balances in the Community Emergency Services Fund are expected to be \$22.3 million by 30 June this financial year.

The committee has fulfilled its obligations under the Emergency Services Funding Act 1998. I take this opportunity to thank the current members of the Economic and Finance Committee, departmental representatives from Treasury and Finance, the chief executive of SAFECOM and the chief officers of the MFS, the CFS and the SES who assisted the committee in reporting on the Treasurer's determinations. Therefore, pursuant to section 6 of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Economic and Finance Committee recommends to parliament that it note this report.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:48): I rise to make a contribution on this report. As is customary, the opposition has agreed to note the report whilst reserving the right to discuss some of its contents.

I want to firstly break down the revenue side of the equation and then talk about the expenditure side of the equation in the second half of my contribution. We have seen huge increases in our ESL bills since 2014-15, when the removal of remissions saw an extra \$90 million being levied

against the people of South Australia. What we have seen since that time is a 2 to 3½ per cent increase in the ESL.

Essentially, what happened two years ago was we made an allowance to be recovered of about \$7.5 million for the Sampson Flat bushfire. That bushfire happened six months before the end of the financial year, and that money was sought to be recovered. Last year, we saw the Pinery bushfire stripped out, and a separate increase of about \$2.8 million to the ESL was sought specifically to cover that fire. But what was interesting to me was that even though we separated that amount and asked for the \$2.8 million, which is less than the \$7.5 million that was asked for the year before, we still had an effective increase of about 3.5 per cent.

But if we were to discount the fact that the Sampson Flat bushfire recovery was a one-off, we were essentially in real terms providing somewhere north of a 5 per cent increase to the ESL in the 2016-17 year. So, it was not surprising this year that we had a smaller increase. There was a small reduction in the rate, which was offset by an increase in property values, which essentially gave us a zero nominal total increase. Having said that, there were discussions about the floods and the costs that were associated with having firefighters and emergency services personnel come in from interstate to help fight that fire and the various associated costs. It was a separate incident, and a separate bucket of money was not sought outside of the normal ESL process.

We have seen ESL increases well above inflation. We have seen ESL increases with the removal of the remissions showing huge increases to the bills that people pay in their household, and that has an effect. It has an effect in the form of the number of people who are not able to pay their ESL bills. The most surprising statistic that we heard on the day was that there are now 21,000 people who have not paid their ESL bill at a total outstanding debt of \$12.5 million. That is up from about \$4.5 million to \$5 million in the previous year. That is a huge increase.

In this place, we talk about the cost of living, about the pressure that families are under, and sometimes it can be an esoteric or abstract discussion. People can glibly say that there are people out there doing it tough. The ESL hearing this year brought home in a very real way the fact that we can number these people. There are 21,000 families out there who are struggling to pay their ESL bill; 21,000 families who have most likely prioritised paying their increased electricity bill, who most likely have prioritised paying their kids' school fees or putting food on the table. When it comes to this tax, even though interest will then be levied against that outstanding amount, people have chosen to pay for other things in order to keep the lights on in their household and put food on the table. These 21,000 families are sending a very clear signal to the government that they are struggling.

The fact that we have seen a threefold increase in the amount of outstanding debt speaks to the fact that this problem is getting worse. It is getting worse because people are paying more for utilities, whether they be water or electricity, and people are paying increased taxation. The ESL and the increases to council rates are probably two of the most significant examples. For me, this was a very clear opportunity to understand and make a connection to the very real problems that 21,000 families are telling us they face.

This is why we in the Liberal Party have a very clear position on how we are going to fix this problem, and that is to return to the average household \$150. That is a significant commitment. It is going to be a significant commitment and a significant hit to the budget, but it will not lead to a decrease in the amount of funding for the emergency services agencies of \$90 million. It will not.

When the government say that, they are flat out not being straight with the South Australian people because, when the remissions were removed in the first place, that did not lead to a \$90 million increase in the amount of funding that emergency services got. That \$90 million went to general revenue. The extra \$90 million that South Australian households paid displaced government revenue that came from general government revenue coffers. So, when we reverse this decision and put that average \$150 back into the South Australian household pocket, it will come from the same place, and that is from general revenue.

The government are out there trying to muddy the waters to try to confuse people into thinking that somehow the \$90 million increase all went to emergency services—it did not, and I find the comments frustrating and, borderline, worse. They are probably as ill informed as they are

offensive. This will be a clear point of difference between the Liberal Party and the Labor Party at the next election and it will provide two alternative views on how we look at taxation.

We have a higher taxing government that looks for ever-increasing ways to punish anyone who tries to own the Australian dream or a party that seeks to make it that bit easier to put food on the table, that bit easier to pay your ESL bill, that bit easier to get on with life. We know that putting that money back into the pockets of South Australians means that that money will flow through our economy and stimulate our economy, and that is why tax cuts are so important in the mix of any government: to try to stimulate growth within the economy. We know that stimulating growth is code for new jobs—something this government would like to learn something about when it talks about job budgets, whilst at the same time jacking up taxes.

On the spending side of the equation a lot of good and worthy work is being done. We heard that the MFS will be \$2 million over budget this year, mainly because it has an ageing workforce, a higher workers compensation liability and plenty of blokes with long service leave and annual leave built up, and those liabilities weigh heavily on the department. It is something that no doubt they will have to deal with. We asked questions around the Mount Barker CFS and whether or not that would be switched to an MFS station. I put on the record now a concern that has been highlighted to me by a local lawyer from Mount Barker, Dan Cregan.

He has raised with me the issue of how we will deal with this transition from a CFS station, which is much loved by the community and which has performed a very professional service in a high growth area of our state for a long time, to an MFS station. No time lines were given and no understanding of how the process would work, but I put on record the fact that, if the government is going to switch (and there is a long-term goal by 2020-24 to put this in place and switch to MFS), those hardworking CFS volunteers, who have been doing this on a volunteer basis for many years, should be given the first opportunity to apply for those retained MFS positions.

Those people who were willing to give of their time voluntarily should be afforded the first opportunity to apply for those positions, and it is something I will push for as the shadow minister and something I know Dan Cregan, as a local community advocate, will be pushing for. I look forward to a sensible resolution on that issue as it transitions in time to come.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (11:58): I know that I do not have a lot of time left on this report. I will make a few brief statements now and make some more at a future date. I would like to speak to the emergency services 2017-18 report, as provided to the Economic and Finance Committee. I am sure that in a future contribution the member for Elder would like to make some comments about the emergency services levy and the report as well.

Following on from the member for Schubert, on 7 June we had some hearings in regard to the ESL for the next 12 months, and it was an opportunity to get a bit of an indication of the priorities of the government in terms of ESL spending. We have seen the government make an announcement that in 2017-18 it is, essentially, going to return—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you going to seek leave to continue your remarks?

Mr DULUK: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

INDUSTRY ADVOCATE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 June 2017.)

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:00): I will continue my remarks on this bill from yesterday. Obviously the strong interest I have in this bill centres around steel, but there is a whole raft of other aspects that are crucially important for the economic development of our state. The work done to

date by the Industry Advocate and his office has made a very positive contribution when it comes to state procurement policy in South Australia.

I will carry on with my remarks about the steel industry. The South Australian government believes that the quality of locally produced steel and steelwork creates a competitive advantage for our steel suppliers and fabricators that should be capitalised on. Government projects that use significant amounts of steel include a 20 per cent industry participation weighting at tender that measures commitment to local jobs, investment and the supply chain opportunities. As I said yesterday, this participation policy represents a very important part of the approach to maximising, for South Australia-based companies, the economic opportunities that exist. This is especially important for the steel industry.

The success of this policy is already evident through projects like the Northern Connector road project won by Lendlease Engineering. The Northern Connector will use about 7,500 tonnes of reinforcing or structural steel from the Arrium steelworks in Whyalla in the \$985 million construction project. It is probably also worth mentioning, when it comes to reinforcing, that the actual reinforcing itself is not produced in Whyalla. It is produced in the Eastern States, but the steelworks in Whyalla produce the billets that are then sent to the Eastern States to be turned into reinforcing.

Other key state-funded infrastructure projects that incorporate the use of steel from Australian standard-certified mills and fabricators include the Torrens to Torrens, O-Bahn City Access and the Darlington Upgrade projects. These have already given Arrium an estimated steel component benefit of approximately \$68 million. Tony Dixon from the Australian Steel Institute notes, 'The introduction of this bill to parliament fully demonstrates the South Australian government's continued commitment to maximising opportunities for local industry.'

When we initially launched the policy surrounding steel back in Whyalla towards the end of 2015 I think it was, the peak body, the Australian Steel Institute, at the time indicated that this was the best policy in the nation. He was keen, as I was, for other states and the federal government to replicate the very progressive policy position we had taken in South Australia when it came to supporting the steel industry. Arrium management at the time also indicated that it was a fantastic policy, the best policy in the country, and a policy that would lead to a very tangible difference in the use of Australian steel when it came to taxpayer-funded projects in South Australia. They also hoped that we would see this policy replicated elsewhere in the country.

Recent revisions to the South Australian Industry Participation Policy have also seen a greater focus on opportunities for regional development from government procurement activities. One of the issues with regional businesses is that over time they have missed out on some of the state-based procurement work. Sometimes it is the issue of scale and sometimes it is the emphasis on efficiency and reducing cost that often leads to very big companies being able to deliver price savings, but this often comes at the expense of regional businesses. We need a far more nuanced approach to ensuring that regional businesses benefit from state government procurement policy.

Public procurement spending in regional areas provides important flow-on benefits to the rest of the community. This encourages regional businesses, directly and indirectly involved in supplying to government, to invest, improve and expand their operations. A recent example of that is the refurbishment of a number of Housing SA properties in Whyalla. That has been structured in a way to directly benefit local contractors and local employment. There have been a number of examples of that nature lately. It was great to see some of the STEM developments in our school system, with regional businesses winning those particular contracts.

We want to make sure that regional businesses get opportunities to win government contracts. Under the revised policy, for any contract valued above \$33,000 in a region, government agencies will need to seek a quote from a business in that region. There is a new regional industry participation plan template for contracts valued at \$1 million or greater that sees a larger proportion of the industry participation weighting attributed to businesses based in the region, helping those businesses achieve a higher industry participation score in tender evaluations. That is an important step forward that will help a number of businesses located in regional South Australia. I believe there is a lot more that we can be doing to assist regional businesses.

Jeremy Hawkes, managing director of Bowhill Engineering, a regional steel fabrication business, says:

The work we now have on large infrastructure project is a direct result of the State Government's Industry Participation Policy...and the role of the Industry Advocate...

Yesterday, I noted with interest some of the comments made by the member for Mitchell when he was speaking to the bill. I am pleased those opposite, in the main, support the bill. The member for Mitchell was emphasising the challenges faced by the South Australian economy when it comes to employment. Of course, it was all doom and gloom: a litany of negatives. There are some real challenges out there arising, if you like, out of the historical structure of the South Australian economy. But there are strategies in place to start to address some of those challenges. I am pleased with some of the strategies that are going to significantly benefit regional South Australia.

I highlight the \$20 million copper strategy that has been developed by the state and, before the development of that copper strategy, the PACE program, which had already established some successes when it came to copper resources in South Australia. As a direct result of state government intervention and financial assistance with the exploration program, we helped uncover the largest undeveloped copper deposit in Australia.

It looks like that is now going to translate into real jobs in regional South Australia, potentially 400 jobs during construction at Carrapateena and 400 jobs at the mine site in an ongoing sense, not to mention the 100 jobs that will be developed at the copper concentrate plant. I believe that there is a real potential to build on those initiatives through the very sophisticated copper strategy that is being developed.

Another one of those mineral-based strategies is the magnetite strategy. We have a massive magnetite resource in this state, and there is a strong belief that over time China and other countries are going to increasingly shift to magnetite because it is a cleaner source, if you like, of iron ore, given that it is an exothermic mineral when processed, so it gives off energy and brings companies exploiting it down on the cost curve. They are a couple of strategies that I think are going to benefit South Australia and Australia in the long run.

I am always interested when those opposite start talking about renewables, and I should flag that I have had an active involvement in the renewable sector in one way or another going back to 1998. The member for Mitchell commented the other week that we should adopt the national target when it comes to renewables. Expressed as a percentage, that is 23.5 per cent, so to ask us to adopt the national target is a bizarre policy, given that we are up around 50 per cent.

I would like to go around regional communities with the member for Mitchell and explain which of the wind farms that are currently in place should close. He could come to Whyalla with me where we have the first utility-scale solar project on the way, which is employing local contractors, and he could come and explain to them why that project should come to an end because we exceed by far this national target. I could take him to Ottoway Engineering—

Time expired.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I advise members that the live streaming is being tested today, so work out which side is your best angle for the camera and then make sure it is facing whichever camera you are closest to.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:12): I would like to make a few comments in support of the Industry Advocate Bill from my perspective as a member of parliament who represents Gawler and the northern suburbs. From my reading of the bill, this new legislation will provide the Industry Advocate with more power to recommend reforms to state government and ensure that commitments made by contractors through industry participation plans are acted upon.

In addition to recent policy reforms, the Industry Advocate has been given the power to investigate why competitive South Australian suppliers miss out on government contracts. So, it is quite clear that when this bill passes and becomes an act, it will enable the Industry Advocate to make sure that he can advocate for small business in South Australia.

The South Australian Industry Participation Policy has recently been revised to incorporate into a single comprehensive framework the strategic procurement policy regarding steel, regional development, Aboriginal participation, innovation and growth, investment attraction and economic participation in regions, so we are really focusing on ensuring that jobs remain in South Australia. The bill sets out the objectives of the South Australian Industry Participation Policy and confirms the South Australian government's commitment to the establishment and maintenance of the South Australian Industry Participation Policy. It also establishes the Industry Advocate as a statutory position with specific functions and powers to further the objectives of the policy.

The bill makes very clear this government's commitment to putting small business at the centre of all of our economic policy and outlines a whole range of functions for the Industry Advocate. One that I would like to draw upon in addition to the ones that are mentioned in the bill is to also encourage the adoption of industry participation principles by local government. I think that is a very important function because one of the complaints I receive from local small business in my area—and in fact it was reported in the local newspapers over the last 12 months—is that some small businesses that win state government contracts unfortunately do not even get invited to participate in the process for tenders for local contracts.

The small businesses I am talking about are not saying they should be given the contract automatically. What they are saying is that they would like to know when the council has contracts out and be invited to participate in the tender process. It is as simple as that, yet it does not happen. This policy, which is now a state government policy, encourages local government. It would be great to see local councils do what we are doing at a state level. That does not mean all local businesses will win that work, but at least it puts them in the running and, given their local knowledge, and given perhaps that they have a lower cost structure because they are local, they may be able to compete effectively for this business, which is very important.

I will certainly be discussing this bill and this provision with councils in my area and asking them to make sure that they perhaps have a register of local businesses and invite them or make them aware when tenders are actually out there to be won. For constituents and particularly business constituents in my area, which is Gawler and the northern suburbs, this bill guarantees that the focus on jobs and investment will continue through projects like those flowing from the recently announced \$1.1 billion in funding for hospitals throughout the metropolitan area, including the \$52.5 million announcement for the upgrade of the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The Lyell McEwin Hospital will clearly create quite a few jobs and, hopefully, people in the northern areas will win that work.

It is not only the northern area: there are also places like Gawler that will benefit from this. I am mindful that it was recently announced that an agreement has been reached between the state government, the Town of Gawler and also the developers of the Gawler East Springwood development regarding the announcement of the \$55 million Gawler East Link Road project. That road project will be subject to the state government's Industry Participation Policy, which means that a whole range of small construction companies in the Gawler and surrounding regions and the local northern areas will actually be able to compete for that work.

It is not only small companies that will be able to compete for that work, but also a whole range of people who are seeking employment because they are finding it hard to find employment will be given a chance to find some meaningful work as well. This policy benefits my community in two ways. Firstly, it enables small business to compete for the work and, secondly, it also helps people to get jobs in that area. Added to the massive Northern Connector project, as it moves into full swing, opportunities for small business and local jobs continue to grow in accordance with the Northern Connector Industry Participation Plan. That is the important part. Big projects will have their own plans to ensure they achieve the various objectives of the overall bill and our policy.

The Northern Connector road project commits the project to an average of 480 full-time jobs each year during the construction and at least 20 per cent of labour hours being filled by apprentices and trainees, Aboriginal workers and people facing barriers to employment. People living with a disability may be in that category as well, which I think is very important in giving everybody a fair go. The project is also committed to ensuring that 90 per cent of all on-site labour hours will be performed by South Australians and at least 50 per cent of those hours will be performed by residents from the northern suburbs and the Gawler area. This is a major job boost to the northern area.

A great example of these commitments in action is the traffic control contract awarded to SEM Traffic Control as part of the SEM Group of Companies. This will allow the business to maintain its current workforce and expand their traffic control division with 13 new employees and the purchase of an additional four fully-equipped traffic control vehicles. The general manager of SEM Group has been quoted as saying:

Due to being awarded the contract for traffic management with the Northern Connector project, SEM will continue to support local businesses with almost 100 per cent of the supply chain based in South Australia.

Mr Stephen Fines-Phillips, General Manager of SEM, said that this sort of policy benefits South Australians. Currently, all SEM subcontractors are local small to medium enterprises, and 100 per cent of all the signs purchased for the traffic control project at the Northern Connector were manufactured in South Australia.

SEM Group, which started as Salisbury Earthmovers, is a privately owned South Australian business established in 1976 by Harry and Janice Wauer as a small earthmoving business which has turned into a diverse civil engineering contractor specialising in South Australia-based construction projects. This highlights that if we have the appropriate state government and, importantly, federal government policies, we can use our projects and purchasing power to promote, support and grow small businesses and local businesses in our communities. Mr Colin Coulson, SEM Group Construction Manager, said:

Over the past few years, SEM have attended numerous Meet the Buyer events which are run by the Office of the Industry Advocate and I would highly recommend businesses to add these events to their calendar as it has enabled us not only to meet key state government staff for project management and procurement but also to meet new potential suppliers.

With those comments, I commend this bill to the parliament.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (12:21): Thank you, member for Kurna, for giving me an opportunity before you close the debate. I thought it was too important a bill for me to pass over because to support the enshrinement of the Industry Advocate in legislation is extremely important and to have a Governor appointment to really cement the seriousness of it. The reason I say this is that over time I have had a number of chances to meet with Ian Nightingale, who is here in the gallery and I appreciate him being here. He is extremely supportive of business and small business and ensuring that they are heard and have their fair share of business in this state.

I have been really grateful to Mr Nightingale. He has been in my electorate a number of times. I am involved very closely with what was previously known as ERBA (Edwardstown Region Business Association) and is now Southern Business Connections. Its membership is made up of a number of small to medium-sized businesses. I think the membership has grown now over the last few years to be about 120 or 130 businesses. They are a very focused group of people who are there to ensure that the South Australian economy does indeed grow. They see the value of the Industry Advocate, and every time I meet with them they have nothing but praise for this particular individual, Mr Nightingale, and the position he holds.

To have a position like this that can advocate on behalf of business is essential to not just the economic growth of our state but also to the social development of our state, because within this legislation is the expectation that there will be local South Australian content of materials in the building and construction industry, but also, really importantly, that there will be a percentage of local people.

There is the expectation that contractors will employ a certain percentage, if not all, of local employees. This really goes to the strength of this particular government to recognise the importance of this South Australian economy that is built on South Australian products and South Australian people, while recognising certainly that we need to have other players come in from interstate. We need to maintain this focus to ensure that our economy does indeed flourish and grow.

I think to have enshrined in legislation this particular position that will advocate on behalf of business for procurement of goods and services to connect to interstate government building and infrastructure projects is really important. It also supports those interested in in public-private partnerships and federally funded projects, where the state government has the responsibility to ensure those projects come to fruition. It is very important.

Phil Sutherland of the Civil Construction Federation is always very supportive of any type of functionality that the government puts forward that will support development in our state and the flourishing of particularly his industry. He and I often joke that we like being late for appointments when it is due to roadworks because that means we are building things and people are employed. He and I have had that experience quite a few times where we have been late meeting each other, but that is an absolute positive.

I also know Paul Williams from the Australian Subcontractors Association very well. He owns a business in St Marys in the new Elder. I have known him for some time now. He is very committed to ensuring that our state flourishes and grows. He goes above and beyond the borders of his own business to ensure that business is certainly represented in the contract, subcontract and sub-subcontract sections of our community.

In my role as Chair of the Public Works Committee, I highly value the role that the position the Industry Advocate plays and will continue to play post being enshrined in law. Without fail, with every project that comes before the Public Works Committee, there are questions from not just one but a number of committee members about local content and local people being employed and also about the wood, steel, and what have you, coming from a South Australian base. It is extremely important.

On the edge of my electorate, I see the north-south corridor and the Darlington upgrade as an extremely visionary piece of work being undertaken right now to make sure that we have a smooth-moving north-south corridor all along South Road. This goes past the Tonsley precinct, which is in the electorate of Elder. I certainly enjoy visiting the Tonsley precinct and, I must admit, I probably end up there once a fortnight to see what is happening in the area. I am told that there are now about 112 businesses in the area that employ about 1,000 people. That is more than when Mitsubishi was there. Mitsubishi, I understand, had about 800 employees, and this now has 1,000. This is extremely exciting for this inner southern area.

There is also the Flinders University building. A second tower will be under construction in the near future. We have the TAFE, which caters for those interested in trade. It is really essential, but it is also an extremely interesting campus to visit because you can see students learning their trades through the glass window facility, doing bricklaying and carpentry just to name a few.

The other important aspect in this particular part of southern Adelaide is the plan that Flinders University has to reinvigorate the area near the Flinders Private Hospital, with the building of the Flinders Link train line that extends from the Tonsley train line. This is extremely exciting because not only will we see in this proposed development further facilities for teaching but there will also be student accommodation, other accommodation and shops—venture capital capture that can occur around the train station located near the Flinders Private Hospital. These are extremely exciting times in the inner south. It is certainly timely to have the Industry Advocate role enshrined in legislation.

On this side of the house, we are building South Australia. We are not just physically building South Australia but, in the language we use, we build South Australia. We talk up what our businesses are doing, we talk up what our small to medium-sized businesses are doing. We applaud the fact that they take risks every day to expand their businesses, take on extra people in their businesses and use the Job Accelerator Grant that we have had in place for some time. We will be looking to the budget for extra support to businesses as well, as has been heralded in the paper today regarding the payroll tax. I certainly, for one, understand the implications of that.

It is really important that in our state we talk up business and we talk up what is happening in South Australia. I know, with all the businesspeople I speak to in my area and the forums I convene—I convene quite a number of these forums—that the business community comes back to me with ideas and says, 'Can you convene a particular forum on this particular issue?' That is where Mr Nightingale comes in to support as well. He will suggest people who will be relevant speakers for these particular groups.

I know that businesses in this state want to hear us speak in a positive way. They want to hear us speak about South Australia reaching out towards interstate, towards the world. They do not want to hear the negativity that all is doom and gloom. In fact, they find that an absolute insult to what they are doing and how they are contributing to this state. Besides the physical building of our state,

I think we can be proud of the dialogue that we use in building South Australia and supporting small to medium and large-sized businesses.

With those few words, I would like to say that I really absolutely, totally and thoroughly support the Industry Advocate being enshrined in law, and I look forward to the continuation of that position and the good work.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (12:31): I would like to thank all the members who have spoken during this debate for their contribution, particularly the members for Giles, Light and Elder, the Minister for Small Business, and the members for Mitchell, Bragg and Hammond. I appreciate the support of the opposition in supporting this bill through the chamber, although with some reservations, I think it is fair to say, from some of the speeches. I certainly support their support for this bill progressing.

We think on this side of the house that this is definitely a very important piece of legislation. We think that this is a very important position that has been brought in through the Industry Advocate over the last four years. It has made a real difference in terms of the way that we achieve support for businesses in South Australia through the record infrastructure program that we have had over the past few years and that we are projecting over the next few years as well. We want to see that work benefiting the people of South Australia, not only in the outcomes those projects will bring but also in the construction and other work delivered through those projects.

To do that needs what I see as the three different roles of the Industry Advocate, and the first is the pure advocacy role that the Industry Advocate plays in promoting businesses and connecting government and businesses, particularly in those infrastructure projects but also through the whole range of other services that government needs to contract with through the private sector. We see that through the work of the many Meet the Buyer events that happen not just in the city but around the state, in connecting those businesses and giving those businesses a way to connect in with government to bid for that work.

The second way you see it is through the actual tendering process for that work. We have what I and many have regarded as the best process in the country for assessing the local industry benefit of particular contracts. Fifteen per cent of major contracts in this state are determined upon what the benefit economically in South Australia is, and the Industry Advocate plays a very important role through that process.

Thirdly, I think the permanency, the additional powers and the independence of this bill will give the Industry Advocate an important role to play once a contract has been signed, once commitments have been made by suppliers (usually by the lead supplier), to deliver for the local workforce, to deliver for local subcontractors and to deliver for local architects and people right through the supply chain. The Industry Advocate then has the role of monitoring that contract in its delivery to make sure that the promises that have been made are actually being delivered. That is where the permanency, the independence and the power of this position will be really important because a temporary position cannot ensure that those functions can be carried out to the best of what we would hope.

I know there were some comments from the other side that perhaps this should be a temporary position that could be got rid of in the future. If you had a benefit in the future where government and business were in perfect harmony in all things, you would obviously still need this position there to provide monitoring and oversight of those contracts to make sure that we were getting what we were promised through those contracts being delivered. They are the key functions of the Industry Advocate.

I would like to go through some of the comments that have been raised during the second reading debate. Particularly, there were comments from the member for Mitchell in regard to what some of the stakeholders have been saying. We have gone through a range of consultation processes leading up to this bill, and we have been overwhelmed by the support we have received for the bill from the business community in South Australia and from industry leaders and industry organisations. A few of the organisations that were mentioned included the Ai Group and Business SA, and I am very happy to read, firstly, statements by the Ai Group from 7 April this year:

From Ai Group's perspective, we support the role and the work of the Industry Participation Advocate and the Industry Participation Policy. Feedback from our members is that the work of the Advocate has been instrumental in providing opportunities for members to showcase their capabilities.

Business SA was also quoted through its head, Nigel McBride, who stated:

Business SA was delighted to be a major lobbying force behind the creation of the Industry Advocate. We then continued to push for the Industry Advocate to have more 'teeth' and more resources, and I am pleased that the State Government has taken these steps. In these tough times, this initiative has the potential to be a real 'game changer' for many of our small to medium-size employers—and therefore, a game changer for our State's jobs and economy.

Those examples, which were mentioned by the other side, show how supportive the business community is in this state for this position and how supportive it is, as Nigel McBride said, for this position to have 'more teeth and more resources' in the future.

I would also like to address a few other issues that have been raised in the debate. It is the deputy leader's birthday today, which we should formally note—so happy birthday to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. She mentioned that she intends to move some amendments, and the first is in relation to FOI provisions. Our approach to the drafting of the bill was very similar in a lot of regards to the powers and functions of the Small Business Commissioner.

There was a comment that the Small Business Commissioner did not have a similar exemption, and the quote was that it was completely novel in this legislation. I have to say that that is not the case. In fact, we drafted our provision about freedom of information directly copying what was in the Freedom of Information (Exempt Agency) Regulations 2008 regarding the Small Business Commissioner. Regulation 9 states:

9—Exempt agency in respect of certain information—Small Business Commissioner

For the purposes of the definition of exempt agency in section 4(1) of the Act, the Small Business Commissioner is declared to be an exempt agency in respect of information other than—

- (a) financial and administrative information relating to the operations of the Small Business Commissioner; and
- (b) statistical information that does not identify any particular person or business.

That is exactly the same as the provision we have concluded in this piece of legislation for the Industry Advocate, and the reasoning is simple. Obviously, we want the actions, the operations and the administration of the Industry Advocate and his or her staff to be subject to freedom of information as other agencies would be, but there has to be an understanding that this agency—similar to that of the Small Business Commissioner—has a very clear role in dealing with sensitive commercial documents on a daily, hourly, minute-by-minute basis, and a lot of the documents will be very sensitive.

We want businesses to be very open with the Industry Advocate about their documents and about their information. We fear that relying just on the exemption provisions currently in the FOI Act would lead to businesses being very fearful of sharing information with the Industry Advocate. In a similar way to what happened with the Small Business Commissioner, we think that section of the Industry Advocate's work should be exempt from the act.

In fact, I am informed that the Small Business Commissioner's FOI exemption came out of negotiations with the opposition through the Legislative Review Committee when they dealt with the exemption regulation when it was brought in. Through that process with the Small Business Commissioner, there were negotiations through the Legislative Review Committee. It ended up with the words we have there for that agency, and we have now adopted the same words here for this provision. The other example was that the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island did not have an exemption in the same way. Of course, they largely deal with the Public Service rather than with the private sector in the way we are talking about here.

A few other issues have been raised. In terms of the term of appointment, we have said it is up to five years, which is consistent with the Small Business Commissioner and other senior government executive appointments. Where the government wants a smaller, shorter appointment, that is something that the government and the cabinet would certainly be able to consider.

There was also a suggestion that the Industry Advocate would not be able to, and would not need to, give a report to the parliament, which is not the case. As an agency of the Crown, the Industry Advocate will be required, under the Public Sector Act 2009, to produce an annual report which will be tabled in this parliament. That is an accountability measure that the Industry Advocate would have to this parliament to inform the parliament of its operations and how it is achieving the objectives under the act.

There were also comments in relation to the State Procurement Board. I think there was some suggestion that perhaps we could roll the work of the State Procurement Board into the work of the Industry Advocate or vice versa. We are very wary of that suggestion. The State Procurement Board has a very broad role under the State Procurement Act 2004. It deals with a whole range of different procurement matters, particularly about the processes and probity issues that need to go into our procurement processes across government, whereas we see the Industry Advocate as a very particular role, looking at the industry component and the industry economic benefit for South Australia.

Because of its very particular and separate role, we do not think that the entire gamut of procurement issues should be bundled with that role. It is going to be much more effective if those roles operate separately under our Industry Participation Policy. Obviously, the two deal with each other, work together and manage issues where they might have intersection, but I think that putting them in together would undermine the role of the Industry Advocate.

There was also discussion about the powers that the Industry Advocate would have in terms of requesting information. In the bill, we have proposed powers for the Industry Advocate, which are similar but narrower than those held by the Small Business Commissioner, to be able to require information from participants in government contracts. These powers enable the Industry Advocate to effectively investigate suspected or reported noncompliance with Industry Participation Policy commitments.

This is not a broad, unfettered power to request any information the Industry Advocate might wish to obtain. Clause 13 of the bill clearly limits this power in a number of ways, including that the information sought is required by the advocate in order to perform his or her functions under the Industry Advocate act; that the information is from participants in government projects, including subcontractors or suppliers; and that the information or documents are in the person's possession.

Given the broad nature of the investigations the Industry Advocate may be required to undertake, the bill is deliberately silent as to the nature of information or documents that may be requested under this provision so as not to unreasonably restrict the Industry Advocate in his or her investigation. Of course, once the Industry Advocate is established under this new act, we would think that guidance would be provided on the sort of information the advocate may request in a compliance and enforcement policy that the advocate would develop in consultation with key stakeholders.

The amendments that would be proposed appear to imply that there is a risk that the advocate will attempt to retain information specifically for the purpose of providing a commercial advantage to government in its negotiations with businesses or for some sort of phishing exercise. We do not think that that is the case. We think that there are protections to prevent that sort of action from occurring, including under the obligations under the Code of Ethics for the South Australian Public Sector and the Public Sector Act 2009, not to mention the various provisions under the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012.

There is also an issue that has been suggested, in terms that appeals should be made by businesses objecting to having information requests being made and that they should be able to go to SACAT. We are concerned that might seek to limit the ability of the Industry Advocate to quickly manage issues as they arise. We also note that there are similar powers in both the Small Business Commissioner Act 2011 as well as in the Fair Trading Act 1987, which contain even broader powers to request information and maximum penalties of up to \$20,000. Both those acts do not have an appeal to SACAT contained within them.

I have dealt with some of the issues that have been raised during this debate and I look forward to the committee stage. As I said, we think this is very important legislation in terms of more

South Australian jobs for South Australian companies but also for South Australian employees in industries like building and construction and a whole range of other industries that we have in South Australia. We think that the Industry Advocate over the past four years has done a fantastic job, and we look forward to having this role's powers, functions and independence strengthened through this act.

I would like to thank everybody who has worked on the legislation over the past few months, in particular Ian Nightingale, the Industry Advocate, as well as Nari Chandler, the executive director of public projects and participation in the Department of State Development, for their very hard work. I also thank Jodie Rimmer in DSD and Denise Loftus in the Industry Advocate's office. I thank the Treasurer for his support of this legislation, as well as the Minister for Small Business—both are the ministers who oversee this role. I also thank parliamentary counsel, in particular Shirley Armstrong, for their very excellent work on this legislation. I would also like to thank Gemma Paech in my office and Chris Russell in the Treasurer's office for their hard work on this. With those remarks, I endorse and commend the bill to the house. I look forward to its current consideration in committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Ms CHAPMAN: I ask the assistant minister, in respect of the new Industry Advocate position, which minister will the Industry Advocate be reporting to? Will it be the Minister for Finance, the Treasurer, the Minister for State Development or someone else?

Mr PICTON: I thank the deputy leader for her question. In regard to the powers at the moment under the administrative arrangements of the government, it would be the Minister for Finance. Of course, as with most legislation, in the way it is drafted it is usually the minister. Then it is a matter for the government to determine its administrative arrangements as to which minister it allocates different pieces of legislation. For the purposes of the government at the moment, the powers would be in relation to the Minister for Finance.

Ms CHAPMAN: I asked this question during the briefing provided by Mr Nightingale and Ms Chandler, and some information has been provided to me today in response to that. As I understand it, the Chief Procurement Officer is currently reporting to the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Is that going to continue and, if so, how is that going to align with the reporting processes currently within the Procurement Board, the new statutory authority and the Chief Procurement Officer?

Mr PICTON: As I outlined in my summing up, we do have a procurement board. We think that the functions of that procurement board under its own legislation are distinct from those of the Industry Advocate. This year, the government appointed a new chief procurement officer. Their job is to work with the Procurement Board but also to report to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet for those whole-of-government procurement issues, which are obviously much broader than just the Industry Advocate participation role, which is contained within this legislation.

Ms CHAPMAN: Does the Industry Advocate recount to the Minister for Finance?

Mr PICTON: Yes, the Industry Advocate, as in your first question, reports to the Minister for Finance under the administrative directions of the government, which we expect would continue once this bill is enacted.

Ms CHAPMAN: In the time that it has operated, has the Office of the Industry Advocate provided a report to the Minister for Finance each financial year?

Mr PICTON: At the moment, obviously the Industry Advocate is not a statutory body. I understand that its report is included as part of the Department of State Development's report, whereas, establishing it as a separate statutory and official body under this legislation, it would report separately to the parliament.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, has the current report from the Industry Advocate over the three financial years that it has currently operated been provided to the Minister for State Development, and is it available?

Mr PICTON: As I said, the Industry Advocate's report has been included within the department's report to the parliament. I am advised that originally when the Industry Advocate started it was in DPC; it is now in the DSD, so it is included in both of those reports, which are of course publicly available. I will be happy to send a copy to the deputy leader. But there is no separate reporting or official report that body does to the minister outside of those annual reports by the department at this stage.

Ms CHAPMAN: Can I clarify that. There is clearly a report because, as you say, it then goes into the annual report of the Department of State Development. To be clear, it is not the finance minister's report but the Department of State Development's report. It happens to be the same minister at the moment, but that may change at any time. Currently, a report is presented to the chief executive of state development. It is incorporated. It may only be a sentence in the annual report. Is the report that is currently being prepared each year for the information to be provided to the minister available and, if so, can they be provided?

Mr PICTON: If I am getting the question correct, essentially you want to know whether the section that the Industry Advocate gives to the department for their broader report is available. As I understand it, that is published as part of their department's report and therefore is publicly available.

Ms CHAPMAN: We are at cross-purposes. We get an annual report from departments. I get one from the Attorney-General's office every year. They now have a little sentence in relation to a lot of the subdivisions in it. This is a subdivision of the state development department. It may be that the Minister for State Development sees other aspects in respect of its operations in more need of reporting in its annual report to the parliament. That is a matter for them. But there is clearly data and information provided from the division to the chief executive and then, presumably, the minister.

The chief executive actually prepares the report and then the minister has certain obligations to table it in the parliament. The data and operations and reporting that are made from the Industry Advocate division, if I can call it that, to the chief executive are documented. I am asking, because only a small part of it ends up in the annual report, whether those annual reports by the Industry Advocate are available; if they are not, I will FOI them. I am just asking whether or not you want to actually produce them.

Mr PICTON: I am advised that it is not a matter, as the deputy leader suggested, that a big Industry Advocate report is given to the chief executive of the department that then gets slimmed down. What I am advised is that what is provided goes into the report, but there is obviously a lot more information and data that the Industry Advocate has that are not included in those reports. I think one of the good things of this legislation is that parliament will be provided with a lot more information on the work of the Industry Advocate in the future than is currently the case, where this is just an officer set up within the government who could be got rid of tomorrow by the government if it wanted to.

As a separate statutory officer, the Industry Advocate will provide a lot more information to the parliament than is currently the case. If there is particular information and data that the deputy leader would like about the work of the Industry Advocate, I think it is fair to say that the current holder of the Industry Advocate position, Mr Ian Nightingale, is more than happy to share the work that he does and the data and successes that they have had. I am sure that he will be very happy to provide as much information as you would like on the work of that office at the moment. In the future, that information will be provided to parliament through an annual report under the Public Sector Act.

Ms CHAPMAN: I want to clarify that as well because the Commissioner for Victims' Rights in South Australia used to give an annual report. By statute, that officer has to give an annual report to the parliament. It is now incorporated in abbreviated form in the Attorney-General's Department. That is why I am looking for a mention in this bill for the new Industry Advocate to be obliged to provide that report, usually to a minister, and then the minister within a certain number of days to table it here in the parliament. That is not included in here.

I am looking now at clause 15—Reports to Minister. I am happy to ask these further questions on clause 15, if you would like, but that does not mention an annual reporting obligation to parliament. You say that once it is a statutory body, there is public sector legislation which will require them to give an annual report. What I am saying to you is that we already have the Commissioner for Victims' Rights. I know about that one because for about five years he did not provide his annual report, as required by the statute. I complained about it, and ultimately he provided a consolidated one via the Attorney-General to the parliament.

I want it to be clear. Usually when we have this body, as we have with the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island, there is an obligation to provide an annual report. In fact, in her case, she is actually able to come directly to the parliament with anything she wants to complain about. In this new model for your Industry Advocate, he or she has to report to the minister any current problems and must report to the minister any failure, but there is nothing in here about the obligation to provide a report of the activities of this new entity to the parliament.

Mr PICTON: I am advised that this body will have to provide an annual report under the Public Sector Act, and that is the advice we got through the drafting process through parliamentary counsel. I am happy to check in terms of the victims' commissioner and why that is different as to why they have not been providing an annual report. I am happy to look into that and check that further. It is not something that I have any information on, but I can say that it is the government's intention that this body has to report to parliament. We discussed it, we discussed it with parliamentary counsel, and the advice we got is that because it is in the Public Sector Act that these sorts of bodies have to report to parliament, we did not have to replicate that provision in this act.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Petitions

SOUTH EAST COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICE

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier): Presented a petition signed by 1,473 residents of Mount Gambier requesting the house to urge the state government to reinstate funding to the South East Community Legal Service Inc. to maintain the same level of local service, knowledge, expertise and meet the legal needs in Mount Gambier and surrounding districts.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Aboriginal Lands Trust—Annual Report 2015-16

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

SACE Board of South Australia—Report 2016

Ministerial Statement

LAUNCHME

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: While our government is proud that South Australia has consistently been recognised as an affordable place to live and raise a family, we understand that

some South Australians are doing it tough. Unfortunately, many aspiring small business owners on low incomes may have a great idea but are excluded from the financial and support services they need to make their idea a reality. This results in lost opportunities for individuals as well as our economy.

I am pleased to advise the house that our government has committed \$900,000 to deliver a new microenterprise program, LaunchME, to create business opportunities in the northern Adelaide regions. LaunchME will be delivered by Good Shepherd Microfinance and is accessible by local residents with a viable business idea who have an income below \$45,000 or a current healthcare card or pensioner concession card.

Under this program, eligible participants will receive affordable, no-interest loans of up to \$5,000 to help them transfer their innovative business ideas into successful enterprises. Our government understands that small businesses need more than sporadic loans to thrive. That is why this new program offers tailored support to suit the needs of each enterprise, including mentoring and coaching to develop sustainable business plans.

Those of us who live in the northern suburbs know just how acutely Holden workers and those who work in the automotive supply chain need assistance to transition to new industries. This Labor government understands what needs to be done to increase economic opportunity and provide additional employment to those impacted by the imminent Holden closure.

It was this Labor government that implemented the Be a Job Maker youth program in the north. It was this Labor government that implemented the Beyond Auto strategy in the north. It is this Labor government that is now implementing the microenterprise program to support emerging entrepreneurs in the north. We value the people who live, work, study and invest in our northern suburbs. We are proud of South Australia's great tradition of entrepreneurialism and innovation, and LaunchME will continue this tradition. For further information about eligibility criteria, please visit www.goodshepherdmicrofinance.org.au/services/microenterprise.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:05): I bring up the 47th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is to the Minister for Health. When is the government going to start listening to the doctors and nurses who run our hospitals in South Australia instead of delivering poorly planned policy on the run?

The SPEAKER: Of course, that question isn't in order, but it will elicit a response, which will be similarly expansive.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:06): Isn't it interesting that on the day the government were out announcing a \$1.1 billion investment in our public hospitals the Liberal Party in this state were out announcing the decriminalisation of GoPros on bike helmets. It's good to know that the Liberal Party are there on the big issues. The old GoPro on the bike helmet—that's what the public of South Australia are interested in. It reminds me of that scene in *The Castle* where Steve presents his dad, Darryl Kerrigan, with a bike helmet with a brake light on the back. What does Darryl say? 'Steve, you're an ideas man. You're an ideas man.'

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: the contents of films and bike helmets are not going at least towards health. It's clearly a stretch.

The SPEAKER: That was a bogus point of order. I was expecting a legitimate one, which I would have upheld. The deputy leader is called to order.

WOMEN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Minister for Health. What is the intended bed capacity of the proposed women's hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:08): Thank you, the ideas man. We will work through all of these issues with our clinicians, but the new women's hospital, to be able to deal with all the current activity that's going through the Women's and Children's Hospital for birthing, will be built, obviously, so it can deal with additional capacity as well.

WOMEN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): Can the minister explain why there has been such a massive blowout in the cost per bed from the commitment that he took to the last election compared to the announcement made yesterday?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:08): When we were re-elected, we had a very good look in detailed planning into a new women's and children's hospital co-located with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, and there is no doubt that that obviously was our preferred option. When we had a good look at the site, though, while from an engineering perspective, yes, it would be possible, it would have left no capacity in the budget for the other investments we have made as part of this budget. It would not have allowed us to invest \$250 million in The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It would not have allowed us to invest \$50 million in the expansion of the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

We are yet to hear from the opposition any commitment to the infrastructure spend—any commitment, any interest whatsoever—because, when it comes down to it, what are the opposition really interested in? GoPros on bike helmets. That's all they care about. On this side of the house, we are interested in and we stand by our massive investment into our public hospitals. You can deride it all you want. The old hospital hater—it's always bubbling beneath the surface. The old hospital hater, that deep, deep instinct that runs so deep in the Liberal Party in South Australia, but on this side of the house we are committed to our investments in public health and the public hospitals and we stand by them.

Members interjecting:

Mr Marshall: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before we get to the supplementary, I call to order the members for Davenport, Mount Gambier, Morialta, Chaffey and Stuart. I warn the members for Chaffey, Morialta and the deputy leader, and I warn for the second and final time the members for Chaffey and Morialta. Leader.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): Supplementary: can the minister inform the house how many beds are currently occupied—the capacity—by women versus children at the Women's and Children's Hospital and whether or not the government will give a commitment that this number will be at least maintained at the new facility?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:11): Of course we will give a commitment that it will be maintained at the new facility.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): Can the minister provide some clarity on how many women's beds there are at the current Women's and Children's Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:11): I will have to check and come back to the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned and the member for Adelaide is called to order.

WOMEN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): Does the minister envisage a significant increase in the number of women's beds in the new hospital, given that he provided the people of South Australia yesterday with the budget of \$535 million? Can he now tell us how many beds that is based upon?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:11): What I can guarantee the house is that the new facility will provide greater capacity. The Liberal Party, the opposition—

Mr Gardner: How do you not know this?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health will be seated. The member for Morialta has been through his warnings. If I hear another word from him outside standing orders, he shall depart. Minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The rationale for co-locating the women's hospital with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is to have the wraparound services—the intensivists, the vascular surgery, the ICU—co-located. It seems as though the Liberal Party in this state are making the same mistake they have made over the last 10 years. They know the new Royal Adelaide Hospital—how popular it's going to be, how loved it's going to be and, suddenly, you can see the terror in their eyes as they realise for the last 10 years they have been on the wrong side of this debate. And now what do we hear? The same old trite rubbish you expect from the Liberal Party in this state—the same trite rubbish.

This is going to be a great outcome for women in this state. It's going to be a great outcome for women having complex birthing who need the services of a quaternary hospital co-located. This is something from my earliest days as health minister in my meetings with the AMA they were calling for, and this is something we are happy to deliver on.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Unlike the opposition, who, going in to the last election, what did they have to say on this particular issue? Absolutely nothing.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert, the leader and the members for Goyder and Hammond are called to order. The members for Mount Gambier, Schubert, Adelaide, Davenport and Hammond and the leader are warned, and the member for Davenport is warned for the second and the very last time. Leader.

WOMEN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): Given that the government had provided a costing for the people of South Australia in the lead-up to the last election, which in essence amounted to \$2 million per bed, can the minister explain whether the original costing of \$600 million for those 296 beds was incorrect or whether there is a massive increase in the number of beds envisaged in the new women's hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:14): When we have sat down and done the detailed costing, the current budget allocation that was announced yesterday—\$528 million—is the cost of building a new women's hospital.

Mr Marshall: But how many beds?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The opposition needs to get out more and needs to spend a bit of time actually visiting hospitals. A hospital is more than just its beds. I think the Leader of the Opposition has gone back to Florence Nightingale ideas, that all a hospital was was a big room full of beds. A modern hospital is more than just that, and the costs of building a hospital are driven by far more—

Mr Marshall: You got the same question on the radio this morning.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Well, obviously, the only place you get questions is by listening to Matt and Dave. I'm glad Matt and Dave are able to write your questions for you, but just because you ask it doesn't make it any more intelligent. A hospital is, of course, a lot more than just its beds, and its costs—the cost of building a hospital—if you think it's a simple equation that the number of beds somehow delivers you the price of a hospital—

Mr Marshall: You don't know the number.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Please keep carrying on like that, and I can't wait for the election ads with you screaming your head off sounding like a demented banshee. It is going to make for wonderful campaign ads.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: 'Demented banshee', I don't think it's in the list.

Mr GARDNER: Just because a creature is mythical does not make it parliamentary.

The SPEAKER: Well, it might be.

An honourable member: It's not an animal.

The SPEAKER: It's not an animal. That was my thinking—it wasn't an animal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, 'unicorn' is unparliamentary because it's an animal.

Mr GARDNER: Banshees are as much an animal as a unicorn.

The SPEAKER: No. No, obviously, the member for Morialta isn't of Irish origin, otherwise he would know he is wrong about that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: We might move on with question time, and I will get a ruling on 'banshee'.

WOMEN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): Thank you. Can the minister provide any plausible explanation to this house and to the people of South Australia why the cost per bed has blown out from \$2 million to \$4 million between the time that he has presented those costings to the people of this state—\$2 million to \$4 million? Is there any plausible explanation?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Should we just start shouting back? Is that what you want?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:17): If the Leader of the Opposition will just calm—

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —the farm, the cost of a hospital is not driven solely by the number of beds. A hospital is more than just the beds that are in it.

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: A modern hospital has other things as well.

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: A hospital has more than just beds. The Leader of the Opposition might be interested to know that a hospital has operating theatres or technical suites. A hospital has medical imaging. A hospital generally has pathology labs. A hospital has many, many other services—outpatient services, outpatient clinics. It is not just beds. I know that this is a difficult issue for the poor old Leader of the Opposition to get his head around, but a hospital really is more than just its beds, and you cannot come up with a simple equation whereby a hospital's cost is driven by the number of beds it has.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Health, I have sought advice on your reference to the Leader of the Opposition as a 'demented banshee'. It has been held unparliamentary to refer to a member as a 'demented parrot'. There is no reference to 'banshee'; therefore, I am ruling it in. The minister will withdraw and apologise for the reference to 'demented'.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Happy to withdraw, sir.

The SPEAKER: No—

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I withdraw, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Just withdraw.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Just withdraw.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, the minister realised his error and immediately corrected himself to a plain withdrawal, as I required the member for Hammond to do yesterday.

WOMEN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Supplementary: can the minister then inform the house how many operating theatres will be in the new women's hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:19): We will, in good time. In good time, we will—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I've hardly said anything.

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: In good time, we will be releasing to the public our detailed plans for the new women's hospital, and what a great day it will be. As I said earlier, you can only unwrap your Christmas presents one at a time. We are not going to do it all at once. Of course, in time we will provide the full plans and all the details of the new women's hospital, but I can guarantee the house that it will cater not only for the existing capacity but also for future growth in demand for services.

The SPEAKER: I am also advised that the Deputy Speaker has ruled the term 'banshee' unparliamentary, but I respectfully disagree with her.

Ms Bedford: It's a sexist word, isn't it? Banshees are women.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): You take that up. My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. How many people are currently being investigated by SAPOL in relation to incidents that occurred at the older persons mental health service at Oakden?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:21): I refer to the ministerial statement that the Minister for Health added yesterday. As was stated in yesterday's statement, there were eight people referred to SAPOL.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. When were another five people from Oakden referred to SA Police, given that on 5 June SAPOL told the elder abuse committee that there were three investigations, whereas the Minister for Health's statement to the house yesterday, and the Minister for Mental Health's statement to the house just now, stated that there are now eight referrals?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:22): As I have told the house on a number of occasions, these numbers move up and down on a regular basis. Every time we have the opportunity of updating the house, we do. The current information, I am advised, is that there are eight people who are currently being referred to SAPOL.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary: when did the additional five incidents referred to SAPOL occur?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:22): I am happy to go back and seek advice from my department about the discrepancies between the evidence given in the upper house and my parliamentary statement but, to my knowledge and the information that I have been provided at this point in time, there are eight people who have been referred to SAPOL for investigation.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Can the minister provide some clarity to the house on whether any of the incidents that she has referred to occurred after the Chief Psychiatrist's report was received?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:23): I beg your pardon? Could you repeat that? I couldn't hear because of the noise behind me.

Mr MARSHALL: Can you provide some clarity to the house as to whether any of the additional five referrals to the police occurred after the Chief Psychiatrist's report was received?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: I am happy to make inquiries of the department.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister outline to the house how the government's energy plan has influenced the national market operator's energy supply outlook for eastern and south-eastern Australia?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:23): Last week, the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) released the first report into energy supply projections for eastern and south-eastern Australia for the next two years. Overall, AEMO expects that all National Electricity Market (NEM) regions will meet the reliability standard set in the National Electricity Rules (NER) over the next two years based on the generation and storage expected to be available.

The market operator's inaugural energy supply outlook shows that the government's energy plan is working and is already having an impact on the overall reliability of the network and future supply requirements. While electricity supply would have been tight in the absence of state government intervention, the outlook for the next two summers, incorporating our 100 megawatts of battery storage and our 200 megawatts of temporary generators, is significantly more secure. The last projections re-evaluate conclusions drawn in November 2016 and have now factored in recent industry developments up to 1 May 2017, including Our Energy Plan. The Chief Executive Officer of AEMO said on radio FIVEaa:

It actually shows that the work in South Australia is extremely effective in helping meet the needs of next summer.

It is clear that even the national market operator believes our energy plan is working and will improve grid security.

According to AEMO, the national energy market reliability figures have not yet factored in the procurement of reserve under the Reliability and Emergency Reserve Trader in addition to their collaboration with ARENA to secure a further 100 megawatts of demand response. Both of these will

further work to strengthen reliability. While the report contains some encouraging aspects, it still highlights the need for urgent reform to be instigated by the commonwealth government, which is why we welcome and support in principle the blueprint for our energy future, released by the nation's Chief Scientist, Dr Finkel.

One of the primary recommendations of that report is the urgent need for a market mechanism for our energy transition. It is a significant step forward in terms of energy policy, and we implore the commonwealth government to act swiftly to support and implement a national market mechanism as recommended by the Chief Scientist. This will help ensure that the private sector has long-term confidence to reinvest in the NEM. This is absolutely aligned with what we have been saying all along. It is encouraging to see the pillars of our plan, released more than three months ago, having such a positive and material impact on the national energy market.

Meanwhile, we are waiting for alternative plans to emerge in the state from our opponents, who have not put out an alternative plan. I think it is important that we have a debate before the election about energy plans. There is nothing more important than having a debate of ideas on this. We have released our plan. The commonwealth government has released the Finkel inquiry. They are yet to adopt which recommendations they will accept and not accept. We strongly support a market mechanism. The question now is: will the opposition just wait for the commonwealth to tell them what to do, or do they have their own independent plan for South Australia?

The government is committed to taking action and working closely with AEMO to ensure that South Australians have a secure and reliable energy supply into the future. Nothing can be more important for the long-term prosperity of the state than reliable, secure and affordable electricity.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Were any of the Oakden staff who have moved to the Northgate facility among those staff who were investigated or received retraining?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:27): As I have outlined to the house before, a number of staff were placed on professional improvement programs. The staff, led by Dr Duncan McKellar, have made all appropriate decisions about HR and who will move across the site. I have made it very clear to everyone on the Northgate site that I expect the very highest standard of care for all of the people who are now residing at Northgate and that people are to comply with their obligations to provide high-quality care to the people living at Northgate.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): A supplementary: given the minister's indication of her expectation of a high standard, including those who have been retrained, what measures have been put in place to ensure that the conduct of that staff is appropriately monitored?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:28): Dr McKellar and I are meeting regularly at the moment and one of the conversations we regularly happen to have is about ongoing training and the efforts that the team are making to further improve their performance and efforts in medicines and other ongoing professional training obligations. He is very committed, as is the rest of his leadership team, to ensuring that takes place.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): A supplementary: minister, given the regular meetings you are having with Dr McKellar, has he explained to you what monitoring measures have been put in place to do that?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:29): Dr McKellar and I have gone through medicine charts and a variety of other training things, and we will continue to discuss those as we move forward.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Will the minister disclose the reason for the five additional referrals to SAPOL?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:29): My understanding is these are not new investigations; they are actually health department investigations that have now been referred to SAPOL.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Can the minister provide any explanation to this house or to the people of South Australia why she failed to publicly disclose the additional referrals to SAPOL as soon as they had occurred?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:30): As soon as I am made aware of information, I come forward to the house. If the house isn't sitting, I update the house as soon as possible, based on the information that I am given.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Just for clarity, during the winter break there will be no updates for the people of South Australia whatsoever; we have to wait for parliament to be recalled.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:30): I meet with a number of families who have had loved ones at the facility, at the old Makk and McLeay wards. I talk to them regularly about things and I have recently met them again. People who make inquiries, we are happy to share that information before us, but we haven't had the situation where we have gone into a winter break before, and we are happy to continue to update the general public. Traditionally, we have been doing that via parliamentary statements.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. What assessments were made to ensure that the transfer of patients from Oakden to mainstream nursing homes was clinically appropriate and that the nursing home was suitable to receive them?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:31): I do believe there have been some media statements about this on the radio in the last day or so, and many of those statements are actually factually incorrect. Dr McKellar has made it very, very clear that there were extensive meetings with the families and continuous assessment of people who were being transferred to a variety of different settings, and particularly assessment of where those people should go because, as I have said in the chamber a number of times, people's clinical status can move.

We are very sure that the appropriate settings were provided, and the appropriate additional supports to help people settle into their new homes—their new nursing home environments—were put in place.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Supplementary, sir: how many Oakden patients have now been transferred to mainstream nursing homes?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:32): I am advised 12.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Can the minister update the house as to whether any supplementary funding has been provided to those facilities to accommodate Oakden patients?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:32): I believe I have made this clear to the house on a number of occasions, that additional resources would be allocated to anyone who needed that during the transition process.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): So, can the minister provide an update to the house how much has been provided and for how long that supplementary payment will be made?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:32): I am happy to inquire of the department on that information.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Have any of the patients transferred to mainstream nursing homes been transferred back to an SA Health facility since they were moved from Oakden?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:33): Not to my knowledge at this point of time but, again, because they are private people in a private aged-care setting, it wouldn't necessarily be brought to my attention straightaway because they are no longer under the care of the Makk and McLeay team. I am sure that we would have heard if that had been the case, but I am happy to make inquiries. Not to my knowledge at this point of time.

OLDER PERSONS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Again, a question to the Minister for Mental Health: how many elderly patients with severe or extreme dementia have been inpatients in metropolitan hospitals for more than 100 days since sanctions were placed on the older persons mental health service at Oakden?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:33): I am happy to seek a briefing from the department, but we know that people move through a number of clinical spaces when they suffer from severe dementia. We know that the Clements ward is a transition ward and potentially they may move across a number of clinical settings during their time, but I am happy to ask the department for that information.

OLDER PERSONS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Is the minister aware that, as of today, the SA Health inpatient dashboard shows that there are four patients at the Lyell McEwin Hospital and four patients at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital who have been in mental health beds for over 100 days?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:34): What the Leader of the Opposition doesn't make clear is what sort of mental health patients they are and the variety of the conditions they may be facing.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: No, I am not, and I have made a longstanding tradition of not revealing individual consumers, clinical notice and information across this space, nor would I—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: When there are cohorts of only four people that we are discussing—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

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

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: —I will not draw information to that level. What I will do is undertake to—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

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

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: —make some inquiries in those sections.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Can the minister provide any indication to the house of what is the time frame for relocating these patients to a more suitable, long-term residence?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:35): I will make an inquiry about the reasons that these four people at the two various sites—

An honourable member: Eight.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: —two times four is eight—and when that information becomes available to me, I will consider your response.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Which goods have contributed to the increase in South Australia's trade with Singapore and Malaysia?

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) (14:35): I thank the member for Colton for his question. Not only is he an accomplished fisherman—world recognised, a world champion—he is also representing a very multicultural electorate with a big focus on small business and international engagement.

There has been significant growth in Singapore and Malaysia exports. These are very important trading partners for South Australia, with Malaysia ranking as our third biggest export destination and Singapore our fifth largest trading partner. Our exports to both countries have experienced a significant increase in 2015-16, and that is in the context of significant growth across all sectors.

The ABS have recently confirmed that exports have risen to \$15.12 billion in the 12 months to March 2017. I can point the page out to the member for Chaffey, if he would like to read it. The latest services exports of South Australia for the 2016 calendar year show an 11 per cent increase, faster than the national rate of 9 per cent, to \$2.657 billion, so we are outperforming the nation in services exports.

Strong growth in volumes of exports is counterbalancing price falls in some categories, and 72,000 jobs now hinge on selling our goods and services overseas. For example, wine exports are up 11 per cent, or \$147 million to \$1.487 billion. In fact, wine is now a bigger export for us than minerals. This is a very significant development. It's the wining boom. Not the mining boom, it's the wining boom that is taking over.

Mr BELL: Point of order: I would hate for this to go on for 29 minutes. Could we have the other clock put up, thank you.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I could easily fill 29 minutes talking about the government's success in helping small businesses—

The SPEAKER: But thou shalt not.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —to grow exports. Goods sold to Singapore increased by more than 27 per cent, from \$136 million to \$173 million. Our top exports contributing to this growth were wine, valued at \$55 million; meat, valued at \$38 million; and vegetables, valued at \$12 million. Added to the growth in merchandise sold, there is also growth in the services sector where South Australia welcomed 539 international students from Singapore last year.

Our exports to Malaysia increased by more than 24 per cent, from \$652 million to \$811 million. Our top five merchandise exports to Malaysia are copper, grains, lead, wine and meat, with wine valued at \$51 million and meat valued at \$42 million, experiencing significant growth in 2016. South Australia also welcomed 1,775 international students from Malaysia last year bringing to almost 35,000 the total number of young people renting, consuming and living in South Australia from overseas.

From 23 to 29 July 2017, I will lead a business mission to Singapore and Malaysia, the second of three state government business missions to South-East Asia in 2017. The purpose of the missions is, as requested by business, to enable them to go to these markets and to meet with buyers. It's about sellers meeting buyers. International missions created up to 1,500 business connections and 650 export leads to a value of \$300 million in 2016. As I mentioned, there are 72,000 meals on the table every night flowing from this achievement.

The following sectors will be the focus of the Singapore and Malaysia mission: investment; agribusiness, food and wine; education and training; defence and advanced manufacturing; infrastructure and professional services; and tourism, arts and culture. A significant number of businesses have already signed up for this next business mission because business knows that government is there to support them to sell their goods and services to the 3.5 billion customers in our region, and that's exactly what we are doing.

CHILDCARE SERVICES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. As more than eight months have now passed since the minister was first asked, and repeated again yesterday, will the minister now tell the house how long the 15-year-old hoon driver who killed Mrs Tucker—and under her guardianship, that is, under the minister's guardianship—had been missing at the time of Mrs Tucker's death?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:40): As I indicated yesterday, I am seeking advice on what is appropriate to provide in terms of public information relating to a child under guardianship.

CHILDCARE SERVICES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): Supplementary: when was the minister then first advised that this hoon driver had even gone missing, and what did you do about it?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:40): I won't comment specifically on that individual child, but it is absolutely true that children who are under guardianship occasionally are out for a night, and sometimes for more than one night. That is, sadly, a feature of particularly older adolescent children under child protection. And it is not routine for the minister to be informed when the child is absent for a period of time. So, in terms of the specific case that is being asked about, as I have said repeatedly, I am seeking advice on what is appropriate to provide publicly.

CHILDCARE SERVICES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Further supplementary: given that the minister is still considering what information she can give to the house, will the minister at least tell us that when you hear of these occasions in the media or ask questions in the parliament, do you make any inquiry of your department about the whereabouts of these children and how long they have been missing?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:42): The question was phrased in a way that

captures a number of different circumstances. Naturally, when I become aware of a child under my guardianship who has been involved in a matter that relates to the law, I take a great deal of interest in the fate of that child and the circumstances that led up to that.

CHILDCARE SERVICES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Supplementary: again, notwithstanding the minister's indication that she is taking advice as to what information she is going to give on this case, did you make that inquiry in respect of this case and were you briefed on it?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:42): As I have indicated, when a matter becomes public or, alternatively, simply comes to my attention through other mechanisms, that involves a child under guardianship, then I do receive a briefing. I do make an inquiry.

Ms CHAPMAN: Further supplementary then.

The SPEAKER: Well, you are out of supplementaries, so let's make it a question.

CHILDCARE SERVICES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Thank you, sir. Will the minister provide to the house any report that she has received from her department or from the Guardian for Children and Young People about why this particular youth was not in his accommodation or under supervision at the time of the incident that he killed Mrs Tucker?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:43): I believe that my previous answers relating to what is acceptable and legal to provide publicly relating to a child under guardianship covers that question also.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Does the minister stand by his comments on 1 December last year that he is comfortable with the level of reliability in our electricity network and that 'prices will come down gradually over the next 12 to 18 months'?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:43): Yes, sir. If the shadow minister had been listening to the question the member for Wright asked me earlier, not only do I agree with that statement but so does the new CEO of AEMO, where she said on radio FIVEaa that the work the government is doing will increase reliability. In terms of reducing prices—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I know you just work here, sir. I understand. Also, of course, the government is out to procure new competition to the market using its own procurement. That is, the South Australian government is a very large customer, and we use it for our schools and for our hospitals, for our police and our other services.

We are out to the market now trying to incentivise a new generator into the system to try to create more competition. This could be a new solar thermal plant, it could be a new gas-fired generator, but what it will be is new competition. On the day we announced Our Energy Plan the Premier announced that we had short-listed three candidates. So, yes, I do absolutely expect Our Energy Plan to increase reliability and lower prices.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:45): A supplementary, sir: given the minister's answer, when will prices reduce and by how much?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:45): Ultimately, my very

strong view now is that the market is fundamentally broken and uncompetitive. You are seeing price rises across—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's right. The National Electricity Market across the entire NEM is showing massive increases. You are seeing it, of course, in New South Wales and you are seeing it in Queensland. I shudder to think what will happen in Victoria in December when they do their calendar-year update of their price increases. It is important to note that our new competitor coming into the market, underwritten by our new procurement to try to bring new generation in, will ultimately lower prices. Again, I say to the opposition: why don't we have a debate of ideas? Why don't we have a debate of policy? Why doesn't the opposition release its energy plan now, today, and let us have a debate?

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: They are more interested in GoPros.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know that GoPros are a big issue, but why don't we have a debate? Why don't the shadow minister and I have a debate about energy policies? Why don't we talk about our different plans? Instead, all we have is shouting because, in the absence of policy, he thinks that the loudest person wins.

HELPMANN AWARDS

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for The Arts. How is the South Australian arts community being represented at this year's Helpmann Awards?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:47): On Monday night, the Helpmann Awards nominations were announced and I am very proud of the huge number of South Australian artists and arts organisations that are recognised in this year's awards. Rachel Healy and Neil Armfield promised an Adelaide Festival to cement us as Australia's best artistic festival and they have delivered, with Handel's *Saul* earning a staggering seven nominations, including Best Director to Barrie Kosky, as well as Best Male Performer and Supporting Male Performer, Best Lighting, Best Musical Direction, Best Scenic Design and, the big one, Best Opera.

Restless Dance Theatre's unforgettable festival performance *Intimate Space* is up for Best Dance Production, and Concerto Italiano is nominated for Best Chamber Concert. The incredible acrobatic troupe Gravity & Other Myths, which is born out of the western suburbs-based Cirkidz—and based in your electorate, I think, Mr Speaker—has also earned national acclaim for their Adelaide Festival production *Backbone*, with nominations for Best New Australian Work and Best Choreography in a Ballet, Dance or Physical Theatre Production. The crew is touring around Europe with the production, and is doing us proud.

The festival has also earned a nomination for Best Sound Design for their co-presenting of *The Encounter*. Local company Windmill Theatre has also received a couple of nominations. While the film makes waves around the world, the theatre version of *Girl Asleep* joins Gravity & Other Myths with a nomination for Best New Australian Work, and Amber McMahon is nominated for Best Supporting Female Actor. Last year the State Theatre Company shook the Adelaide Festival Theatre with their stunning production of Andrew Bovell's *Things I Know to Be True*. Adelaide girl and former Cirkidz-trained performer Tilda Cobham-Hervey joins Amber as a nominee for Best Supporting Actress for her performance in *Things I Know to Be True*, which is also up for Best Play.

The Adelaide Cabaret Festival is also in the mix, with Paul Kelly and Camille O'Sullivan's *Ancient Rain*, presented by Adelaide's Brink Productions, nominated for Best Original Score, and last year's incredible presentation of Sven Ratzke's David Bowie-inspired performance *Starman* up for Best Cabaret. Alongside Sven is Adelaide's own Jimmy Barnes, and although not technically SA based, they are Adelaide Fringe favourites, Betty Grumble and Hot Brown Honey.

WOMADelaide is hoping to go back to back with their nomination for Best Contemporary Music Festival, with Samantha Hines presented by WOMAD up for Best Female Dancer. Finally, the already announced 2017 Sue Natrass Award, which recognises outstanding contribution to Australian live performance, is this year going to our very own Rob Brookman.

I place on the record my congratulations to all the nominees. The number and diversity of the nominations show what an incredible arts sector we have in South Australia. I encourage everyone to tune in on 24 July when the winners will be announced.

DARLINGTON INTERCHANGE INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENT

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Why has there been no contact from the minister's office or his department with the widow of Andrew Myama after his death a week ago on the site of the Darlington interchange project?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:50): As the member for Unley alludes to in his question, there has been a tragic incident on the Darlington South Road upgrade project, with a worker unfortunately killed on the night of 13 June last week. As media reports have made clear, SafeWork SA has been undertaking an investigation into that incident.

In the meantime, certainly we have been doing what we can as a government, and also the contractor involved, York Civil, a South Australian company, has been engaged with the worker's family to make offers of assistance. We have sought and received the assistance of the office of the victims' rights commissioner to liaise directly with the family to make good that offer that we have made clear will be put by the government to assist the family in the appropriate funeral, repatriation and travel costs and my advice is that those discussions are still continuing.

I am also aware that the contractor that I mentioned earlier has also made an offer of financial assistance, and I also believe that there is a monetary amount which is able to be paid to the family separate to either the government's or the contractor's amounts from ReturnToWorkSA, so there has been contact with the family.

We formed a judgement that it would be appropriate for the government office or the government agency which is best placed to deal with these matters, and that is the Commissioner for Victims' Rights and his office, to be dealing with the family, given that they have the incredibly important yet unfortunate duty to be dealing with individuals and families who unfortunately from time to time have to bear these tragic instances.

DARLINGTON INTERCHANGE INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENT

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:53): Supplementary to the Minister for Industrial Relations: why hasn't there been any contact from SafeWork SA with the widow of Andrew Myama after his death a week ago on the site of the Darlington interchange project?

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) (14:53): I will have to check what the—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I thought it was directed to me. I would have to check what the facts are as to whether or not this matter is being dealt with directly by, for example, Mr O'Connell, or whether it's being dealt with through SafeWork or whether—

Mr Pisoni: Why would SafeWork be involved?

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Perhaps it might assist the member for Unley if I explain what people's different jobs are. There is no doubt that, to the extent that there is an investigation of an industrial accident from the perspective of that accident possibly being ultimately the subject of a prosecution, SafeWork SA is the appropriate agency. They have inspectors. They have the statutory authority.

Ms Chapman: You just said it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That's right. I'm just trying to be helpful. They have the inspectors, they have that responsibility. To the extent that what we are talking about is a communication with a victim, or their family (in this case, their family), then I am simply making the point that it is not necessarily

clear that that first communication, or indeed any communication, would necessarily be from SafeWork; it may well be that it's Mr O'Connell. I will make inquiries as to what communication has occurred, but I don't necessarily—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned. The member for Morialta.

ROYAL ADELAIDE CLUB

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:55): My question is to the Premier. How much money did the state government provide to the Royal Adelaide Club as part of the Qingdao International Beer Festival sponsorship, and what was the nature of this funding?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:55): I understand that the Royal Croquet Club, or the Royal Adelaide Club, as I think it has latterly been known, has made, largely at the behest, I think, of the Adelaide city council, a decision to engage in a project as part of the 30th year celebrations of the sister state relationship between South Australia and Shandong Province.

As part of that, there was a Qingdao beer festival, which they decided that they were going to participate in. I think the Adelaide city council has since formed a sister city relationship with Qingdao. I believe that that would be an excellent way of demonstrating our friendship between the two jurisdictions—the city and the state, Shandong and Qingdao—during that period. They were very supportive of that.

At their urging, they also requested the South Australian government to provide some support for the Royal Adelaide Club, and I think we did provide some support. Indeed, I think they did participate in the Qingdao beer festival, but I will bring back the precise amount of the financial support that was given to that project.

ROYAL ADELAIDE CLUB

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:57): Supplementary: given the Premier's answer just then, in which it was characterised that the Royal Adelaide Club, perhaps with the encouragement of the Adelaide city council, undertook some engagement with the beer festival in Qingdao, why then did the Premier identify in March last year that a substantial presence at the Qingdao International Beer Festival was a coup for South Australia, and why was the presence there described as a joint venture between the Adelaide city council, the state government, Australian Trade Alliance and The Social Creative, the Adelaide company behind the Royal Croquet Club?

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) (14:57): I will take this question because I am in a position to provide some additional information, Mr Speaker. Let's just be clear about this: this was a proposal by the Royal Croquet Club. It was their venture from the outset. They came to the council and to government seeking support. It was completely their idea. On 15 June 2016, the directors of that organisation announced that the company, along with its parent company, The Social Creative, and the Royal Adelaide Club would be placed into voluntary administration partly as a consequence of their initiative.

Several corporate entities associated with the Adelaide Croquet Club launched that venture to which the member refers. The SA government was one of many sponsors in the private venture. We wanted them to succeed, but it was their idea. I will say to you that when I spoke to them I urged them to do a reconnaissance and some thorough business research before they put their neck out. I strongly urged them to go to the Qingdao beer festival and look at what unfolded, rather than relying upon information they had been given.

The decisions they made in regard to how they approached the matter are for them to answer, but it has been made publicly available how it ended from their point of view. The South Australian government—

Ms Chapman: We know that, but how much did you give them?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, if the deputy leader would like to ask a question, hop up and ask one, Vickie. I have been waiting for a question from you. On Facebook, the club claim:

The Royal Adelaide Club is an initiative led by the Adelaide City Council and the South Australian government to celebrate the sister city and sister state relationships with Qingdao and Shandong Province. Coopers Brewery, Yalumba Wines, Mori Seafood, Cleanseas Seafood, Stehr Seafood and Adelaide University will represent South Australia at the Royal Adelaide Club during the month-long festival.

That description was not quite correct. The SA government was a sponsor only. We provided them with support. It was their venture. The Royal Adelaide Club showcased SA food, wine and beer in Qingdao, and I give them credit because they put on a very good show. They put on a very good show and they established a very good presence in Qingdao, and it was actually quite a good stand. The only trouble was that people didn't turn up, and had they turned up I'm sure it would have been quite successful.

The Royal Adelaide Club Pty Ltd established in Qingdao an Adelaide trading company limited, Huangdo, in order to import sample products, such as beer, wine, food, beef, lamb and pork. I am advised they approached the Adelaide city council with concerns regarding import duties and bond-store delays, and those concerns were raised with us and we tried to help them with it. I just make the point that this was completely a private venture. We would love for it to have succeeded. We were, along with the council, happy to support them, but essentially it was their show and it was theirs to run. Now, that's what happened.

ROYAL ADELAIDE CLUB

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:01): My supplementary question is to the Premier. Given the minister has just advised that—and I think his quote was—'nobody showed up', what due diligence did the Premier undertake before telling the people of South Australia on 31 March last year that more than one million people will learn more about the tourism and studying opportunities we can provide in South Australia as a result of that sponsorship reported to be \$600,000?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:01): The member is obviously not listening to the answer. You need to listen to the answer before you ask a supplementary question because, as has been explained, this was completely a private venture by the entity concerned. The \$600,000 sponsorship, which has been publicly reported as having been provided, was in the hope that they would succeed.

They spent much more than that and they lost a significant amount, and we are very sad that that occurred on their behalf. But when a private venture goes to another country and runs an event, that is the risk that you take, and it would have been delightful if it had been successful, but it wasn't. We were happy to support it, but unfortunately it didn't work out for them.

ROYAL ADELAIDE CLUB

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:02): My supplementary question is to the Premier. How many other projects received \$600,000 in state government sponsorship, and I quote from the minister's answer just then, 'in the hope that they could succeed'?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:02): It's a silly question. It's a silly rhetorical question, but we're accustomed to silly rhetorical questions from those opposite. There clearly isn't any intent of there being a serious answer, so I think we will just dismiss it as another bit of opposition nonsense.

ROYAL ADELAIDE CLUB

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:03): Why has the government been at pains to describe this as a private venture in which they were not involved—in fact, all the interest came from The Social Creative themselves—when that is clearly a contested point in many public fora, and the Premier himself, in March last year, described it in different terms?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:03): It's never a good idea to make up your questions off the mobile phone on the spur of the moment without having run them through your question time committee because the question is like—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Here they go. Here they go. There's a 20-year project over there to get into government, and I wonder how successful that's been? It's one thing to set targets; it's another one to achieve them. It might be another 20 years before they get there—but nothing like a target. Work away at it, boys, but you will have to ask better questions than these.

Members interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: standing order 98, the minister is going nowhere with the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta provoked such a response with his question, and I hope it's now over.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I'm sorry, Mr Speaker, but I'm just dying to further answer the question because in his question he purported that we, as a government, had not supported the project. We have made it clear in our earlier answers that we did. We would like for it to have succeeded, but unfortunately it did not. It would have been terrific if it had become an annual event, but unfortunately the venture has been unsuccessful.

ROYAL ADELAIDE CLUB

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:04): Supplementary: given the minister's description that he had hoped it would be an annual event, and reports that the sponsorship was for the event proceeding over two years, how much money is the South Australian government owed as a result of the failure to fulfil the second year of the proposed contract?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:04): I will come back to the member with a more detailed response, but I will say this: the project—

Mr Whetstone: You are pathetic. Get a brief.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Coming from the member for Chaffey, that's a wonderful compliment because the member for Chaffey is a person who certainly understands incompetence. I have made it clear to you that the government gave the project \$600,000 for a two-year commitment. The project has failed. The project owes us \$600,000. In effect, we have lost our investment. As far as I am aware, and I think it has been made clear by the entity, they have no intention of returning for a second year.

Sadly, the venture has failed and others have lost money. There is a long list of creditors involved. Sadly, this one has been unsuccessful. If you want to know what went wrong with the project, go and ask the people who organised it and, hopefully, they will tell you. We were a supporter of the project, but others ran it and others invested their money and, sadly, it was unsuccessful. That is disappointing.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Given that it is over 18 months since the last round of the Regional Development Fund closed, can the minister inform the house when the next round will be advertised?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:06): To the member for Mount Gambier: you have one more sleep and then there will be an announcement.

*Grievance Debate***RIVERLAND COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICE**

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:06): Today, I rise to voice the concerns of the Riverland community about the structural changes to legal services in the region and the severe impacts these decisions will have. Late last month, the state government announced a restructure of community legal services across the state and, sadly, the Riverland was hit the hardest. The Riverland Community Legal Service is based in Berri and provides a valuable service for those who cannot afford legal advice, particularly for issues which are often complex in nature and require face-to-face contact. It currently employs five staff and is a well-utilised service for the disadvantaged in our community. I am extremely concerned about these proposed changes.

As the member for Mount Gambier highlighted yesterday, presently there are eight community legal centres that receive community funding in South Australia. The South Australian Labor government only contributes just under \$1 million each year to the community legal centres, or just 19 per cent of the total funding pool. South Australia is the second lowest contributor of any state or territory government in Australia, with other state governments contributing over 40 per cent or more.

As of 1 July, almost 20 years of the Riverland Community Legal Service providing support and advice to the region and its surrounds will come to an end. I commend the huge work that has been done by the service, particularly through Neil Smith and Marilyn Wilksch. Over almost 20 years, lawyers at the service have advised and represented thousands of disadvantaged people in family law matters, such as divorce, parenting orders, property division, intervention orders and assisting women who are victims of domestic violence.

They have advised, represented and educated individuals on matters such as neighbourhood disputes, start-up businesses, retail and commercial leases, criminal law, licence disqualifications, traffic law, fencing disputes, enduring power of attorney, guardianships and medical power of attorney. They have provided employment law advice and assisted migrants.

The state government's short-sighted decision to close this very important Riverland service will have far-reaching consequences. From 1 July, the five employees at the Riverland Community Legal Service will no longer have a job. The centre is still dealing with a high number of cases, many complex in nature, and it was given four weeks to wind up. They need months, not weeks, to wind up this service, particularly with cases that are halfway through. This impact is still being felt, and it will continue to be felt for a long period of time.

The Southern Community Justice Centre at Christies Beach will now operate the Riverland Community Legal Services. That is an outreach service from the Riverland to Christies Beach. I think it is just outrageous. I am advised that the region may potentially have a part-time employee, but until then travel will be required. Labor's federal government blame game is not going to cut it this time. The state government's cut is \$6 million. The Law Society of South Australia, legal professionals and community legal centres have spoken and made substantial submissions to the Attorney-General to reverse these cuts.

As to the Riverland Community Legal Services, here are just a few numbers of what they undertake as a very important service. Over the last 12 months, they have had face-to-face appointments with 30 to 40 clients per week. That is approximately 1,500 clients per year. Twenty to 30 community legal education sessions were delivered to community, schools, community health, ac.care, Relationships Australia, ethnic groups, senior citizens, carers, adult learning centres, TAFE and so on. They have provided a free duty solicitor service at the Berri Magistrates Court on days when legal aid solicitors are not funded to attend and outreach visits to Morgan, Waikerie, Cadell, Karoonda and Pinnaroo. These centres have been a great base for newly qualified lawyers wanting to get experience.

I received a letter today from Mediation SA, a service that my office has utilised to provide advice to constituents. The letter has informed me that Mediation SA, which has operated for 30 years, will close on 30 June as unfortunately Southern Community Justice Centre was not successful in securing ongoing funding to continue to deliver mediation services in South Australia.

The service will now be provided by Uniting Communities' Central Community Legal Centre, and hopefully a similar level of service that has been provided before will continue.

In conclusion, I wrote to the Attorney-General expressing my concerns almost four weeks ago. I have not had a response. The Riverland cannot afford to have another service centralised to the city, particularly one that provides a community legal service as the region deals with major challenges such as increased drug crime and domestic violence.

Time expired.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:12): In September 2013, an Independent Commission Against Corruption was set up in South Australia. Unlike some other models, it was eventually legislated that our ICAC would not allow for public hearings. Rather, they would remain private until investigations were completed, when findings could be made public and recommended matters proceed to court.

Our ICAC is effective and has many powers. At the time, our new ICAC commissioner, Bruce Lander, described this provision as 'sensible'. Mr Lander said open, public hearings would create a risk of sullyng the reputation of people who were innocent and that he did not see ICAC's role as shaming people who were not guilty of corruption. However, if the person's conduct did not amount to corruption, but it amounted to misconduct or maladministration, then he would make that public.

As then, I have every confidence that Commissioner Lander has, can and will produce valuable and worthy reports with private hearings, and I am concerned confidence in the ICAC process may be eroded by continuing debate without all facts being taken into consideration. I am one of many who say the sooner we get Commissioner Lander's report on Oakden, the sooner we can act upon it. These families and their loved ones deserve a swift investigation and full information on what actually happened, why systems failed and what will be done in future to see these things never happen again.

I am sorry for what has happened, for what they have experienced and for their suffering, which continues while we await the findings and recommendations. If people are found to be culpable, the families need to know there will be repercussions for those who have so dreadfully and tragically let them down and all of us down as well.

On Thursday 1 June, parliament was given short notice to consider an amendment that would give the option of making ICAC hearings open at the commissioner's discretion. Calls for this measure most recently came from the commissioner himself as he prepared to look into what had been happening at the Oakden facility. For some years, families using Oakden have had to watch knowing things were not quite right, knowing their loved ones existed in a place that has obviously not always served them well, despite receiving commonwealth accreditation annually.

Because of the commonwealth's involvement, it is fitting that the Senate inquiry, called 'Effectiveness of the Aged Care Quality Assessment and accreditation framework for protecting residents from abuse and poor practices and ensuring proper clinical and medical care standards are maintained and practised', has been called for and referred to the Senate Community Affairs References Committee on 13 June. The last day for anyone to provide a submission is 3 August, with a report scheduled for tabling on 18 February 2018. I urge anyone with any information to make a submission.

In the years before ICAC was established, I travelled in 2007, coincidentally at the same time as the member for Heysen, to look at the already established Queensland Crime and Misconduct Commission and returned an advocate. I am not a lawyer and so did not have a final view on the model to be implemented. On 13 August 2012, Attorney-General Rau gave a wideranging interview on Radio Adelaide 891 and said:

When you are dealing with an allegation of criminal behaviour by a public official, our provisions are stronger than anywhere except the Australian Crime Commission.

He went on to outline the model we have adopted, including the importance of the presumption of innocence, part of the rule of law we so rightly hold dear. He then added:

The only thing that is being protected from public disclosure here is the collection of information or the collection of evidence or the investigation of a matter. The Commissioner is able to make public statements about pretty well anything the Commissioner wants, provided that those public statements are not going to be compromising criminal prosecutions or things of that nature.

I have always made my decisions with the views of the electorate in mind. Representing my electorate is a solemn undertaking I do not take lightly. It would seem easy for some for me to join the calls for public ICAC hearings, but what would be the aim for such a measure and what would it achieve? Public interest is primarily named as the major factor and is an important part of the democratic process, but so too is the presumption of innocence and the right to legal representation. All factors must be considered, weighed and a balanced position reached.

I believe the correct vehicle for the best result on an issue of this significance is a national royal commission into aged care, similar to the child abuse and protection royal commission, because unfortunately places like Oakden are all over Australia. Royal commissions are the accepted process to guarantee the public interest of open hearings. This is balanced with legal representation and open proceedings and findings.

I am particularly interested in what measures have been put in place by the state government to assist the Oakden residents and families and to stop this from ever happening again. I have spoken with the Premier and sought his assurances that the Oakden matters will be dealt with thoroughly and expeditiously. However, that still leaves us with an aged-care system that needs a major overhaul. A royal commission should solve the fundamental and overarching issues that we as an ageing population face. The proportion of Australians aged more than 65 years is rising steadily and more and more of us will become old, frail and vulnerable, with dementia and mental illness possibly a consideration as well.

For many reasons, as a society, a growing number of us entrust the care of elderly relatives to others. Recently, my family began to know and understand only too well that type of experience. We are facing the same sad reality of Oakden-type issues. Somehow we must find a way to ensure this often repeated story gains attention and is remedied so that our frail and vulnerable older people who once supported us are valued, respected, cared for and live with dignity in a loving and nurturing environment. A royal commission will examine all aspects of aged care.

OAKLANDS PARK RAIL CROSSING

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:17): I rise today to speak on a great outcome for my community. Confronted with a 40-year-old problem that created delays and frustrations, as well as safety issues, it was rewarding to join our community on a Fix Oaklands Crossing campaign. This has been a win for the people and now we have a solution for these ongoing safety and congestion issues that have long been painning our local area.

This is proof that a community coming together and championing a cause can achieve the desired outcome. If anyone would like to see the history of this campaign and follow the time line of what has been achieved to deliver this outcome, you can go to my website, www.fixoaklandscrossing.com.au. Here you can see every step in the journey, including the pressure that was placed on the state government over a number of years, calling on them to come to the party.

The federal member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint, passionately championed the cause from the moment she was preselected to be the Liberal candidate before the federal election last year. In fact, she was the first person to get a financial commitment to the project of \$40 million, which started the ball rolling, followed by negotiations for another \$55 million to deliver the outcome we have today. That was outstanding, and it was great working with her and the federal minister in the Turnbull government, Paul Fletcher, to achieve this outcome. It was also a pleasure to work with the member for Bright and the candidate for Black, who has been there every step of the way, knowing the importance of this project to the people in our community.

The fixoaklandscrossing.com.au website also shows the ongoing engagement our Oaklands champions have had. While I have stated that this is a whole-of-community project, there were a few people who committed to the cause right from the start. They were above the politics and were just focused on getting the outcome. There are too many to name, but they know who they are and I

would like to thank them for their passion and involvement. Can I say in this chamber that they should be very proud of the large part they have played in achieving such a wonderful outcome.

The time line also shows the constant requests for the state Minister for Transport to come and visit the intersection and see the problem firsthand. It took a while, but we eventually convinced him to swing by and, after 15 years, the constant pressure also forced the Premier finally to come and see the problem firsthand and witness the intersection that has caused delays of up to 40 minutes for commuters in our local area.

A lot of people who have contacted me are still angry about the \$6.8 million that was spent by former Labor transport minister Pat Conlon moving the station towards the intersection back in 2008. The community know that this just added to the congestion and delay for everyone who uses the crossing. Again, more detail is outlined on my www.fixoaklandscrossing.com.au website. There were also questions about the \$2 million spent in the lead-up to the last election with fancy pictures of an overpass that was being touted but, today, the government has binned that work and is pushing ahead with the rail under road project that my community was calling to be explored and that has now been seen as the right solution.

Again, there is a lot of frustration with the Premier spending tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayer money sending people letters claiming full credit for this project and ignoring the work done by the community on the www.fixoaklands.crossing.com.au campaign. I have had a number of people contact my office who are angry about this, and I will quote a letter I received on 16 June 2017. The letter states:

The true fact is that there has been a conspicuous lack of any campaign of the State Labor Government to have the Oaklands Railway Crossing fixed except for a few motherhood generalised statements containing no precise details until 7th June, 2017.

Your circular cleverly omitted a number of important items critical to properly assess it.

1. It failed to state that the State Labor Government did not support the campaign until a few weeks ago.
2. It did not mention the Federal Government's commitment to provide \$40 million towards the project announced during the 2016 Federal election.
3. It had not made any commitment to fund the project until a few weeks ago.
4. It failed to mention that as a result of a groundswell of public opinion brought on by the campaign of the member for Mitchell the State Labor Government has been stung into action it did not want to take.

Clearly, my community is upset with the Premier trying to take credit when in fact they are the ones who have done all the work, but I do not want to dwell on the negatives. This is a great outcome for our community following their hard work on this campaign. This is an opportunity to create a space that will make our community safer, reduce traffic congestion and link people to the services they have previously been hampered in accessing.

Our campaign will not end here. We will continue to make sure that we hold the transport minister to account in delivering this project and that we get the best outcome for our local community. The website www.fixoaklandscrossing.com.au will be a vehicle for people to stay in touch and follow the project. I have posted the flyover video of the artist's impression of what the station and intersection will look like. I stress that it is only an artist's impression and that this will be used as a guide. I will be making sure the state government keep our community updated with the actual design plans for the rail underpass and associated works throughout this process.

DISABILITY ACCESS AND INCLUSION

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:22): Late last week, I was really pleased to represent the Minister for Disabilities at a disability access and inclusion consultation in the City of Salisbury, close to my electorate. This consultation looked at ways in which state government can better facilitate the access and inclusion into broader society of people with disability, and looked particularly at ways in which we can assist and encourage local government to do the same thing.

This consultation was hosted by the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion and also by the City of Salisbury, and I want to acknowledge in particular the work of Mike Taggart, who

heads up Salisbury council's strategies for greater inclusion for people with disability. He himself made many worthwhile contributions to that session, which I attended after my official duties.

The point of the consultation was to bring together local people with disability, their carers and the relevant policymakers and workers within state and local government to really tease out some of the barriers to people with disability, particularly in the areas of employment and transport. I missed the morning session on employment but, clearly, employment is critical to providing people with independence and economic security. Both the South Australian Strategic Plan and the National Disability Strategy have a strong focus on improving employment outcomes for people with disability.

I was able to reflect a little on the work of this state government, in particular the Office of the Industry Advocate, which we are coincidentally discussing today, in helping to frame government contracts and tenders that specifically give incentives for employers and businesses bidding for government contracts to look at employing people with disability, among others, who have barriers to employment.

I know from my experience of working closely with Lendlease on the Northern Connector project that this strategy does work and that companies like Lendlease are already exceeding their targets in both this and other areas of workforce participation. I was really pleased to stick around for a while for the transport part of the consultation and to listen and also have my two cents worth about how I see the future of transport and how it might affect people with disability.

Clearly, the ability to move around the community underpins all aspects of life for people with disability, including employment. So, the provision of accessible, affordable and efficient public transport is essential. The 2015 report on the review of the transport standards identified 15 recommendations, including the development of accessibility guidelines for a whole-of-journey approach. This is all about recognising the importance of ensuring that all aspects of a person's journey are accessible and seamless.

I think it is inevitable that in the next decade or so we are going to see something of a revolution in the provision of both private and public transport, particularly in our urban and suburban areas. We will see the adoption of autonomous vehicles, both in the private market and in the provision of mass transit. We will see an increasing use of the sharing economy, with companies like Uber using technology to connect commuters with private transport. We will also see the exponential growth of smart city technology, which will bring all of these things together and, ideally, from a public policy point of view, enable seamless door-to-destination travel, blurring the lines between public and private transport.

The challenge for government, of course, will be to make sure that public policies keep pace with technology and afford people with disability, among others, the same options that will be available to the broader community. Even now we have gaps. The forum heard from many of the people present many examples of various barriers to public transport, air travel and taxi travel. They also suggested many smart solutions, which will form part of the submission to the minister.

The next step is that the findings from this consultation, as well as from similar forums elsewhere, will be collated by the Disability Policy Unit and government will be provided with a report to help prioritise our efforts into the future. Of course, overshadowing all this is the NDIS, which is changing the face of disability service provision and, in the process, providing the potential for thousands of new jobs into the future, particularly in the northern suburbs. We have already seen service providers like Minda set up in the Elizabeth CBD and the creation of a disability hub at Elizabeth City Centre to help coordinate some of this expected employment growth.

On Monday, I was pleased to attend the opening of the new Novita service centre on Philip Highway, also in the Elizabeth CBD, along with the minister, the Premier and His Excellency the Governor and Mrs Van Le, who are long-time patrons of Novita.

Novita understands that the growth of this industry will largely be based around the northern suburbs. They are also responding to the opportunities of the NDIS by expanding their services beyond the arbitrary age of 18 to cater for young adults. In addition, the expansion of Novita into Elizabeth will lead directly to the creation of 10 new jobs, with the possibility of more to come as the NDIS rolls out further to include adult funding.

All this activity is not only good for people with disability in the north but also for the economic and cultural health of Elizabeth into the future. I think these are exciting times for that sector.

COUNTRY CABINET

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:27): I would like to make a few points today about the recent country cabinet visit to my electorate. I welcome country cabinet regional visits. It is always good to get government ministers out and about to see what is going on. They visited Kangaroo Island, Victor Harbor and Yankalilla. I may start at the end and work back to the front.

The people of Yankalilla were somewhat perplexed that the cabinet was there. They were highly amused and bemused at some of the antics that went on in what was a deliberate pork-barrelling exercise. I was not amused. The Premier, the Minister for Education and the Minister for Tourism went to the Yankalilla Area School. On their sign out the front, the Yankalilla school welcomed the Premier and the Minister for Education, but they were instructed to put Leon Bignell down as the member for Mawson, rather than as the minister. It was a deliberate tactic that did not go down well. I might add that I was not invited to that function where they handed out money to the school, which I gratefully accepted.

Victor Harbor was another case of an interesting exercise, where the ministers ran around the town. I went to the high school with the Minister for Education, which was a congenial type of visit. I do not have any argument with the Minister for Education but, once again, the session in the rec centre was rather entertaining. It was quite clear that the Labor Party had organised people to ask questions. The first two or three questions came straight from local Labor Party identities. No-one else got a look-in. If you think I am cynical on that lot—yes.

But the one that really took the cake was the visit to Kangaroo Island where they descended en masse—46 vehicles that I know of came over on the boat, including ministerial limousines and drivers everywhere, and 46 of them went back on one boat. The cost to the taxpayer of that particular trip across the water and back would have been around \$15,000 on its own. Of course, Kangaroo Island residents just love to see shiny chauffeur-driven limos driving around on their rough roads. I do not think they went on the rough roads, but enough of that. I am getting even more cynical. It was a great pork-barrelling exercise.

They had a function on Sunday night in the Town Hall that was well attended. I might add that most of the functions they held were half-full of bureaucrats, hangers-on and government agents but, be that as it may, they held them. Afterwards, there was a business dinner for investors. They had potential investors and already committed investors into various projects on the island and they had the full board and hangers-on of KI Plantation Timbers. They invited them along, but they did not invite anyone from Yumbah Aquaculture. They did not think they were investors. They have only invested \$30 million, I might add, and they want to make further investment, but they did not invite anyone from there. It was a complete set-up.

I have no doubt whatsoever that the government's agents, the KI commissioner and a few other hangers-on over there sorted out who was going and who was not going. What they did not pay any attention to was the infrastructure on the island. To the best of my knowledge, they did not discuss in any way, shape or form the SWER lines out at the west end of the island, which are severely rundown and degraded. They did not discuss at any time the critical water situation. The minister in another place today failed to tell the house what was going to happen in this dry year if the Middle River dam does not fill up, because you are not going to have golf courses or developments without water. That was a really critical thing that happened there today.

They did not want to talk about the BJ Jarrad creditors who have never been paid. They did not want to talk about the NBS contractors on the airport project who have not been paid. They wanted to put out all the good spin, but they did not want to talk about the bad spin. I think what we have here is a version of SA Inc. and they have actually turned it into more of a KI Inc. on Kangaroo Island. It is KI Inc. with those who support the government and get into political bed with the government and do the government's bidding and the rest of them can just run around.

Interestingly, on Saturday the member for Mawson, the Minister for Tourism, went to two games of football and I had local people ringing me up saying, 'What is that fool of a man doing out

here? We don't want to see him.' That was another interesting point. You might want to refer to minister Hunter in another place, who had quite a bit more to say about it yesterday and said that the member for Mawson was mobbed. I can assure you that he was not mobbed when he was on Kangaroo Island. He was not mobbed at all. It is all interesting in the lead-up to the election.

Time expired.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unfortunately, member for Finniss, we are going to have to wait for another instalment to finish off an exciting report.

ARRIUM

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:33): I will unexpectedly get up and speak on this side. I am looking forward to the next instalment. I have to say that the cabinet visits that I have been involved in—and there have been three of them now—have all been, I would have to say, pretty positive affairs that went over very well. Sometimes there are costs associated with these trips. The cost in going up to the APY lands and the logistics behind it would have been significant. I am not sure if there is an argument being put that we should not go to places like the APY lands in my electorate because it is costly. I think it is incredibly important to go to places like the APY lands and meet with people face to face. There is no substitute for being on the lands and meeting with people.

What I want to talk about in the time that I have left is the step-by-step progress that is being made in relation to the future of Whyalla, the integrated steelworks and the mines at Whyalla. A big step has been made. We are down to the final bidder, the Korean consortium, and I hope that we are going to have a final sign-off and a new owner in the not too distant future.

I am always very mindful in my community, given what we have been through, of building expectations. There is always a need to emphasise that, even though we are down to the final bidder, we do not have the sign-off, that there are a number of things that need to happen: it has to go before the Foreign Investment Review Board—I am fairly confident it will get through that process—and there has to be a creditors meeting.

For those of us in this house, one of the important elements, and the important element for the state and federal governments, is what the final assistance package for the steelworks will look like. All the way through this process, from before the administrators were appointed, I have had a lot of confidence that the Premier, the Treasurer and the cabinet have got the back of the Whyalla community. Throughout this process, I have been left in no doubt that we are going to be there to ensure that we get the best outcome possible for the people of Whyalla and for the future of the structural steel industry in this country.

It has been left to the state government to provide leadership, leadership that in circumstances like this normally comes from a federal government. I am fairly confident that the federal government will come to the party. I am confident that they have an understanding of the circumstances the Whyalla community would face if there were a closure of the steelworks. I am also confident that they appreciate the national significance of this industry, the strategic importance of the structural steel industry in Australia.

We do not want to be put in a position, as a major iron ore producer, of being almost totally dependent upon overseas suppliers for something as foundationally important as structural steel. I think that is why there has been significant backing in the private sector to ensure that there will be a future for structural steelmaking in Australia.

Some of the things that have been floated in relation to the bid from the Korean consortium, if they come to pass, will be incredibly positive for Whyalla, for the region and for the state. If that investment flows into a fundamental transformation in the iron-making process in Whyalla and, as part of that transformation in the iron making process, a major cogeneration unit is established in Whyalla, it will be incredibly good news indeed and it might well turn Whyalla into an energy hub along with the solar projects that are happening at the moment.

*Bills***HEALTH CARE (PRIVATE DAY PROCEDURE CENTRES) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:38): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Health Care Act 2008. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:39): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The government is introducing the Health Care (Private Day Procedure Centres) Amendment Bill 2017 into parliament to amend provisions of the Health Care Act 2008 relating to licensing of stand-alone private day procedure centres. The act was previously amended by the Health Care (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2016, which was passed by the parliament in May 2016.

This bill is necessary, as during the passage of the Health Care (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2016 in the other place an amendment was moved by the shadow minister for health causing understandable concern for the medical profession. As a result, the government believes it has an obligation to correct this error, which relates to the administration of local anaesthetic in private day procedure centres.

It was never the intention of the government that routine surgical procedures undertaken in private medical consulting rooms or office-based surgeries be captured within the scope of the licensing regime. The bill that the government previously introduced in this place reflected this position. However, the shadow minister for health in the other place insisted on an amendment that meant the administration of local anaesthetic would be captured as a 'prescribed health service' for licensing purposes.

This understandably prompted significant concern for us from stakeholders, including the Australian Medical Association, the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, as well as other colleges and associations representing a variety of medical and health practitioners, who rightly argued that including the administration of local anaesthetic in the scheme would prohibit specialists and other practitioners from performing routine surgical procedures in their private medical consulting rooms or office-based surgeries without being licensed as a private day procedure centre. Not only would this be administratively burdensome for practitioners but it would be overly burdensome from a regulatory perspective.

It is for this reason, as well as to make another minor amendment, that the government is introducing the Health Care (Private Day Procedure Centres) Amendment Bill 2017 into parliament to amend provisions of the act to revert to the intent of the original bill with respect to local anaesthetic, correcting a somewhat misguided amendment insisted upon by the shadow minister for health. I seek leave to have the balance of my second reading speech and explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Government is introducing the Health Care (Private Day Procedure Centres) Amendment Bill 2017 to Parliament to amend the Health Care Act 2008 ('the Act') to:

- Remove health services involving the administration of local anaesthetic from the definition of a 'prescribed health service' in relation to the licensing of premises as private day procedure centres; and
- Insert a power for the Minister to confer exemptions in relation to specified prescribed health services by notice in the Gazette.

The *Health Care (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2016* amends the Act to enable the licensing of stand-alone private day procedure centres. This brings South Australia into alignment with other jurisdictions and provides a range of measures, including the ability to impose specific licence conditions, to ensure that potential safety and quality risks are addressed.

In accordance with the *Health Care (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2016*, a person must not provide a prescribed health service except at premises in respect of which a licence is in force as a private day procedure centre. Prescribed health services are defined as:

- a health service that involves the administration of general, spinal, epidural or major regional block anaesthetic; or
- a health service that involves intravenous sedation (other than conscious sedation); or
- a health service that involves the administration of local anaesthetic; or
- as prescribed by the regulations.

The administration of local anaesthetic was not included as a prescribed health service in the original Bill that was consulted on in March and April, 2015, and which then entered Parliament last year. The intention had been to capture procedures of sufficient complexity or invasiveness using only local anaesthetic in the *Health Care Regulations 2008*. This would have avoided the scope of the licensing system being applied too broadly and unnecessarily capturing within scope a range of minimally invasive or low-risk procedures using only local anaesthetic.

However, an amendment to the Bill was proposed in the Legislative Council to include the administration of local anaesthetic as a 'prescribed health service' for licensing purposes. A further amendment excluded services provided by a medical practitioner in the course of practice as a general practitioner; and by a dentist in the course of general dentistry practice, being the two largest groups of practitioners using local anaesthetic to undertake minor procedures in their private consulting rooms or office based surgeries. The ability to make further exclusions via the regulations was also added and the Bill was passed by Parliament in May, 2016.

During the recent stakeholder consultation on the subordinate legislation, the draft *Health Care (Private Day Procedure Centres) Variation Regulations 2017*, it became apparent that substantial concern exists regarding the inclusion of the administration of local anaesthetic as a 'prescribed health service' in the Act.

Stakeholders including the Australian Medical Association, Royal Australasian College of Surgeons and other colleges and associations representing a variety of medical and health practitioners, such as the Australian Society of Plastic Surgeons, Australasian College of Dermatologists, Australian Podiatry Association, Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Ophthalmologists and Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, expressed substantial concern that local anaesthetic was included in the licensing criteria and that only general practitioners and general dentistry were exempted from this criteria in the Act.

They are concerned that the legislation appears to prohibit specialists and other practitioners from performing routine surgical procedures using local anaesthetic in their private consulting rooms or office based surgeries. It is argued that restricting the performance of these procedures to licensed private day procedure centres will lead to a number of unintended negative consequences and adverse patient outcomes, including an increase to the cost of basic minor procedures imposed on patients and lengthy delays to a significant number of important diagnostic procedures and other treatments.

A broad range of minimally invasive, low-risk procedures are performed under local anaesthetic in practitioner's private rooms or office based surgeries. For example, by a dermatologist to diagnose skin biopsies and remove malignant or non-malignant skin cancers. A podiatrist uses local anaesthetic to undertake procedures on ingrown toe nails, warts and skin lesions. Ophthalmologists use local anaesthetic for eyelid skin biopsies and lesion excision, drainage of abscesses and intravitreal injection of medication for the treatment of macular degeneration. Obstetricians and gynaecologists use local anaesthetic for the insertion or removal of hormonal implants and intra-uterine devices and the investigation, biopsy and treatment of pre-malignant or potentially malignant conditions of the genital tract. Radiologists use local anaesthetic in their practices to facilitate ultrasound guided joint and tendon investigations or during aspiration biopsies of breast lumps. These are just some examples of the use of local anaesthetic for the performance of a substantial range of minor procedures by a large number of different medical and health practitioners.

The consistent message communicated by the majority of stakeholders with respect to the consultation on the draft regulations was that an amendment should be made to exempt all registered medical, dental and health practitioners in the course of their normal scope of practice from the local anaesthetic criteria. Exempting all registered practitioners clearly undermines the provisions of the Act pertaining to local anaesthetic and makes it redundant. It is therefore sensible to remove the sections of the Act referring to the administration of local anaesthetic.

The South Australian legislation would then be consistent with other jurisdictions that require facilities to be licensed based on the higher levels of anaesthetic (general, spinal, epidural, major regional block) and intravenous sedation (other than conscious sedation). No other jurisdiction includes the administration of local anaesthetic within their private day procedure centre licensing criteria.

Where more complex or invasive procedures are performed under local anaesthetic these will be prescribed by regulations, as was the original intention. A good example of this is the tumescent technique for liposuction, where a large volume of very dilute solution of local anaesthesia is injected into the fat beneath the skin, causing the targeted area to become tumescent. To this end it has been proposed with stakeholders that the cosmetic surgical procedures listed in the New South Wales' *Private Health Facilities Amendment (Cosmetic Surgery) Regulations 2016* be

replicated for inclusion in the South Australian regulations. It is understood that the majority of stakeholders, including the Australasian College of Cosmetic Surgery, support this approach. Prescribing these specific procedures by regulation, rather than in the Act, will provide the flexibility to add additional services as and when required in response to changes in technology and service delivery methods.

It should also be noted that the existing thirty-one private day procedure centres that have already been declared by the Australian Government and issued with a facility provider number under the *Private Health Insurance Act 2007 (Cth)*, on the basis of a previous recommendation by SA Health, will be issued with a deemed licence under the Act's 'grandparenting' provision.

In addition, this Bill inserts a power to confer exemptions in relation to specified prescribed health services by notice in the Gazette. This power will be used to make exemptions for emergency services organisations including the South Australian Ambulance Service, MedSTAR and the Royal Flying Doctor Service, as well as providing the flexibility to make any further exemptions in the future. There are two further clauses in the Bill which are administrative in nature and simply redesignate sections.

The Government believes that the proposed amendments will bring South Australia into alignment with other state and territory jurisdictions, by setting an appropriate threshold for licensing based on patient safety, without unnecessarily restricting the provision of essential health services utilising local anaesthetic in private practitioner's consulting rooms or office based surgeries.

The *Health Care (Private Day Procedure Centres) Amendment Bill 2017* will come into operation immediately after section 10A of the *Health Care (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2016* comes into operation, which has been delayed until 1 May, 2018, to enable an appropriate lead-in time for premises meeting the requirement to be licensed to prepare for licensing, including the requirement to attain accreditation to the National Safety and Quality Health Service Standards.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Health Care Act 2008*

4—Amendment of section 89—Preliminary

In Part 10A section 89, this clause proposes to delete paragraph (c) from the definition of *prescribed health service* thereby removing from that definition a health service that involves the administration of local anaesthetic. The clause also makes a consequential amendment to delete subsection (2).

5—Insertion of section 89L

This clause proposes to insert a power for the Minister to make general exemptions from the operation of Part 10A of the Act or specified provisions of that Part by notice in the Gazette. Such exemptions may be granted on conditions the Minister thinks fit and a failure to comply with a condition will be an offence with a maximum penalty of \$20,000.

6—Redesignation of section 89—Other staffing arrangements

In Part 11 section 89, this clause resolves a conflict in the numbering of certain provisions.

7—Amendment of section 92—Conflict of interest

This clause is consequential on the redesignation in clause 6.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:42): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:42): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Criminal Law Consolidation (Criminal Organisations) Amendment Bill 2017 amends part 3B division 2 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1934. That division contains a scheme that responds to serious and organised crime in our community. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Background

In 2015, the *Statutes Amendment (Serious and Organised Crime) Act 2015* ('2015 Act') was passed. The 2015 Act inserted Division 2 into Part 3B the CLCA. Division 2 is headed 'public places, prescribed places and prescribed events'. It is directed toward participants in criminal organisations. It prohibits such people from:

- being knowingly present in a public place with 2 or more other participants in a criminal organisation;
- entering a prescribed place or attending a prescribed event; or
- recruiting another person to become a participant in a criminal organisation.

For the purposes of Division 2, 'criminal organisation' is defined in three ways. Criminal organisation means:

1. an organisation of 3 or more persons who:
 - have as their purpose, or as 1 of their purposes, engaging in, organising, planning, facilitating, supporting, or otherwise conspiring to engage in, serious criminal activity; and
 - by their association represent an unacceptable risk to the safety, welfare or order of the community; or
2. a declared organisation within the meaning of the *Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act 2008*; or
3. an entity declared by regulation to be a criminal organisation.

For the purposes of the third limb of the definition, the Criminal Law Consolidation (Criminal Organisations) Regulations 2015 declare 10 entities to be criminal organisations. Those Regulations are not a product of the usual regulation making process. They were contained in a schedule to the 2015 Act and converted to regulations on its assent.

The process that must be followed in order to declare any additional organisations for the purposes of the third limb of the definition of criminal organisation is detailed in section 83GA of the CLCA. There is scope for a report from the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee, there is scope for the Minister to consider any information suggesting a link between the entity and serious criminal activity, relevant convictions, and a range of other information. A regulation declaring a criminal organisation may be disallowed by resolution of either House of Parliament. In this way, the Parliament retains control over which further entities, if any, are declared to be criminal organisations.

Removal of no criminal purpose defence

In relation to each of the offence provisions in Part 3B, Division 2 there is a 'no criminal purpose' defence. It first occurs in section 83GC(2), which provides that:

It is a defence to a charge of an offence against subsection (1) for the defendant to prove that the criminal organisation in which it is alleged that the defendant is a participant is not an organisation that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or conspiring to engage in, criminal activity.

Where the no criminal purpose defence is raised, the prosecution is required to disprove it. This means that the prosecution is required to prove that the criminal organisation had, at the relevant time, the purpose of engaging in or conspiring to engage in criminal activity.

The no criminal purpose defence is problematic where an entity has been declared to be a criminal organisation, particularly under the third limb of the definition of criminal organisation. In those circumstances, where the no criminal purpose defence is raised, the prosecution will be required to adduce complex evidence about the purpose or purposes of the criminal organisation that would not otherwise be required in the proceedings.

In the view of this Government, the prosecution should not have to prove the criminal purpose of an organisation that has already been declared by the Parliament to be a criminal organisation. Once an entity falls within the scope of the definition of criminal organisation, and participants in the entity engage in conduct that is prohibited by Part 3B, Division 2 of the CLCA, the offence provisions should be readily enforceable in relation to members of that criminal organisation.

For these reasons, this Bill deletes the no criminal purpose defence where it occurs in Division 2 of Part 3B of the CLCA. Depending on the circumstances, common law or statutory defences may be available to an accused.

The Government believes that the removal of the no criminal purpose defence will improve the practical workability of Division 2 of Part 3B of the CLCA and will ensure that it remains a useful tool in the suite of responses that this Government has implemented to combat serious and organised crime.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

3—Amendment of section 83GC—Participants in criminal organisation being knowingly present in public places

This clause amends section 83GC of the Act to remove the defence contained in subsection (2). Currently, subsection (2) provides that it is a defence to a charge of an offence against subsection (1) for the defendant to prove that the criminal organisation in which it is alleged that the defendant is a participant is not an organisation that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or conspiring to engage in, criminal activity.

4—Amendment of section 83GD—Participants in criminal organisation entering prescribed places and attending prescribed events

This clause amends section 83GD of the Act to remove the defence contained in subsection (3). Currently, subsection (3) provides that it is a defence to a charge of an offence against subsection (1) or (2) to prove that the criminal organisation is not an organisation that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or conspiring to engage in, criminal activity.

5—Amendment of section 83GE—Participants in criminal organisation recruiting persons to become participants in the organisation

This clause amends section 83GE of the Act to remove the defence contained in subsection (2). Currently, subsection (2) provides that it is a defence to a charge of an offence against subsection (1) to prove that the criminal organisation in which it is alleged that the defendant is a participant is not an organisation that has, as 1 of its purposes, the purpose of engaging in, or conspiring to engage in, criminal activity.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Transitional provision

This clause provides a transitional provision such that an amendment of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* made by this Act will apply only in respect of an offence alleged to have occurred after the commencement of this Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

INDUSTRY ADVOCATE BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 1.

Ms CHAPMAN: If I could clarify the position to date. We have a situation where the Industry Advocate is currently accountable to the Minister for Finance, but I understand that in future, once this statutory body is established and passed in legislation, that it ('it' being the position, he or she) will be accountable to the Minister for State Development.

Mr PICTON: As I was saying before question time, at the moment there is obviously no legislation covering the Industry Advocate. It reports to the Minister for Finance and also, I believe,

in some respects, to the Minister for State Development. Also, in terms of a lot of its industry promotion work, it works with the Minister for Small Business.

Bringing it into a statutory provision creates roles for the minister as per lots of other pieces of legislation. The minister is not necessarily defined in the legislation, and it would be up to the Premier and the cabinet to determine which minister it would be connected to once the legislation is enacted under the administrative orders. I would expect that would probably be the Minister for State Development. I would not want to pre-empt the decision of the Premier and cabinet in that regard, but I expect that would be the case.

Ms CHAPMAN: The Chief Procurement Officer is an appointment currently accountable to the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Is it anticipated that he or she will continue to be accountable under that arrangement, or would that role be somehow or other transferred to the minister who is in charge of the Industry Advocate?

Mr PICTON: No, there is no change to the State Procurement Board. The State Procurement Board obviously has its own legislation that is not being amended through this legislation; hence, there is no change to that board or the Chief Procurement Officer and the arrangements they have in terms of their reporting.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Ms CHAPMAN: Clause 4 relates to the establishment of the statutory position. As the assisting minister has pointed out, under the proposed clause 4 the role must seek to promote, firstly, government expenditure that results in economic benefit; secondly, value for money for public expenditure; thirdly, economic development of the steel industry and other strategic industries; and, fourthly, capable businesses based in South Australia being given full, fair and reasonable opportunity to tender and participate in government contracts.

There is an equity aspect to it in addition to a promotion aspect, if I can put it in that general way, with rights down the track as to who he should report to if there is some mischief or failings in these regards. Firstly, in respect of the promotion for government expenditure that results in economic development, is that the clause designed to suggest that there should be some weighting in the strategies or in the plans for local content of labour or product?

Mr PICTON: Yes. As the deputy leader has alluded to, clause 4 is where we say that the government must establish a South Australian industry participation plan. Of course, we have had one of those for a number of years. It had significant revision about four years ago when the Industry Advocate was brought in. From that time onwards, the plan has included a percentage to be weighted for the economic contribution to the state.

What we are saying in this legislation is that the minister must, in establishing this plan, seek to promote government expenditure that results in economic development for South Australia. In the future, I guess there could be different interpretations of how that could be done. Certainly, this government believes that the process we have in place under the industry participation plan is the right one and, in fact, leads the country in actually determining the proper benefits of individual projects to the economy in South Australia.

Ms CHAPMAN: Referring to that plan, do you mean the South Australian Industry Participation Policy?

Mr PICTON: Yes, sorry, the policy.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you—with the capacity to deal with guidelines. Subsequent to our briefing, I have now been provided with the detail of the changes to the policy and guidelines that were recently reviewed, and a new published policy and guidelines are online. I thank the office for the provision of that today in identifying the updates in that regard. Let's go to value for money for public expenditure. I think that is pretty self-evident. We do not necessarily want the cheapest, but we are looking for a good product in the contract or service to the state that produces some value for money.

As to the advocate's role to assess these, subsequent to the briefing I have been provided with a summary of some of the major projects which, although not in a statutory entity, have a role in which the Industry Advocate and his advisers—and I think Ms Chandler who has a policy and a surveillance role in relation to the office—have been monitoring. They have already been monitoring some major projects in the state, and they make an assessment in dollars as to the value of the labour directly engaged by the contracting party, the value of the work packages awarded by the contracting party, the number of work packages actually awarded and the number of work packages that are listed and the number of work packages, which I think are then divided into an overall category and a South Australian breakdown, if I can generalise it in that way.

I thank you for providing that because it gives a helpful summary of how there is subsequently a calculation as to the dollar value of the various aspects, largely of the project and then the South Australian content, if I can generalise it that much. Ultimately, statements have been made in the second reading contribution by the assistant minister that there has been an increasing focus on goods and services from South Australia and that it has grown in recent years from 65 per cent local content to 80 per cent since the Industry Advocate role was created.

Whilst the extra information has suggested that the trend is positive and that it is reasonable to expect an 81 per cent target for the 2017-18 year, what I do not have is the model upon which these calculations are made. I am not in any way suggesting that the information that has been provided is inaccurate. But, for example, take one of the projects such as the Torrens Road to River Torrens project, which is a major project obviously. It has been identified, at least at September last year, that there was a \$41.98 million direct value in labour engaged by the contracting party and that the number of work packages was 212, for example.

Whilst there has been some explanatory material identified as to what the definition of those are, there is no indication of how that is actually calculated or from which documents that information is obtained or assessed. I am assuming that at present, under the contract, obviously there is a cost involved in the contract so that is not difficult to identify the amount, but in the breakdown between local and non local, there must be some way in which this is being assessed, whether it is all on information provided by the contracting party or whether the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, which often is the supervising party of these major projects, has an input into this as to who might do the calculations.

I appreciate that it may be more complicated than being able to necessarily explain today. I am happy for the detail of the modelling of that to be provided between the houses, but I am keen to have it to be able to identify what it is that the assessors—in this case, the Industry Advocate and its officers—are relying on for the purposes of this breakdown.

Mr PICTON: I think the question essentially is: for the benefits to South Australia of those major projects, how are those figures worked out? The process is that, once a major project is awarded—for instance, the Torrens to Torrens project—under our Industry Participation Policy there is a panel for each of those projects established. It includes the contractor, it includes people from DPTI (or whichever the relevant department would be) as well as the Industry Advocate or his nominee on that panel.

Through that panel there is an assessment made and the Industry Advocate is very heavily involved in going through the documents and making that assessment. He looks through the details, in making that assessment, of which of those works and which of those employees are from South Australia and delivering benefits for South Australia. Obviously, a lot of that information is very commercially sensitive, but the Industry Advocate is right there through that whole process on that panel as the project is being delivered, ensuring that he has oversight of that and has the ability to make sure that that is being delivered as promised.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is the information only coming from the contract and—to be fair, I will add the reference to what I think this is called—the local industry participation and job creation documents?

Mr PICTON: As I understand it, once the contract is awarded, the panel receives the information from the contractor, who obviously holds the information in terms of what work they are

doing and what work the subcontractors are doing, looks through the information and makes that assessment based on the information that is provided to the panel by the contractor.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is that all done either on the documents that are presented to the panel or the oral statements of the two parties representing the two contractors on the panel?

Mr PICTON: There are essentially two aspects to that. Before a contract is awarded there are obviously multiple people bidding for the contract. During that process there is a determination made of what the economic benefits of the respective bids are. There is an assessment made and then that assessment forms part of the eventual contract as an attachment to that contract.

What I thought we were talking about was, once the contract has been established and has been signed with one particular party—there is only one contractor, obviously, from that time on—all the information is delivered through that process and that is when the panel is established with DPTI, the contractor and the Industry Advocate to work through that process for the entire length that the contract is in process.

Ms CHAPMAN: Who prepares and/or makes the decision on the economic benefit statement, which is done on the assessment on each of the tenderers? Who does that?

Mr PICTON: That assessment is done by Ms Chandler's team in the Department of State Development. Obviously, she works very closely with the Industry Advocate and that assessment will be done of each of the relevant bids before a decision is made.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is that assessment done based on the material presented with the tender? If that is it, that is fine, but if it is anything else can you tell us what else it is relying on?

Mr PICTON: That is based on the information that they will provide, based on The Industry Participation Policy. The policy sets out that each tenderer will need to provide a plan for how they want to determine and want to deliver economic benefit for South Australia. They will provide that information in the format that we set out in the policy and then that information will be assessed by the DSD team underneath Ms Chandler. An assessment will be made of each of the respective bidders before a decision is made.

Ms CHAPMAN: So the economic benefit component is actually presented with its supporting documents from the proposing party who is putting forward their best position, including how it is going to benefit the state, how many local people are going to be used, what services and products are going to be used, etc. Is that with or without ancillary documents of calculation—that is, by corporations such as Ernst & Young and the like—or is it just simply a submission with the claimed expectation of benefit?

Mr PICTON: They will provide information. If, for instance, you are building a road, they will say, 'We intend to hire particular subcontractors,' and that will involve a certain amount of South Australian labour from those subcontractors and a certain amount of capital. If you are using cranes that are in South Australia, all of that is very economically important to the state.

They will send that information out to us and present their best case of why they deserve the contract. That will be assessed by the DSD team as to what percentage of that 15 per cent they should get as part of the tender evaluation for that. After that, I think where this bill becomes really important is in terms of the Industry Advocate having that role to monitor and ensure they meet those commitments they have made at that initial stage when they are bidding for the work.

Obviously, people want to present their best case when they are bidding for the work. Certainly, since we have brought in these changed policies four years ago, we have seen people really stepping up and wanting to engage with local contractors to make sure they are putting their best foot forward to win that work in the initial stage.

When there were much lower criteria with much less information needing to be given, people worried about it a lot less because it factored less into the overall decision. We really want to make sure that the Industry Advocate, after the contract has been decided, has the full powers that he needs, and the ability to get the information that he might need in the future, to assess that people are actually delivering on all those commitments that have been made.

Ms CHAPMAN: I understand the second stage; I am still on stage 1. On stage 1 then, is the assessment or certification of Ms Chandler's team on the tenders presented to the body or person who makes the decision on the tender, or is that just kept for their own records?

Mr PICTON: Particularly on the major contracts, Ms Chandler has a panel that includes a number of experts, particularly in construction. They will provide advice to her and the team on what the assessment of those bids should be, and it is that DSD team that makes the decision on the 15 per cent, or I think it is 20 per cent in northern Adelaide under the policy. They will provide that information and say, 'We have determined that this bid is 14 per cent out of 15 per cent, and this one is 12 per cent out of 15 per cent.' That then goes to DPTI, or whoever the lead contractor is, to make the final decision, but when that goes to them the assessment has already been made in terms of the 15 per cent.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a couple of other questions in relation to subclause (2)(c), which relates to identifying particular industries. Before I ask those, I will use the Torrens Road to River Torrens project as an example because that has been referred to. Yesterday, the parliament received an Auditor-General's report on this project.

I do not know whether the assistant minister has had the opportunity to read it yet, but in that report the Auditor-General made a number of findings in respect of that project, including that there were some areas in which DPTI's oversight as a project owner was wanting. I think this is the kindest way I can describe it. Secondly, 'For planning, evaluation and approval we found that DPTI did not have a process in place to check that the project complied with the evaluation and approval requirements of Treasurer's Instruction 17.'

Thirdly, the Auditor-General found that DPTI needed to review their policies and procedures for receiving gifts and benefits and financial rewards, as apparently some officers of the department had been receiving some invitations to treat from parties in respect of the contract, and there needs to be register rules about those. He went on to say that he found proper accounting of all the commonwealth money that was coming in and a few other things, but also some fairly serious deficiencies regarding one of the parties to the contract in respect of that particular proposal.

I am just wondering whether in the course of the assessment by the Industry Advocate of these projects—and this project in particular, its tendering process for the original and/or its monitoring of that project since—any of these three deficiencies were identified.

Mr PICTON: I thank the deputy leader for her question. I had a cursory look at the report when it came out yesterday, particularly to see whether it had any relevance to this bill. I think most of the issues raised were regarding the general responsibilities of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and its minister and its arrangements, rather than matters that would form part of the role of the Industry Advocate.

The Industry Advocate and the team in DSD who support that have played their role in terms of the assessment of the industry participation and the benefits to the South Australian economy. I am not sure that their scope extends to any of the matters raised in the Auditor-General's Report. However, I am happy to take that on notice and come back if there are any matters that did touch on what is in the report.

Ms CHAPMAN: A briefing was kindly provided by the Industry Advocate and Ms Chandler in respect of matters raised by the Auditor-General in his 2016 report regarding how this entity was going, having been operating for a number of years. He apparently did an assessment of how four agencies were dealing with their industry policy compliance and it seems that four were wanting: the Attorney General's Department, which does not surprise me given what has been happening in that department; Primary Industries and Regions SA; TAFE SA; and the Department of State Development, which is the very department responsible for the Industry Advocate. In any event, it was deficient. The report found:

DPC's approach to procuring film services did not consider acquisition planning at the outset to develop a strategic approach...[It was not documented] how compliance with the South Australian Industry Participation Policy was met.

That is information provided directly from the Industry Advocate's office. DPC advised that they addressed the issues through procurement training workshops in late 2016. As this was one of the highlighted areas of noncompliance, even though there seems to be some information to suggest that people had been retrained in some way, can the assistant minister tell us which film services that were procured were deficient?

Mr PICTON: I am not sure, to be honest. I am happy to take that on notice. I think that was meant to say the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, not the Department of State Development, as it then goes on to say in that paragraph. We will get you some information on that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7.

Ms CHAPMAN: This is the ministerial direction clause which, in my view, seems to undermine this process completely and make it some sort of hybrid process. Either they are an independent statutory body or they are not, but in this case it seems they have given it a name and they have to account to a minister after keeping an eye on certain things, particularly the behaviour and compliance of certain contracting parties, yet they are to act under the direction of a minister. I am rather puzzled as to why that should be there. We seem to have a roundabout independence here, which makes it really a bit of a nonsense. Nevertheless, whoever fills this role in respect of the future Industry Advocate, we will see how that operates.

As I have said, we are not objecting to the actual implementation of it, but it does seem a little inconsistent. In respect of the position itself, if the bill passes both houses of parliament and is enacted, which it may do of course in the next few weeks, is it proposed that this position is going to be offered for consideration of any applicant, or is it to be offered just to the current Industry Advocate?

Mr PICTON: Firstly, I will just respond quickly to the issue about the directions raised by the deputy leader. I understand that this is a relatively standard clause that appears in many statutes, but I would say that, in particular, it sets out very clearly that no direction can be issued in terms of a particular investigation, which I think is very important. I think that you would not want a minister directing any particular investigation of the Industry Advocate, so it is important that that provision is there.

Secondly, in terms of the appointment process once the bill is enacted, that is of course a matter for cabinet to consider and eventually recommend to the Governor who would be appointed as a statutory officer. I understand that that could be considered by cabinet to be part of an open process, or cabinet could consider that there was a particular meritorious candidate who already existed and who they may want to appoint to that position without going through an open process. I would not want to pre-empt cabinet in terms of its decision-making after the bill was passed.

Ms CHAPMAN: This question in no way reflects on the current Industry Advocate, who has undertaken the job over the last three years, but has the Industry Advocate received any advice from the government, and/or in particular the minister he is currently accountable to, that he will be considered to take up the statutory position?

Mr PICTON: Not to my knowledge, but I am happy to check if there have been any discussions along those lines. Certainly, it has not been a discussion that I have been a party to.

Ms CHAPMAN: In the last three years, has the minister to whom the position is accountable issued any direction for a particular area to be looked into? I do not mean as an investigation of any complaint or not as a complaint, but some area of government procurement that needs to be looked into, that is, 'I want you to look at the steel industry. I want you to look at the Rossi Boots contract,' or anything in particular.

Mr PICTON: I would say, in particular, that there has been a large amount of discussion between ministers and the Industry Advocate asking him to do work in particular on steel policy in the last three to four years. It has been something that the office has been dedicating an increasing amount of work in order to ensure that our projects are using as much Whyalla steel as possible,

both in terms of steel that is produced at the Whyalla steelworks but also steel that cannot be produced there but uses billets from Whyalla. That has involved a whole lot of work.

It has led to the steel policy that we have in place. It has led to steel being highlighted in this bill and it has played an important role. The Industry Advocate has played a very important role in ensuring that we are increasing the amount of steel that we are using from Whyalla that meets Australian standards in our infrastructure projects.

Ms CHAPMAN: On the steel use in projects, the office has provided subsequent to the briefing confirmation, as follows:

Since the introduction of the Steel Procurement Policy in late 2015, the Office of the Industry Advocate has been keeping a summary of steel used in government projects, which is regularly updated when further information is available.

It then goes on to say that it should be noted reinforcing steel is typically sourced from the Eastern States and generally as to where they might source material from. It goes on to say:

The volume of South Australian steel on major projects is monitored through the work packages reviewed on a monthly basis by the Industry Advocate or his delegate.

There is then reference to a number of projects for which we were provided a summary, including the Torrens to Torrens, which I have referred to, and a number of others have been provided. In respect of the major projects that are currently monitored, is it the case that we can be told how much steel, either in tonnage or percentage, is being used on these major projects?

Mr PICTON: Yes, particularly on those major projects that have the panels established. This is one of the things that those panels monitor, to make sure that they know what the steel is, where it is coming from and, in particular, as I mentioned, whether it is directly from Whyalla, which is structural steel in the large part but also steel used for rail, as well as steel that has been manufactured in Australia and involves steel that started off in Whyalla. So we can go right through the supply chain to identify what started its life at Whyalla, which is obviously very important. I am happy to provide the deputy leader with more information on that.

Ms CHAPMAN: In provision of that, the projects that I have been given the summaries on are the Northern Connector, Torrens Junction, CBD high school, the O-Bahn city access tunnel, the Darlington upgrade, the Torrens to Torrens, the Flinders Medical Centre upgrade and the Kangaroo Creek dam. These are the ones that have been in this process in the last two years and are under monitor. In whichever way it is recorded, either as an expression of a percentage of the steel or tonnage, can we know how much steel is used? I do not know how steel is measured in that sense, but if you could provide that to us between the houses that would be appreciated.

One of the things that has been difficult to identify is how much local product has been used. Hence, we have had answers from the government to date in respect of the Royal Adelaide Hospital that show they really do not have a clue how much local steel has been used. I am not being critical of that at present. Obviously, it is a fairly recent regime of assessment that is being undertaken. In relation to the assessment on steel, for example, how are you able to determine how much is steel is produced in Whyalla as distinct from how much steel is provided by Arrium to fulfil the contract?

The reason I ask you this, just so that we are clear about it, is that one of the concerns raised in this whole steel debate is how much steel from overseas is being imported by Arrium to fulfil its contracts in South Australia. This is directly from people who work at the steelworks. Whilst I listened to the member for Giles' concerns about the future of industry, it is not a lot of help to us here in the parliament, or to any South Australians, if there is not a very clear identification of how much of the product is created in Whyalla, in this instance, because that is our major steelworks, as distinct from how much the contracting company brings in from overseas. Who is monitoring that and how on earth do we know?

Mr PICTON: Since the steel policy came in in 2015, there has been not only the process in terms of the panels established to look at steel but we also have a regime of third-party audits put in place in terms of steel in particular. The Industry Advocate has been working with independent third-party auditors, whose job it has been to do exactly what the deputy leader is concerned about—

to identify where the steel came from. It is not merely a cursory check of some paperwork; it is an independent third-party auditor we are engaging to do that work.

Ms CHAPMAN: Does that audit process involve having someone at the Whyalla site, or does it mean identifying and reviewing all the certificates of assessment for Australian standards, or checking what comes into the country? How does that work?

Mr PICTON: It depends on the circumstances, but the third-party auditor will check the certification of all the steel that is being used, and if there is something that looks a bit questionable then the third-party auditor might go further and request some more documents or more evidence as to the location of where the steel originated. I am happy to get more information for the deputy leader on exactly the work that the auditor does to assure us where the steel came from.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

Ms CHAPMAN: This relates to the term of five years. As I understand it, the current Industry Advocate—assuming that his application may be to continue in this role, as such—is under a contract at present, which has some three years to go. If he were to be either selected and/or appointed for the purposes of this role, is it proposed that that will be subsumed in a five-year appointment, or will it just continue on from the contract that is there?

Mr PICTON: You mean his current role, whether that would exist or not? In terms of the current position, once the bill is passed and enacted that would be replaced by the new position. In terms of the five years, that is obviously up to five years; cabinet could advise the Governor for a shorter period if they were so inclined.

Ms CHAPMAN: If the statutory appointment happens to appoint the incumbent, is it agreed or acknowledged that there is no payout on the remaining three years of the contract?

Mr PICTON: We will get some advice from the Office for the Public Sector on that matter.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 12 passed.

Clause 13.

Ms CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Chapman–1]—

Page 7, after line 32—Insert:

- (3a) A participant cannot be compelled to give information or a document under this section if—
 - (a) the participant is a party to a dispute or complaint (however described) in respect of a government contract; and
 - (b) the information or document is relevant to the dispute or complaint; and
 - (c) disclosure of the information or document would materially affect the participant's position in the dispute or complaint.
- (3b) A participant cannot be compelled to give information or a document under this section if the information or document—
 - (a) has commercial value to, or relates to the commercial or financial affairs of, the participant; and
 - (b) disclosure of the information or document—
 - (i) may cause damage to the participant or the interests of the participant; or
 - (ii) may confer an unfair commercial or financial advantage on a person.

This amendment makes provision for information or documents that are produced, with an exception that the party to the contract cannot be compelled if that information is in respect of where that party

is in a dispute or complaint in respect of a government contract and any information or disclosure that will materially affect that dispute or complaint. Secondly, a participant will also not be compelled to produce it if it has a commercial value, and that disclosure would obviously be contrary or cause damage to the interests of the participant.

This is two-pronged, particularly in an environment where there is no definition of what information and documents to include, to the extent that we would be expressly identifying that if a party who has been given a notice to produce this information or document is already in dispute with the government over that, and there is litigation or notices are given in that regard or, alternatively, they would say that if disclosure is not in their interests they should not have to provide it.

If the government were not insisting on clause 17 in this bill, which is the exempt agency under the FOI Act clause, then this would not necessarily be needed. Under the Freedom of Information Act, there is already a whole list of circumstances in which material kept by a government agency is not disclosable and does not have to be produced, i.e., it is a document prepared for the benefit of cabinet; it has personal information in it or it may cause conflict. In fact, I have even had an FOI rejected on the basis that it would be contrary to the cultural interests of an Indigenous group. I have had documents rejected on the basis that they might cause marital discord between two different parties who have given opposing submissions on a government planning action.

There are all sorts of reasons why parties may not be required to produce material under the Freedom of Information Act. They include where the material is commercial-in-confidence and it would be a disadvantage to them. In fact, we have had a whole District Court proceeding on that in respect of the Glenside Hospital and the Chapley company for the production of a letter. They claimed it would be adverse to their commercial interests if they had to disclose the particulars of a proposed retail outlet on the Glenside site.

So we have had all sorts of examples and plenty of common law to determine and protect those interests, but the government have decided, in their wisdom, that they will make the Industry Advocate an exempt agency except for the purposes of administration, financial information of the agency and something to do with statistics. They claim that it is based on the fact that it was a compromised position on the Small Business Commissioner bill. It may be in that act—I do not have any dispute about that—but the parliament should be reminded that it was the opposition's position that the Small Business Commissioner Act not be passed.

Whilst a compromised position may have been presented in respect of this issue of freedom of information to have the crossbenchers' support in another place, it does not mean that it came with our blessing. It still remains repugnant and it ought to be removed. If the government had one ounce of commitment to transparency and accountability, they would be rushing to delete clause 17 in this bill, but they do not. They say that they need to keep it to protect the interests of the parties whom they are investigating, in the broad sense, by the calling of documents, whom they might potentially prosecute and from whom they want compliance. They do not need clause 17.

Mr PICTON: We are on clause 13.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am saying that the government's insistence that they proceed with clause 17 is why we are moving amendment No. 1, to place in it protections to deal very specifically with the production of material and protection for those parties in those specific circumstances not to comply with a notice from the Industry Advocate to produce documents or information that would otherwise carry a penalty of a fine of up to \$20,000.

That is why it is there. That is why I would urge the government, if they are genuine about the importance of this role—because we are not opposing the concept of having an Industry Advocate or a participation policy for South Australia's economic benefit—not to try to make it with some sort of secret Star Chamber-type approach. This is something they ought to be proud of and it ought to be public.

Mr PICTON: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for moving this amendment, though I have to inform her that the government will not be supporting it. I have to say that I think this amendment undermines entirely what we are trying to do in terms of this act and the powers of the Industry Advocate, nor do I see at all how it connects with her concerns about the Freedom of

Information Act in clause 17. I have to say that, in terms of both proposed subclauses (3a) and (3b), I am concerned that this amendment would essentially give anybody who did not want to give information to the Industry Advocate a free pass to not give that information.

The whole idea here is that we want the Industry Advocate to be able to get the information on the delivery of the contracts to ensure that what they have promised is being delivered. However, if this were passed, it would mean that the participant to the contract (the contractor) would be able to say, 'We have a dispute under the contract and it would cause damage to us in terms of that dispute: hence, we are not going to give you any information on what we are doing.' Alternatively, it would give them the power to say, 'This information has commercial value and it might not be in our interests to give it to you: hence, we are not going to give it to you.'

Of course, any time that the Industry Advocate is using these powers, which would be in a very extreme situation in which we are seeing some noncompliance by one of the contractors, they probably are likely to be in dispute with the contractor, so it means that that power to receive the documents would not be available to the Industry Advocate.

Almost all the information that would ever want to be obtained by the Industry Advocate would have commercial value attached to it because this is about commercial deals that people have signed up to, and if they are not complying with what they have signed up to, and that causes a problem with the contract, then that means that there may be damage to them in terms of damages under the contract. We think this is dangerous, we think this is undermining what we are trying to do here and the government will be opposing it.

Ms CHAPMAN: I assume from that contribution that the assistant minister does not have any questions of me as the mover of this amendment because he has made it quite clear that he is going to be opposing it. I would just say then in response in dealing with this motion that, firstly, I am disappointed that the government has not accepted this; and secondly, on the briefings that I received, in the three years the Industry Advocate has operated in this space to date without any coercive powers, not once am I told has his request for information and documents been rejected.

It raises the whole question of whether we need to have this statutory provision at all and the coercive powers that are being imposed. What it does mean is that by introducing a regime where there are coercive powers and there is a fine process to follow for default or failure to produce we may well have created a situation that will produce a reluctance on the part of a party to provide that information.

Obviously, at present, parties are keen to contract with the government. It is entirely appropriate, once the government has committed to a certain contractor, that they have the right of supervision of the employment and application of that contract to be to the standard to which the government had contracted. That is entirely appropriate. But it is also entirely inappropriate that someone should face a fine in a circumstance where they may be in dispute with the party and that this is treated as a backdoor discovery application by the government. That is completely unacceptable. So, I am disappointed with the government's position on it but, be that as it may, there may be another place that sees it more meritorious.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 14 passed.

New clause 14A.

Ms CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Chapman-1]—

Page 8, after line 14—Insert:

14A—Review of certain decisions by South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal

- (1) The South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal is, by force of this section, conferred with jurisdiction to deal with matters consisting of the review of a decision of the Industry Advocate under section 13 to require a participant to give the Industry Advocate information or documents (a *reviewable decision*).

- (2) An application for review of a reviewable decision may be made to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal by the participant to whom the requirement relates.
- (3) An application for review of a reviewable decision must be made within 14 days after the participant is notified of the requirement under section 13 (or such longer period as the Tribunal may allow).
- (4) However, the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal may only allow an extension of time under subsection (3) if satisfied that—
 - (a) special circumstances exist; and
 - (b) another party will not be unreasonably disadvantaged because of the delay in commencing the proceedings.

This amendment inserts a review process to be in the format of a new section 14A. It is to provide for a review of a decision of the Industry Advocate under section 13. In other words, it is to have an appeal process to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal to review a decision of the Industry Advocate, who issues that notice.

In a simple process, if there were a party who received a notice and for whatever reason they did not accept that that was a valid or appropriate notice to be issued, they would be able to have it reviewed by the tribunal. In the absence of any review, all this party is left with is to go to the Supreme Court as a judicial review by a Supreme Court judge. Time and time again this government, including with the advocacy of the SACAT in this state—we were the last in the country but, nevertheless, we eventually got one—was to have a tribunal that would be accessible to deal with administrative reviews and decisions, and that is exactly what it was set up for.

It seems to me that the government's decision not to have any review process through the tribunal process that has been set up to do this, without the need and expense of having a judicial review in the Supreme Court, is completely unacceptable. It is very disappointing if the government does not accept this amendment because I have been in this parliament on a number of occasions where we have asked for some kind of review to deal with the lowest common denominator.

Again, this is no reflection on Mr Nightingale, who has had this job for three years and he may continue to have this position, but what if some complete goose takes up that position in the future? Somebody might retire from parliament and—

The CHAIR: Don't look at me when you say that.

Ms CHAPMAN: No, not you, Madam Chair. I was not expecting you to retire.

The CHAIR: No, but you looked at me and I got really upset.

Ms CHAPMAN: Exactly. I can think of other members in the other chamber who have already announced that they are going to be retiring. There are several of those—take your pick. Anyway, if one of them decided that they were going to take up this position and they were successful, then heaven forbid. We do need to have a review process. It would be very disturbing to me if the government resisted this. On a number of other occasions, they have agreed to administrative review and I would hope they see the merits of this again.

Mr PICTON: I regret to inform the deputy leader that the government will not be supporting this amendment. We have drafted this consistent with other information gathering procedures that are in place under other acts, particularly including the Small Business Commissioner Act and the Fair Trading Act. In fact, I think in those acts there are even stronger powers to request information, but it does not include a SACAT review process within those acts.

We think that the process in place in this act is appropriate. Hopefully, this will be a very rare occurrence in which this power will be used and not something that would need to require significant court time or use of administrative law appeals time to deal with.

New clause negated.

Clauses 15 and 16 passed.

Clause 17.

Ms CHAPMAN: In respect of clause 17, we on this side of the house find that the proposal to make the Industry Advocate an exempt agency, along with other austere bodies such as SAPOL, ICAC and the like, is just laughable. It should not be there and it just indicates the capacity and intent of the government to do whatever they can to have a cover over their investigative operations. I think it is scandalous that they continue to do it.

It is bad enough that they have rejected a resolution of our whistleblowers legislation, which is sitting here in deadlock and about which every day we come in to say that we are going to allow it to sit during the course of this parliament, but not one time does the Attorney-General turn up to tell us even when we are going to have a deadlock conference. The last one was scheduled and he did not turn up; we were happy to call it the next day. Of course, this government does not want to have that scrutiny and they do not want whistleblowers to feel free to come forward, as Mr Lander has repeatedly pointed out. We had to drag them kicking and screaming to deal with ICAC.

Frankly, this is just one more reason why it is important that whatever laws we have in the Freedom of Information Act at least stand. I think they should be better. Mr Lander QC thinks they should be better. He gave this parliament a report several years ago to suggest how they should be better, and the government have done nothing about it, but at least it is there. So, at the very least, we ask the government to agree to withdraw this and not try to pretend that some sort of deal to deal with the Small Business Commissioner having that same clause is some excuse, pathetic as it is, for getting away with that type of conduct. We oppose clause 17.

Mr PICTON: I would like to respond for the record. I will not respond to any of the broader freedom of information concerns that the deputy leader has; I will leave those to the Attorney-General. In respect of this bill, essentially the premise behind clause 17 is the fact that the Industry Advocate will be dealing with very, very sensitive business information, as we have already previously discussed, and the deputy leader has already outlined how she thinks this will be sensitive information as well.

The Freedom of Information Act, as members would know, does not grant any automatic exemptions for information: there just may be exemptions for information. We want to make sure that, in terms of the operations of the Industry Advocate, what he does and what his office does, the reports that they produce and the information and data that they produce would all be available for freedom of information. But the Industry Advocate does other work in terms of going through the documents, going through the steel audits that we have been talking about, going through the reports regarding staff right down to the details of individual staff members and individual contracts and subcontracts and values and amounts of those contracts.

We want the Industry Advocate to have access to that information in order to do his or her job, but we do not want businesses to be fearful that, by obtaining access to that information, that is going to somehow get out into the public domain via the Industry Advocate, because then we would start to see more and more disputes, as the deputy leader was saying she was fearful of. We would see more and more disputes between the parties and the Industry Advocate regarding requests for information. We want to make sure that that sensitive business information is not affected.

In terms of the Small Business Commissioner, that act was passed. As the deputy leader said, the opposition voted against it, but then after that, as I understand it, there was a regulation put in under the Freedom of Information Act, so it sits in the FOI Act regulations. That regulation exempting the business information from the Small Business Commissioner, but allowing FOI for the operations of the Small Business Commissioner, is exactly the wording that we have copied.

I understand that went to the Legislative Review Committee as all regulations do, and this was wording that was agreed to and negotiated between the parties for that position. That is where we have taken, word for word, clause 17 of this bill from. I think it is good to put that sort of thing in legislation and allow the house to debate it, and I think that in this particular form it serves a very important purpose.

The committee divided on the clause:

Ayes	23
Noes	19
Majority	4

AYES

Atkinson, M.J.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Brock, G.G.	Caica, P.	Close, S.E.
Cook, N.F.	Digance, A.F.C.	Gee, J.P.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Hildyard, K.	Hughes, E.J.
Kenyon, T.R. (teller)	Key, S.W.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.
Vlahos, L.A.	Wortley, D.	

NOES

Bell, T.S.	Chapman, V.A. (teller)	Duluk, S.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P.
Knoll, S.K.	Marshall, S.S.	Pederick, A.S.
Pengilly, M.R.	Pisoni, D.G.	Sanderson, R.
Speirs, D.	Tarzia, V.A.	Treloar, P.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Williams, M.R.
Wingard, C.		

PAIRS

Koutsantonis, A.	McFetridge, D.	Weatherill, J.W.
Redmond, I.M.		

Clause thus passed.

Clause 18 passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (16:51): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:51): Deputy Speaker, thank you for your excellent chairmanship of the committee in respect of this bill. I would also like to acknowledge Mr Ian Nightingale and Ms Nari Chandler, who are the Industry Advocate at present and Director of Public Policy respectively, for their advice and information provided during the course of consultation and consideration of this bill.

If Mr Nightingale is ultimately accepted, I want to thank him for his work in this area to date and wish him well in respect of the continuing position. I want to especially thank him for the work he did in relation to the reassessment of the contract for the Kangaroo Island Walking Trail, which was otherwise going to be given in full to a Tasmanian company that apparently had expertise in mountain biking or some other such thing and not walking trails. Ultimately, some discussion ensued in which at least local contractors were given an opportunity to undertake that work. That is the only matter I personally have been involved in taking to the Industry Advocate.

I referred a matter in respect of Rossi Boots and an application for their use by the police force, which a former commissioner had specially designed and made up. The Rossi Boots company locally had worked out and tooled their equipment to ensure they made the product. Sadly, the government had a change of policy that enabled police officers to buy their boots directly and from alternative companies. It might have been a voucher system or whatever that produced greater value, but of course it did not for the local company.

I do not know what actually happened to that in the end. I certainly hope that some police officers are wearing Rossi boots because it is all very well for this parliament to consider the legislative models we have for the surveillance and protection of the interests of South Australians, but in the real world they fall apart.

I wish the office and those employed in it well in the pursuit of what is a worthy objective, and that is to ensure that the government, in its very powerful position of the procurement of services, whether it be at a smaller level for departments, as to who feeds the prisoners at the children's prison or who does the laundry at hospitals, or major projects and the products we use, it does the best it can to ensure opportunities for the future of South Australians.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

IKARA-FLINDERS RANGES NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (16:54): I move:

That this house requests His Excellency the Governor to make a proclamation under section 27(3) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 excluding allotment 63 in approved plan No. D93043, Out of Hundreds (Parachilna), from the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park.

The purpose of this motion is to excise an area of land from the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park. The park is located approximately 450 kilometres north of Adelaide and is renowned for its natural and geological significance as a major part of the South Australian identity. It is co-managed by the Adnyamathanha people and provides a wonderful opportunity for visitors to experience landscapes, wildlife and Aboriginal culture. The proposal before parliament today seeks to consolidate the boundaries of one of our greatest natural assets.

The government and the lessees of Willow Spring Station have reached a mutually beneficial agreement for the exchange of land. In the south-eastern corner of the park is an area of land that has little conservation value and is better suited to pastoral activities. It abuts Willow Spring Station, a neighbouring pastoral property. This land is to be excised from the park and added to the pastoral lease. The National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 requires parliament to pass a motion before such an excision can occur.

Once parliament has given this approval, Willow Spring Station will surrender from their pastoral lease an area of mountain range country, which has high conservation and landscape value. This land will be then added to the park. The result of this will be that 1,350 hectares will be excised from Willow Spring Station and added to the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park. This will be swapped for 900 hectares being excised from the national park and added into Willow Spring Station. The agreement between the government and Willow Spring Station for the land exchange covers a range of matters and importantly preserves their access to land for tourism.

Brendan and Carmel Reynolds should be commended for having worked hard to develop their Skytrek business over the years as one of those great nature-based tourism offerings in the Flinders Ranges. In recognition of the tourism operations conducted on Willow Spring Station, the land being added to the national park will continue to be made available to them for tourism activities through the grant of a commercial tourism licence.

The government is committed to fostering nature-based tourism offerings throughout our park system and supporting Willow Spring Station to maintain its tourism products is part of this. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (16:57): It is good this afternoon to be able to provide the opposition's contribution on the motion that the Minister for Education and Child Development, in her capacity representing the Minister for Environment, in this house has moved. That motion is:

That this house requests His Excellency the Governor to make a proclamation under section 27(3) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 excluding allotment 63 in approved plan No. D93043, Out of Hundreds (Parachilna), from the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park.

This has been a work in progress for some time. It was first brought to my attention that this land swap needed to take place long before I found myself in the role of shadow minister for the environment. It was brought to my attention by a constituent of mine, Hallett Cove resident Mr Kym Groves. Mr Groves has had a long-term association with the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park through his involvement in the Yellow Footed Rock Wallaby Preservation Association.

Mr Groves has been a strong advocate, a very passionate advocate, that this land swap needed to take place to enhance the quality of the environment in the national park, expand its reach into a more productive and high biodiversity landscape and also to bring in some portions of land with exceptional scenic views, which in turn could add to the overall quality of the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park.

For a number of years, the government has been negotiating this mutually beneficial land swap with Willow Springs Station, which is found adjacent to the south-eastern boundary of the national park, and an agreement was recently reached. I understand there has been a lot of backward and forward between the department and the interested parties to this agreement, and I thank the public servants who have been involved in what has been at times a difficult negotiation but one which has now been concluded, and that is why it is before both houses of parliament this week.

The agreement proposes that Willow Springs Station surrender a parcel of land, which is known locally as Block 101 and which has high biodiversity and landscape value, from the pastoral lease at Willow Springs for addition to the national park. As I mentioned before, the proposed land to be added to the park contains significant intact biodiversity and spectacular scenic views. The land to be added to the national park from Willow Springs is 1,350 hectares in size.

In return, the land swap will see a portion of land better suited to pastoral activities excised from the national park for addition to the Willow Springs Station pastoral lease. The land to be excised from the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park is 900 hectares, and that obviously leaves the national park with a balance of land overall that is slightly larger than it currently is. The addition of the land to the park does not require the approval of parliament and will proceed once parliament has considered the excision today.

I would like to commend this motion to the house and thank all those who have been involved in what have been long-term and difficult negotiations. In particular, I thank my constituent, Mr Kym Groves of the Yellow Footed Rock Wallaby Preservation Association, for bringing this to my attention some three years ago. I thank him for his work in preserving that unique natural environment.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (17:02): I rise to support this motion, as you would expect, and I will not hold the house very long at all. The Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park is a remarkable natural asset and the home, as you are aware, Deputy Speaker, of the Adnyamathanha people.

When I was in fourth year at high school our school camp was to the Flinders Ranges, and I had never been there before. We travelled from Henley High School in a bus to stay at Wilpena Pound in the tents that were there then, and I woke up in the morning, opened the tent and could not believe what I was seeing. At that stage, being a young man, I did not know a place like that existed in South Australia. It is nothing but absolute beauty, and I am pleased that this great asset to South Australia is also now under the control and the care of the Adnyamathanha people—their traditional land.

The area includes the Heysen Range, Brachina Gorge, Bunyeroo Gorge and the vast amphitheatre of mountains that is Wilpena Pound—and a wonderful, wonderful site both from the ground and the air. Visitors to the national park have the opportunity to undertake a cultural tour with Adnyamathanha elders that is highly regarded. Their spiritual and cultural connection to the land stretches back thousands of years, and there are many artefacts and culturally important traditional sites across the region.

I remember when the hand-back to the Adnyamathanha people occurred in the Flinders Ranges. I was the minister at the time and we held a function. I think the member for Stuart was there, too. It was a very colourful speech by Vince Coulthard, as you would expect, and he took the lectern, which was a DEWNR lectern, and I said, 'I'm giving this back to you.' Of course, he was not

just implying it, but he was saying, 'You're only giving back what was ours anyway', and it was a colourful speech.

I went for a walk with Vince to go under a tree, and there are magnificent trees there—these great big camaldulensis, the river red gums—and this tree must have been 600 or 700 years old. I said, 'Vince, your great-great-great-great-great-great-grandfather probably sat under this tree—or even further back.' It is just an amazing sight. They have a great connection to their land, and it was a very proud event that day for me to be involved in being able to ensure that it was returned to the traditional owners. I know they also have the care and control of the Wilpena Pound Resort. I have not kept my ear to the ground as to how that is going, but I hope it is going very well. Again, that is a great asset to South Australia and the Adnyamathanha people, and I hope that it is operating well.

The spiritual and cultural connection to the land stretches back thousands of years. There is also the fascinating restored Old Wilpena Station. I have been there quite a few times, and it is beautiful. The station contains historical remains from pastoral and mining activities that date back to the 1850s, and without doubt it is one of the most scenically spectacular pastoral settlements in South Australia. A working station for 135 years, Old Wilpena Station slipped into retirement in 1985. The settlement is now a tranquil archive of pastoral history, and 'tranquil' is the right word.

The substance of today's motion is about adding new land, as both the minister and the opposition spokesperson mentioned, with a high conservation value to the national park. The agreement will see a parcel of land with high biodiversity and landscape value added to the national park in exchange for land better suited to pastoral activities. It makes a lot of common sense. The result of this will be a 450-hectare expansion of the 90,000-hectare national park. With those few words, I commend the motion to the house and I congratulate those people who negotiated this outcome.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (17:05): I thank those people who have spoken before me. I agree with the things they have said. Certainly, the opposition supports this motion. I support this motion because it is an agreement between the government and the pastoral leaseholder in question, which has been confirmed in writing. In fact, it has been confirmed in writing twice, once in an exchange of letters and also by a deed signed by my constituent Mr Brendan Reynolds of the Reynolds family and Willow Springs Station.

We are talking about a very important area of land in our state. It has been important to the Adnyamathanha people for tens of thousands of years and important to pastoralists for 150 years at least, and of course it is an area that is very important to our state environmentally. No doubt we all would and should have the goal of making sure that those three things can work well together, that local Aboriginal people can continue to be connected to and engaged in their culture, that pastoralists can use the area productively and usefully for their commercial benefit—and that of the state, by the way, because everything that is produced in our regions is to the benefit of our entire state. This area is an important homeland to the pastoralists as well, who have been there for many generations. All that must be done while protecting the environment.

I do not doubt that all of us in this chamber have those goals together, but I have to share with the house some very genuine concerns that have come to me from my constituent Mr Brendan Reynolds. The Reynolds family has been in this part of the Flinders Ranges for a very long time. There are quite a few branches of the Reynolds family. The immediate family we are talking about at the moment are Brendan and Carmel Reynolds, their daughter, Michelle, who runs their tourism business, and their son, Chris, who manages another station nearby with his family, but is still, and will be into the future, very involved in the pastoral side of the Willow Springs business.

It is also worth pointing out that Willow Springs, from a tourism perspective, is a well-recognised, award-winning business. These are very capable, very responsible people who have put their hearts and souls into developing their home, developing their business and developing their region. They have been recognised for that with many awards for their tourism offers, which includes the Skytrek offer at Willow Springs. Having laid that as the groundwork, I have to say that Brendan Reynolds has expressed very deep and very genuine concern with me about this land swap. He has agreed to it, and he is not seeking to undo it—let's be as clear as possible about that—but I will summarise some information that he has given to me over the last couple of years about this issue.

He says that in around 1987 his father, Kevin Reynolds, wrote to National Parks outlining his concern about the grazing pressure around the woolshed at Willow Springs Station and the state of the Willow Springs Station-Flinders Ranges National Park boundary fence near Skull Rock. He was advised that his idea of a land swap back then was not possible because it required parliamentary approval.

In approximately 1990, Brendan and a representative of the government came to an agreement of swapping two parcels of land which created a win-win for both parties and solved the land management issue—two sections of the national park for one equal sized section of Willow Springs Station, which has become known as Block 101. As the member for Bright (shadow minister for the environment) mentioned, one of the reasons this has been wanted to happen for quite a long time is that inside the park is some relatively good grazing land, inside Willow Springs Station is some less useful grazing land but higher in value from the biodiversity perspective, and it made sense to do that swap.

When it was first contemplated, it was going to be a swap of essentially the same number of hectares for the same number of hectares. The park would get land that it preferred to have, Willow Springs Station would get land that it preferred to have. In the interim, Willow Springs Station started leasing some of that land from the park, which was a very sensible, useful thing. They could use the land responsibly for their pastoral pursuit, land that really the park did not hold in as high a value as other parts of the park or as the part of Willow Springs Station the park wanted to get.

Just to continue on with the information from Mr Reynolds, over the years circumstances have changed, particularly with regard to the number of hectares to be swapped. Again, as the shadow minister for the environment pointed out, Willow Springs Station is giving up a lot more country than the park is giving up, and that was not the way it was to be earlier on.

It was discovered that the boundary of the Skull Rock area was not surveyed to where it was originally believed to be and, despite Mr Reynolds' best efforts to plead with the then regional director of national parks, the director refused to rectify this mistake and without Mr Reynolds' consent selected two points on a map and drew a line as the boundary, not realising that had put Skull Rock into the Bunkers Conservation Reserve by approximately 100 metres, making the original proposal even more one-sided. For the benefit of people here and for *Hansard*, I am summarising what Mr Reynolds has given me rather than quoting it directly.

Much later, this area was physically surveyed by two retired surveyors who found the boundary to be even farther out than believed at the time, but the then regional director would not rectify the mistake, according to Mr Reynolds. The Reynolds family then engaged a lawyer and met with parks/government representatives and a compromise was reached that Willow Springs Station clients would have access to the viewing platform. This was agreed by the Yellow Footed Rock Wallaby Preservation Association also.

As to this boundary, the bit of land that is to be swapped comes very close to the Bunkers area, which is precious for many reasons, not least of which is the yellow-footed rock wallabies, but also the Skull Rock area is an extraordinary piece of geology to have a look at. It was and is very important for the Reynolds family that they are able to continue taking people through this area as part of their tourism business so that they can access it and have a look at the Skull Rock area. They did not need to climb on the rocks, they do not need to get onto that piece of land, but they did need to have access to be able to take people to where they could get a great view of it. That is why these boundaries have been so important, not because anybody is trying to be too fiddly about whether it is 100 metres here or there, but because access to a certain place to get the right view is very important.

In the past 23 years, the Reynolds family has continually tried to finalise the land swap and in the meantime Willow Springs has invested huge amounts of money and time into rabbit ripping and refencing the southern and eastern boundaries, installed a watering point and constructed a campground. That is all in the area that Willow Springs has been leasing in the park and is about to receive into their pastoral lease.

The reason I wanted to go through that is that it is important that everybody here understands the concerns of my constituent. I say again that he is not looking to undo this deal; he has agreed to

it in writing, but he does feel that he has been pressured into this. With these negotiations starting in the late 1980s with his father and concluding very recently, he does feel that the original deal was much better for him than the current deal with regard to the area being swapped. Essentially, 900 acres are being swapped for 1,350 acres, so the park is getting 50 per cent extra land in terms of hectares compared to what it actually has at the moment.

Another important issue is that, over the time that the Reynolds have leased the area of the park that they are soon to gain permanently through this land swap, they have naturally invested in it. As I said, they have put in a watering point, done work on fences and put in a campground. It is therefore very hard for them not to proceed with the swap. The government might well say, 'Well, that was their choice. They leased that land. There was no guarantee that they would ever keep it. There was nothing in writing to say that it was theirs. They invested that at their own risk.'

That would be true, but the Reynolds family could not just sit there and do nothing with that land. They could not leave it in the original condition. They needed to develop and upgrade it. Probably most important is the fact that their upgrades belong to them—the upgrades that the Reynolds family put into this area they are now about to receive permanently, but they actually already belong to them. It is not as if the park or the government is in the position of saying, 'We are giving you a watering point.' Well, the Reynolds family put the watering point in that land to begin with. The only thing the government has to swap is actually the land itself.

I thought it was very important to put that on the record. As recently as 14 June, Mr Reynolds put in writing to me many thoughts about this land swap, including the fact that he feels that he has been dealt with unfairly. Yes, he has agreed to it because he thinks that he does not have any choice. He is actually quite bitter about the way he has been dealt with. I do not think for a second that any of the public servants that I have engaged with who are involved with this at the moment have deliberately done anything untoward or inappropriate. I do not think that is the case.

I think that what has happened is that the people acting on behalf of the government at the moment have looked at this long train of negotiation since the late 1980s and said, 'Look, it's our job to bring it to a head.' They have probably been tasked with just finalising the matter—just do the deal or walk away from it. Of course, part of walking away from it included telling the Reynolds family that, if they did not take the deal, the land that they leased in the park they would no longer be allowed to lease, so they would lose the investment that they had made, keeping in mind that this is land that the park has said it does not really want anyway.

I can understand how the Reynolds family would feel hard done by if they were told, 'If you don't do the deal, you lose the land, which by the way the government doesn't really want to have in the park anyway, and then you will lose all the upgrades that you have put into it.' So, I have great sympathy for the Reynolds family in this situation. I say again that it is not because I think the people I have worked with on other matters have deliberately gone out of their way to do anything particularly harmful to the Reynolds family, but the Reynolds family have been dealing with this for a long time.

They would have liked to extend the negotiations and they have basically been told, 'Take the offer as it is today or all bets are off, including that you will not be allowed to continue to lease the land that you have leased.' That would have been for the Reynolds, of course, an even worse outcome than the one they have taken on at the moment. Another aspect I want to make sure the house is aware of is that Mr Reynolds put forward quite a few suggestions to the government about how he could proceed with the land swap but have security of access through the land that will become part of the national park so that he can get to this very important Skull Rock point. He put quite a few suggestions forward about trying to keep a freehold corridor at the boundary, etc., that were knocked back by the government.

The Reynolds family just wants to know that, after the land swap, they will still be able to run their tourism business through this area. The government offered them the ability to have a certified tourism operator's agreement, which lasts for three years, and that is good, but of course, if you have a multigenerational pastoral and tourism business, you want more than three years. I have to say that I thank the government for agreeing very recently to allow the Reynolds to send their tourist guests on self-guided tours to the Skull Rock area, rather than the original requirement, which was that they would only be allowed to take their tourism guests on a guided tour to the Skull Rock area. That was a very important concession to make and I think a very fair concession. It was not hurting

the government, the environment or anybody else who has an interest in this, so it was important to do that.

I will certainly do everything I can with regard to helping the Reynolds family and the government maintain sensible, working, productive relationships well into the future. I hope, if I am re-elected, to be able to contribute to doing that because this is very important locally. As we all know, whether we are city or country-based MPs, there can be arrangements that are entered into on behalf of the government that are part of a day's work but, at the same time, that exact same arrangement on behalf of our constituents is not just part of a day's work. It could be their lifelong work, and a very different attitude, approach and priority are given to these things.

I know that the Reynolds family will do everything they can to respect the agreement that has been reached, which we are discussing today. It seems certain that this will be implemented. The land swap will go ahead as proposed, and I support that land swap because I see merit in it and because my constituent has agreed to it in writing. So, I support it, as does the opposition, but I thought it very important to put those concerns on the record on behalf of my constituents.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (17:23): I thank the member for Stuart for his contribution. This area is in his electorate, and I think he has very ably presented the views of the Reynolds family and some of the frustration that has been experienced through this very, very long process. Of course, my electorate does not cover this area, but the Flinders Ranges are very important to some of the communities that I represent, especially Quorn and Hawker, as they are the main magnet for visitation to the area.

As the member for Stuart indicated, the area is especially important to the Aboriginal Adnyamathanha people who live in that area, and some who live elsewhere now, as well as the pastoralists and other residents who make the Flinders Ranges and surrounding areas their home.

When we talk about long negotiations and the Flinders Ranges, it puts it into perspective. Flinders Ranges is part of the fault of the sediments of the Adelaide Geosyncline. When we talk about an ancient land, the range itself, in a far grander form, underwent its formation back in the Cambrian Period some 540 million years ago. I remember many years ago having a conversation with Doug Reilly. I think he still lives at Chinamans Creek. Doug is a real character. He indicated that the Flinders Ranges, at one stage, were somewhat close in height to the Himalayas. So, over the preceding 540 million years, we have had ongoing erosion, which has created this state's beautiful and most significant range.

My connection, outside of being the member for Giles and representing Quorn and Hawker, dates back many years, although nowhere near as many as some people. As a resident of Whyalla, I used to visit the Flinders Ranges on many occasions, initially with my mates and then with my family. It was always a test of the old man's fitness that I had to keep up with my two young lads. I know the sensitivities about climbing St Mary Peak. After doing the St Mary Peak climb, coming back through Wilpena Pound, a 22-kilometre trip, I was always grateful for a refreshing ale at the hotel at Wilpena. I did not have to shout the lads anything, apart from a soda water, because they were too young to drink.

A lot of people in South Australia are like me in that we are visitors to the Flinders Ranges. We do not live there, but we do appreciate the beauty of the Flinders Ranges. It was not all that long ago that the extent of human habitation in the Flinders Ranges was pushed back even further than was previously thought. It was almost an accidental find. I think it was over 40,000 years, but it might be closer to 50,000. The presence of the original inhabitants of the Flinders Ranges now dates back a lot further than we thought.

That connection to land is incredibly deep, so it surprises me that we are having a debate about putting a national nuclear waste facility in the Flinders Ranges, given all the other potential options that we have in this state and elsewhere. I know that it has caused some deep division. We are here to talk about the national park and the change of the boundary. The park is renowned for its natural geological significance and beauty. It is part of the South Australian identity. I do not think I need to explain where it is. It is 450 kilometres north of Adelaide, just outside the electorate of Giles.

The park is co-managed with the Adnyamathanha people and it provides a wonderful opportunity for visitors to experience landscapes, wildlife and Aboriginal culture. The Adnyamathanha people are the traditional owners of the Flinders Ranges area, having lived there for tens of thousands of years. The connection to land stretches back many thousands of years. As part of the manifestation of that connection, we have ancient rock paintings through the Flinders Ranges. Rock paintings and engravings can be seen at Arkaroo Rock, Sacred Canyon and the Perawurtina Cultural Heritage Site and in other locations through the Flinders Ranges as well.

By expanding the park, we will give visitors and tourists even more reasons to visit this incredible landscape and, hopefully, that will generate jobs and local economic opportunities, both for the Aboriginal people and for Europeans in the area. The member for Stuart mentioned the Reynolds and their activities, in relation not just to pastoralism but also to tourism. There are a number of operators in the Flinders Ranges who help generate economic opportunity and give visitors the opportunity sometimes to see areas that we otherwise would not see. Of course, the Aboriginal people are now intimately involved in the running of Wilpena Pound, so I hope that turns out to be a success.

It is a fantastic outcome and it is a credit to the staff, but I take on board the words of the member for Stuart. It is never good when somebody is left feeling somewhat aggrieved by the process. It can be a message to government that we can get good results through processes like this, but we have to be mindful of a range of issues—the local sensitivities, listening to locals and making sure that we make the effort to get it right.

Sometimes it is difficult when the negotiations have been incredibly protracted because of the lack of continuity within the Public Service. People move on and other people take over. Sometimes that loss of continuity means a bit of a loss of the history and, of course, the Reynolds have been there now for generations. I think that is something we do need to bear in mind. Nonetheless, this is a good result and it is an additional national park attribute for the state with the inclusion of this section.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (17:32): I rise to speak today on the motion before us that involves the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park. Under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, alterations to the boundary of any national park require the resolution of both houses of parliament and a subsequent proclamation by the Governor, and that is precisely what we are doing here today.

We have heard much of the story of how we have come to be here, particularly from the member for Stuart whose electorate within this lies. He highlighted the protracted nature of the negotiations. In excess of 30 years was my calculation of it and it has not always been easy. It has been difficult, and the member for Stuart articulated how difficult these negotiations can sometimes be. For over 30 years, the government has been negotiating a mutually beneficial land swap with Willow Springs Station, the lease of which is owned by the Reynolds family. It is found adjacent to the south-eastern boundary of the national park.

This agreement was recently reached and proposes that Willow Springs Station surrenders a parcel of land, known as Block 101, with high biodiversity and landscape value from their pastoral lease for addition to the park. The proposed land to be added to the park contains significant intact biodiversity and spectacular views. The land to be added to the national park from Willow Springs is 1,350 acres in size. In return, a portion of land better suited to the pastoral activities of the Reynolds family is proposed to be excised from the park for addition to the Willow Springs Station's pastoral lease, so it is a true land swap.

However, the land to be excised from the Ikara-Flinders National Park is 900 acres, so it is significantly smaller, a difference of 450 hectares, or 1,000 acres. The addition of land to the park does not require the approval of parliament and will proceed once parliament has considered the excision.

The Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park is a beautiful place. I have been fortunate enough to visit it a number of times. As the member for Colton said, he first visited it as a schoolboy in fourth year. I think I was probably the same age when I first visited the Flinders Ranges. I have also been fortunate enough to visit Wilpena Pound, which of course is probably the central feature of this particular national park. The Heysen and Mawson trails also pass through the park.

The park's most characteristic landmark is Wilpena Pound, a large, sickle-shaped natural amphitheatre covering nearly 80 kilometres and containing the range's highest peak, St Mary Peak. On 12 February 2016, the park was renamed to include the Adnyamathanha word 'Ikara' which means 'meeting place', referring to the traditional name for Wilpena Pound.

I was rather intrigued by a story my father told me many years ago about some near neighbours who were farming near Cummins, which is where I grew up and where our family farmed. It was the story of the Hill family. I knew Colin Hill, who since passed away; he certainly would be in his 90s by now. His son John and grandson Jarrad continued to farm just west of Cummins, out by our road. My father told me that Colin Hill's father and grandfather had farmed wheat inside Wilpena Pound.

It intrigued me and stuck in my memory, so when this particular motion came up I decided to do a little bit of research. I found out that what my father had told me was in fact correct. In 1901, the Hill family obtained the lease over Wilpena Pound. The original John Hill arrived in South Australia in 1836 on *The Buffalo*, so the Hill family has been here since European settlement began. The Hill family obtained the lease in 1901, and they decided to try farming, something never before attempted so far north.

Goyder's line had proven rather accurate with regard to agricultural expansion in the great drought of the 1880s. Wilpena Pound is some 140 kilometres north of Goyder's line. Being in the shadow of some of the highest mountains of the Flinders, rainfall in the pound is a little higher and sometimes even snow falls on St Mary Peak. The Hill family was determined to try it. After the immense labour of constructing a road through the tortuous Wilpena Gap, they built a small homestead inside the pound, which still stands today. They then cleared some open patches in the thick scrub of the interior of the pound.

For several years, the Hill family had moderate success growing crops inside the pound. In fact, my recollection is that you can find inside the pound some old farm machinery; maybe there is a stripper and a plougher there somewhere. In 1914, there was a major flood, and the road through the gorge was destroyed. It must have been a summer flood because the irony of 1914 is that there was a very severe drought. I remember my uncle, Mick Wagner, telling me that, of all the droughts he saw, 1914 was the worst. Somewhere in that time, there must have been a flood, a thunderstorm that went through Wilpena Pound and destroyed the road through the gorge.

Unfortunately for the Hill family, they could not bear to start all over again and sold their homestead to the government, so this negotiation of occupiers with government has been going on for a long time. I can only assume that in 1914 the Hill family moved from there to take up a block west of Cummins. So, there you go: it stuck in my mind and I have learned something today about the history of the park, Wilpena Pound and the Hill family.

The Flinders Ranges are largely composed of folded and faulted sediments of the Adelaide Geosyncline. Most of the high ground and ridge tops in the Flinders are sequences of quartz sites that outcrop along the strike. The flora of the Flinders Ranges is composed largely of species adapted to a semi-arid environment such as cypress pine, mallee and black oak. The moister areas near Wilpena Pound support grevilleas, Guinea flowers, lilies and ferns. Reeds and sedges grow near permanent water sources such as springs and waterholes.

Since the eradication of dingoes and the establishment of permanent waterholes for stock, the numbers of red kangaroos, western grey kangaroos and euros in the area have increased. The yellow-footed rock wallaby, which neared extinction after the arrival of Europeans due to hunting and predation by foxes, has now stabilised, and other endemic marsupials include dunnarts and planigales. Echidnas are the sole monotreme species in the park, and I am sure that since the removal of foxes and dingoes they have also increased in numbers. Bats make up a significant proportion of mammals in the area and reptiles include goannas, snakes, dragon lizards, skinks and geckos. There is also an endemic amphibian known as the streambank froglet.

I am very pleased to support the motion. I understand the difficulty of the negotiation, which the member for Stuart highlighted. Hopefully, it finishes up being a win-win situation for the government and the Reynolds family as well and that this addition to the park can be enjoyed by many people for many years to come.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (17:41): I commend the motion moved by the Minister for Education and Child Development on behalf of the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation in the other place. We have heard some lovely stories and detail about the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park and the important role it plays in attracting new and returning tourists to our state. It certainly is an area of serenity and isolation, which makes it such an enticing place for pilgrimage for visitors from both home and abroad.

As stated before, it is located about 450 kilometres or a four-hour drive north of Adelaide, which makes me reflect on how odd it was that, as a child, it used to take us two days to get there from Adelaide because I cannot quite work out why we always stopped overnight. I heard the member for Flinders talk about flooding and how it affected the area. I can tell you that one time we went when I must have been a very small child, as I will explain. We had to stay in the town of Hawker on the way up because there was a massive flood, and we were caught in a big car park lot with all the caravanners as the water lapped up to our door. You can imagine, as your mother used to hold you out into the street to go to the toilet, it was quite awkward. I think I was very young, fortunately, at that particular point, but there was an enormous flood, which I believe would have been somewhere in the mid-seventies, and I am sure it would have provided some damage to the local area.

I have some really wonderful memories. I remember my father coming from England in the mid-sixties as the Ten pound Pom. He was determined that we would act out episodes of Burke and Wills' great adventures when we were caravanning up in the Flinders Ranges. We would often get there late at night, and he would force my mother to get out and wave her hands wildly so that he would not reverse into a pine tree as we reversed into what he thought was the best park. But as soon as Mum would shut the door, he would say, 'Don't tell your mother, but there is a tree full of spiders out the back.' The trees would be full of red-backs, and you would hear her shriek and run to the car. It was a joke and all in good fun.

I remember many adventures—falling into creeks and treading in areas where you swore nobody had ever set foot before, the smell of the area, the beautiful sunset and the crisp afternoons. Some of that was in Wilpena Pound, but some was in surrounding areas. We used to camp in creek beds, which was absolutely crazy because of course we know what can happen in flood in the creek beds. I also remember that we would drive up to Blinman. As a young teenager, I believe that was my first experience of a shandy, standing at the front of the Blinman pub. I also remember the curry my father copped because he did not pack the potatoes. I think they cost about a dollar each, and we had to buy some from the Blinman General Store. Those are my memories of the Flinders Ranges as a young child.

Having since returned to see the glamping safari tents, the campgrounds and restaurants, the beautiful Adnyamathanha cultural trails and the bus tours, all those wonderful things that now exist in organised ecotourism of course benefit us greatly as a state. I really appreciate them, but I think that the journey and the experience are very different now from when I was a child. I am reliably informed that the scenic flight over Ikara is one of the most beautiful and spectacular experiences. I would like to be able to help my children to experience that at some point in the future.

Protecting and preserving Ikara is so incredibly important not only for the heritage and biodiversity of South Australia but for our tourism sector. The fact that our Labor government is committed to expanding the tourism sector by \$8 billion, providing 41,000 jobs by 2020, is backed up by what we are doing to protect our parks and our natural biodiversity. It is about long-term sustainability for our state in jobs and tourism. Flow-on tourism associated industries will be critical as we continue to transition to our carbon-constrained future.

I have no hesitation in commending the boundary changes of Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park. I pay my respects to the elders of the land and use this opportunity to express my thoughts and feelings around the shame and pity it would be to make any area near that beautiful place a site for a nuclear waste dump of any kind. It would be a terrible, terrible shame. I would like to commend this motion to the house and thank the ministers here and in the other place.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (17:46): I will speak very briefly to conclude this discussion. I am very grateful for the support on both sides of the chamber for this motion. I would

like to note that the proposition is one that will benefit all South Australians, and I am glad that both sides of the chamber have been able to support it.

I appreciate the history that has been given of some of the very complex arrangements that have been negotiated over very many years that have finally arrived in this settlement. I appreciate that the member for Stuart has been complimentary about the public servants he has dealt with. I was a colleague of many of the people who have been involved over the years, and I know that they would have acted in the best possible way for the good of the state; nonetheless, I acknowledge that there has been a complex history in coming up with this final agreement. On that note, I would like to commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

At 17:47 the house adjourned until Thursday 22 June 2017 at 10:30.