

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 10 August 2017

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

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

Bills

WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY (NOTIFICATION OF NEXT OF KIN) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:30): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Work Health and Safety Act 2012. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:31): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Work Health and Safety (Notification of Next of Kin) Amendment Bill 2017 amends the Work Health and Safety Act 2012. The amendments in the bill amend provisions relating to the duty to notify the next of kin when a prescribed medical incident occurs on a business premises. The work health and safety bill will enforce the requirement for a business owner to take all reasonable actions to notify the next of kin, immediately after becoming aware of a prescribed medical incident, by the fastest means possible. A record of such notification must also be made and kept for at least five years after the incident.

To ensure there is no confusion with notification being given by both the workplace and emergency services, provisions have been implemented that declare that a person is not required to comply with the notification if they have been directly advised by police, ambulance or some other authority responsible for providing emergency services that they have already notified the next of kin of the incident. Presently, there is no legal requirement for a workplace to notify the next of kin in the event of a serious accident.

The confusion that can be caused as a result of the lack of presence of such a requirement was evident in the case of Mr Alan Carter. Mr Carter was involved in a workplace accident whilst attempting to unload livestock at an abattoir. He was attempting to unload a water buffalo. A series of unfortunate circumstances transpired, which resulted in Mr Carter suffering extensive and serious injuries inflicted by the livestock. It was very traumatic for other truck drivers on the scene, who found it difficult to even function, let alone talk to anyone appropriately, such as other contractors.

Emergency services were required to attend the accident. I am aware that the business owner was alerted to the incident shortly after it taking place, and arrangements were made for the livestock and Mr Carter's truck to be returned. After emergency services attended the scene, Mr Carter was taken to Strathalbyn hospital before being transferred to Flinders Medical Centre. At this time, no emergency worker or the business owner had attempted to contact the family.

It is my understanding that the family has been informed that, due to its being a worksite, emergency services attending assumed the family would be notified by the business owner: on the contrary, the business believed they had no responsibility to notify the family. This bill is about taking out any confusion about what happens if a terrible accident like this happens to anyone else in this state.

Unfortunately, due to no notification being made, Mr Carter passed away without the opportunity to have the presence of his loved ones in his final hours. The inability to say goodbye to

a loved one in the final moments of one's life is morally unjust, and this led to Alan's family contacting me in an attempt to prevent these circumstances recurring.

I first met with Cheryl Conway-Randell, Alan's partner, and Alan's daughter in late 2016. They shared with me Alan's story, and from what I can gather he was a man loved and respected by many in the community. I feel it is important to read the words of Alan's partner, Cheryl, to best describe Mr Carter's history and love for the farming and agricultural industry—the late Alan Martin Carter, Al to his mates, the owner of AMC Livestock Transport—as follows:

Alan was from a family of 10 children. He was born at Moonta Hospital on 22 April 1943 and from a young age, Alan was a regular sight in saleyards, auctions and markets with his father Bob. Al's parents over the years owned and operated four butcher shops at Two Wells, Mallala, Bordertown and North Adelaide. Bob, Alan and his brothers, Bruce and Max were all butchers by trade.

Alan purchased his property at Burdett on Sunnyside overlooking the Murray River in 1967. In the early 70's, Alan became a sole trader and purchased his first truck, a Bedford, which he took on the local market calf run.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: A Bedford?

Mr PEDERICK: A Bedford—a very good truck, and my father owned one, a J5, I think. She continues:

His business grew and he went on to purchase his first new truck, a Leyland, and he always said, 'that reliable old girl put me on my feet.' He had blue hurdles made up for the Leyland, and that blue remained an easily identified colour of his truck fleet in the years to follow.

Alan's business continued to grow, with the purchase of two prime movers to cart pigs to Chapmans at Nairn for over 30 years, along with other local work in the Murraylands and beyond. Alan was a regular at the Murray Bridge, Wednesday livestock market and was well known and respected by the local and interstate trucking community.

Al's three sons and daughters are still involved in the trucking industry, they all live at Burdett, and his business is still operating to this day. Along with his own family, he taught many. One of those he taught was a young lad, Alan showed him how to maintain and drive a truck over the years. His exceptional skills as a livestock handler, were also passed on to many.

Alan with a lifetime of experience was well known, loved and respected as a fair and reliable trader through the district and further afield. Al was well recognised as a true Aussie stockman. He was a member of the Livestock Road Transport Association SA from its inception and in later years a member of the committee. He was known as a man of few words, but when he spoke people listened and valued his opinion.

Al knew what it was to do it tough, yet was always willing to extend his hand to help out a neighbour, or a mate. He was more diverse than many people knew, he broke-in his own horses and was an exceptional horse rider, something that he loved to do. Al bred and trained his own working dogs, and on Saturdays, everyone knew not to call him, as he was at the local dance at Burdett, he also loved to sing.

A young truck driver at Alan's funeral summed Al up nicely when he said, 'there was only one word to describe Alan, he was a legend.' Alan touched many lives in his time and was loved by many, yet unfortunately, Alan was not afforded the opportunity to have his loved ones with him at the time of his passing. The moral requirement of notifying his family of the accident was not carried out, however, other phone calls of much lesser significance were made to have the stock and his truck removed from the accident site at Strath Pastoral Abattoirs.

This parliament should without any further consideration, or delay, pass the necessary legislation to change the obligation to notify immediate family of a prescribed workplace accident, and especially if such injury may result in death, from a moral responsibility, to a legal responsibility, so family [have the opportunity to] be with their loved ones at that [terrible] time.

I believe we all would be of the opinion that no person should have to die alone. Under the current law, this can be the case, as it was in the passing of my partner, Alan Carter.

Yours sincerely,

Cheryl Conway-Randell.

Alan's funeral was held at the Murray Bridge Saleyards with over 1,500 people in attendance. Alan now has a saleyard named in his memory and a plaque on the truckers' memorial wall in Murray Bridge. Along with the support of Mr Carter's family, I have also received a letter of support from the Livestock and Rural Transporters Association of South Australia:

The Livestock and Rural Transporters Association of SA fully support your actions to amend the Work Health and Safety Act, by introducing a duty to notify immediate family members in the event of an accident.

What happened to Cheryl Carter following Alan Carter's fatal accident is just not good enough and should have never occurred. Considering the majority of people carry a mobile phone, for no-one to contact her, is inexcusable.

Alan's accident also highlights the need for a second person to be in attendance while operators are engaged in loading and unloading livestock. All too often our members are working with live animals without a second person nearby.

The LRTASA feels strongly that by making this change to the Work Health and Safety Act, it will be a step in the right direction.

Yours sincerely,

David Smith

President.

It is evident that there is support for the implementation of this bill; however, over coming weeks I will conduct additional consultation with relevant industry stakeholders. I trust that those on the other side will see the validity of introducing this bill to the house, and I look forward to its speedy passage through the parliament in memory of Alan Carter. I think he led a remarkable life. He suffered an unfortunate accident. Vale, Alan Carter. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Cook.

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS (INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 September 2016.)

Ms COOK (Fisher) (10:42): I move:

That this Order of the Day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	22
Noes	17
Majority	5

AYES

Bedford, F.E.	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.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Picton, C.J.	Rankine, J.M.
Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.	Weatherill, J.W.
Wortley, D.		

NOES

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

PAIRS

Hughes, E.J.	Tarzia, V.A.	Piccolo, A.
--------------	--------------	-------------

PAIRS

Wingard, C.

Vlahos, L.A.

Marshall, S.S.

Motion thus carried; Order of the Day postponed.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION (GUARDIANSHIP) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 August 2017.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:48): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

CONSTITUTION (ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION) (APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 August 2017.)

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (10:49): I move:

That this Order of the Day be postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the house is that Order of the Day No. 4 be postponed. It is postponed if it has not previously been debated today. It is adjourned if it has been debated today.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 22

Noes 18

Majority 4

AYES

Bedford, F.E.

Brock, G.G.

Cook, N.F.

Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.

Key, S.W.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Rau, J.R.

Wortley, D.

Bettison, Z.L.

Caica, P.

Digance, A.F.C.

Hildyard, K.

Koutsantonis, A.

Picton, C.J.

Snelling, J.J.

Bignell, L.W.K.

Close, S.E.

Gee, J.P.

Kenyon, T.R. (teller)

Mullighan, S.C.

Rankine, J.M.

Weatherill, J.W.

NOES

Bell, T.S.

Gardner, J.A.W.

Knoll, S.K.

Pengilly, M.R.

Sanderson, R.

van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Chapman, V.A. (teller)

Goldsworthy, R.M.

McFetridge, D.

Pisoni, D.G.

Speirs, D.

Whetstone, T.J.

Duluk, S.

Griffiths, S.P.

Pederick, A.S.

Redmond, I.M.

Treloar, P.A.

Williams, M.R.

PAIRS

Hughes, E.J.

Tarzia, V.A.

Piccolo, A.

PAIRS

Wingard, C.

Vlahos, L.A.

Marshall, S.S.

Motion thus carried; Order of the Day postponed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MEMBERS CONTESTING STATE ELECTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 August 2017.)

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (10:55): I continue my remarks from last sitting week.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And you have five minutes; is that right? Five minutes to go.

Mr GARDNER: I will not need all five, ma'am. I understand that, without reflecting on the vote of another chamber—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot hear the member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: —a bill not entirely dissimilar to this has been—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation. Please show some respect for the member on their feet. Member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: —the subject of some consideration in the other place. There were some differences between that bill and this bill. I think this is a superior bill for reasons that I commenced to outline last week. Fundamentally, it treats major party candidates and Independents as the same. The point that I started to make last week is that, when constituents have the opportunity to vote from a choice of a number of candidates at an election, if all the candidates have no party affiliation, that is absolutely fine, but in many cases that puts a burden on the constituent to find information about those candidates—whether they are the sort of person who shares the values of the constituent or whether they have the same set of beliefs that the constituent might have.

Being a member of a major party is absolutely nothing to be ashamed of. In fact, it suggests that somebody has a set of values, a set of beliefs and principles that a constituent, a voter, can immediately understand the candidate aspires to and would represent for them if in government. Therefore, it baffles me why anyone would want to give local council members seeking election as Independents differential treatment to those local council members seeking election as a candidate for a major party, whether that be, as I said last week, the Liberal Party, the Labor Party, the Greens, the Australian Conservatives, or any other group.

I think this is the superior bill. I hope that members of the government will join with the opposition in passing this bill rather than any other bill that does something similar. However, I think the first principle of the bill is sound and probably applies to both bills in that it will clarify for members of council seeking election to a different parliament (this state parliament in this case) their obligations with regard to ceasing their council duties, and instead they can focus on their election to state parliament. I think that is valuable and worthwhile, and I encourage all members to support this bill.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (10:58): I rise to support the member for Unley in his efforts. As someone who came out of local government (I spent 17 years there) to this place, I know over the years it has been quite a topical issue and it has caused a fair bit of dissension in a number of councils around the state over members who have nominated to stand for a position in this parliament. It is an issue that needs clarification. It is an issue that the member for Unley has thought about and discussed with his colleagues for some time.

I have a personal view about this. When I was preselected as a candidate for Finniss in 2005, to all intents and purposes I handed over my responsibilities to the then deputy mayor, who picked

up on that and did what was required. The only thing I did in the lead-up to when the writs were called was to chair the monthly meetings of council, and basically that was it. I also chaired the meetings of council—no, I do not think I did; I will have to check up to correct that.

However, I believe that it is important that if someone is in the local government sphere and they wish to stand for parliament, they should stand aside for the duration of that campaign so that they can focus entirely on their possible election to parliament without any sort of conflict with the local government sector or the council they belong to. I think it would clear up the matter quite well. Next year we are going to see candidates, who are currently serving in elected positions in local government in South Australia, standing for parliament in the lower house or the upper house, and I think this bill gives some clarity and clears the decks for them and it clears the decks for their councils.

It is something that has probably needed clarification for a number of years and the opportunity is here now to do that, and I believe this parliament should pick up on it and proceed with it. There will be members in this place who possibly have a different view to me, and I can live with that, but, as I said earlier, it has caused some grief to a number of councils over the years. I think it muddies the water when elected members are still in that role at that level and are then standing for this parliament.

The situation is that if a person is successfully elected to the parliament on 17 March next year, they automatically lose their role in local government. That changes the second you are elected, quite frankly. It happened to me, and I use my example because I was the mayor at the time, immediately I became aware that I had won the election for the seat of Finniss over Mary-Lou Corcoran, of blessed memory—and I did it again in 2010; I think the house needs to be reminded of that. I could go on about that because it was quite an interesting series of events.

The Labor Party brought in people to hand out how-to-vote cards across the Fleurieu in the electorate of Finniss, and when it went down in a screaming heap, these poor kids they had pulled from all over the Eastern States and had dropped in places such as Parawa and Second Valley were all left there and no-one picked them up. It turned out that my people picked them up and took them back to Victor Harbor or Adelaide, because they had been deserted; they were left in their bright red shirts.

I digress from the business at hand, Madam Deputy Speaker. Indeed, if you are elected you are immediately no longer a part of the local government sector. I support the member for Unley in his efforts, and I am happy to be able to make this contribution to the debate this morning. I wish him well with the speedy passage of what he has in front of the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:03): I rise to speak to the Local Government (Members Contesting State Elections) Amendment Bill. I commend the member for Unley for bringing this bill to the house. We are seeking to address the issue of mayors and local councillors running for state parliament, and to provide a consistent approach across all councils, placing an obligation on local councillors and mayors to step aside from their duties and functions while they canvass for elections in an Australian parliament.

For instance, with regard to registered political parties, this leave would commence from the issuing of state election writs and end at the closing of the polls. In regard to Independents or non-registered political party candidates, the leave would commence from the close of nominations and end at the closing of the poll.

We want to make sure there is full transparency. These amendments, which will be made to the Local Government Act 1999, refer to providing automatic leave for all candidates from the issuing of the writs, and no penalties to apply, for example, and no loss of allowances. The candidate would continue to be a local councillor or a mayor until the casual vacancy came into effect from the date of election to parliament.

What we are trying to offset is retirements and then costly council by-elections taking place to fill that vacancy. Obviously if someone retires from council and their place is picked up, they do not have any opportunity to go back. I note that there are arrangements for public servants, whether they be serving police officers or other levels of public servants, where they can make sure that they can resume their employment if they are not elected.

I certainly understand that that is the case for corrections officers, who have a similar undertaking. They can essentially take the appropriate allowance to run as a candidate. They go through a process of stepping aside, and then if they are not successful, there is a streamlined passage to go back into the role they were doing before the election. What we are trying to do is give that same certainty to mayors and councillors in local government who are having an attempt at representing at the state level. I think it is a very smart move and I commend the speedy passage of this bill through the house.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC (MAIL ZONES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 June 2017.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:08): I rise to speak very briefly in opposition to this well-meaning bill, the Road Traffic (Mail Zones) Amendment Bill, introduced by the member for Adelaide. It is well meaning. The future of parking in the CBD is a matter of some interest to me. There is actually a Legislative Review Committee inquiry starting into this very issue of the provision of parking and whether it is adequate.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: It is very interesting; bear with me. That committee inquiry is focusing particularly on the suburbs. I know that in my area, particularly around the hospital, there is a constant debate about where people can park. I am sure those of us who have hospitals in our constituencies would agree that a lot of people work there and a lot of people visit on an ad hoc basis. It is almost impossible to provide enough parking without impacting on local residents, so there is an inquiry into this by the Legislative Review Committee.

Quite aside from that, driverless or autonomous vehicles will have an impact on the model of driving and parking. It could be that we will see an Uber model of independent, driverless vehicles which are all owned centrally or owned by companies rather than by householders and which are constantly on the move and thus almost never need to park. If they do need to park, they can park off site in some storage facility. This would in turn usher in an era where a lot of parking would be redundant, including a lot of parking that is currently mandated in residential developments.

Then you have the problem of retrofitting old parking arrangements in residential developments that are unsuitable at the moment for habitation and what you do about those. Parking is surprisingly interesting. In Adelaide and North Adelaide, in the Adelaide city council area, there are over 15,500 on-street car parks—10,800, I am advised, in Adelaide, and 4,200 in lovely North Adelaide.

These on-street car parks consist of unpaid time-limit spaces, paid ticket parking, loading zones, motorcycle parks, disabled parking zones, taxi zones and mail zones, of which there are only about 30 across Adelaide and North Adelaide. To my mind, there is a lot of parking in the City of Adelaide, and, as I said before, the future of that parking is very much in question in the long term. Motorists also, of course, have the other option of parking in the tens of thousands of multistorey car park spaces that are available by payment across Adelaide.

The other factor, of course, is that Australia Post is still owned by the Australian government, and I wonder whether the member for Adelaide has spoken to her federal colleagues about this plan. I also wonder whether she has consulted the relevant union. There are people who rely on Australia Post for their jobs. As I think the minister may have pointed out, Australia Post does not use these mail zones for only five minutes every day to do one drop-off. They visit them multiple times and at staggered, random times, and that park really needs to be free so that the mail can get through, as the old American saying goes.

I oppose this bill. I urge other members to oppose it, not because it is not well meaning, but because I think it is largely unnecessary. It complicates an issue that is already quite complicated,

and I think that over time the problem of parking in the CBD will move on and become a much more complex argument than simply changing the mail zones. I oppose this bill.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:13): I congratulate the member on Adelaide on bringing this bill to the parliament because any member of parliament who represents an inner suburban seat knows what has been happening. Over the years, we have seen an increase in urban consolidation and an increase in the number of people who live beyond the inner suburbs travelling to the inner suburbs and parking in the inner suburbs. Either they use public transport—so that they only pay for two zones rather than for the full ticket to come in from the outer suburbs and also save on paying for parking in the city—or they open their boot or go to the back of their car and take out their bike and ride into town.

There is nothing wrong with that. We love to see people using public transport and riding their bikes, but the unintended consequence of this is that we are seeing parking congestion in the inner suburbs, such as in Prospect, North Adelaide and Walkerville, in my electorate in Unley, in Goodwood, Parkside and Forestville. Businesses are having fewer visits because cars are parked all day in side streets. People who live in those side streets cannot get visitors or tradesmen to visit.

We see councils forced to put up timed parking in areas that used to have parking available for residents and their visitors virtually any time of day. It is causing quite a bit of angst in the inner suburbs. There are those who do not like the idea of timed parking. They have to apply for and pay for a parking permit to allow them to stay over the four-hour period because they are residents.

It has become an issue, so Unley council is reviewing its permanent parking process. There are many people in the electorate of Unley, and the City of Unley in particular, who believe that they are being forced to pay the cost of this Labor government's urban consolidation policy and the cost of people using public transport by being charged an annual fee to park in front of their homes, which is something they have done for the last 20 years. The member for Adelaide has been very innovative, and innovation is something we need to encourage not only in this place but out in the private sector.

The member for Little Para mentioned the move to driverless vehicles, but I would suggest they are still some way off. The multiple visits to postboxes in a day that we saw even five years ago simply do not happen anymore, with it now costing \$1 to post an envelope. We have seen growth in Australia Post business coming purely from parcel delivery through people making online purchases, whether they buy them from interstate, locally or businesses overseas. We are seeing an increase in the number of deliveries, but they are not generated by the use of postboxes.

As the member for Adelaide correctly pointed out in her second reading contribution on this matter, the pick-ups happen between six and seven in the evening. That is very clear if you read a postbox. It tells you that it is guaranteed to be picked up on that particular day if you get it in the postbox by 6pm. It used to be a next-day delivery, but I am not quite sure it is anymore. There is no need to go there at 11am to pick it up. It may have been, when thousands or hundreds of letters were going into that box every day, but if you talk to anybody from Australia Post or anybody who is operating an Australia Post franchise they will tell you that the use of postboxes for posting letters has dived in recent years because people are sending emails when they have something to say.

When it is an article, whether it be a new pair of jeans, a MixMaster or something like that, they are delivered. The kitchen sink can be delivered.

Mr Pengilly: Do you know what they are?

Mr PISONI: Yes, I do know what they are; I do use them occasionally.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: They have not made them for years; they do not make them anymore.

Mr PISONI: MixMasters are on the second-hand market. You have eBay and Gumtree, and a lot of those transactions of course are done by post. People do not go down to the local postbox to do that; they normally arrange for them to be picked up or, if they want to save a few dollars, they take them down to the post office or the franchise for those parcels to be delivered.

The member for Adelaide is very much in tune with her electorate, and she has noted that for businesses to be viable cars need to be able to park. I have to say that since the member for Adelaide has been representing that area it has become very vibrant. She has done a terrific job in encouraging people to rent those shops, and some terrific bakeries and coffee shops have popped up. It is very similar to what we have had in Unley for many years. I remember that when I was on Prospect council in my late 20s, together with the Hon. Russell Wortley—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Mr PISONI: —and the member for Newland might enjoy this—there was a coalition of the left and the right at one of those council meetings. We timed it for when the old conservatives who were opposed to a ban on backyard burning—one was ill and the other one was on holidays—and we got together and we got a ban on backyard burning through the Prospect council. The coalition of the left and the right with the Hon. Russell Wortley and the current member for Unley got that through the Prospect council. When I was a member back then—

Mr Griffiths: Who had the longest hair back then?

Mr PISONI: I had the longest hair back then. You might find that hard to believe, but I had the longest hair—long, curly flowing hair! I remember that when I was doorknocking for the ward of Nailsworth—

Members interjecting:

Mr PISONI: No, I was doorknocking and a guy opened the door and he looked at me and said, 'I heard there was a hippie running in the council election.' That is true—little did they know. Within a very short time of my being on that council, that left-wing dominated council described me apparently as 'the lunatic fringe' compared with the values they held on that council in those days. Do you remember those 'Keep Prospect nuclear free' signs that they used to spend ratepayers' money on? Of course, any expansion of a nuclear program was banned nationally, but they spent ratepayers' money putting up these signs everywhere for a political message. I have digressed a little, but I think the chamber has enjoyed the digression.

The point I am making is that Prospect has changed a lot in recent years. It has become much more vibrant, and it is a very pleasant place to shop and socialise. The member for Adelaide has picked up that we can gain another on-street car park. All the research will tell you that if you are passing by and you want a cup of coffee or you want to pop into a shop, if you can get an on-street car park you are more likely to stop than if you have to find a car park at the rear of the shop. We have this debate all the time in Unley when we are talking about preserving our strip shopping.

Cities like Sydney and Melbourne take strip shopping for granted, as it is virtually everywhere, but here in South Australia strip shopping is very limited. We only have a few—we have some in Norwood, Glenelg, Prospect and Unley—so it is important that the strip shopping destinations we have in South Australia succeed. The member for Adelaide has identified a simple, costless policy that will enable an extra car park to be freed up, taking into account that things have changed and that we can get a benefit from that for the community.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (11:23): I would like to thank all the speakers on this bill so far. To reiterate, as a member of parliament it is important to be in tune with what is going on in your electorate. Whilst development issues are the number one priority in Prospect, car parking is most definitely the number one issue in North Adelaide, and probably car parking and development in the city are the things that are on my residents' minds. For many years I have thought, 'Why is it that you cannot park in front of an Australia Post postbox for 24 hours a day, seven days a week, all year, yet the mail pick-up is only between 6pm and 7pm, six days a week?'

Now we know that we do not even have next-day delivery, so if it was a few minutes off we could change it. If they needed from 6pm to 7.30pm to get their deliveries done, that would be no problem; it is really the idea of freeing up the car park. The people who are trying to put the mail in the mailbox are there throughout the day, but at the moment it is a no standing zone, so you cannot even stop in front the Australia Post postbox.

I am 100 per cent certain that car parking is an issue in North Adelaide. Although there are only 12 Australia Post postboxes in North Adelaide and 55 in the city, those 12 car parks make a big difference to the people who would be using them. There is a high turnover; they would be used throughout the day, as the member for Unley mentioned. If people can get a car park easily, they will quickly drop in and pick up a pie from the O'Connell Street bakery or they will pick up some flowers they see in the window for their wife on the way home, which I think should be encouraged.

From the recent surveying that Adelaide city council did, it is not only business owners but also workers and residents who have trouble with car parking. I had a business in North Adelaide on O'Connell Street and I had a business on Melbourne Street, and one of the main issues was staff having to go and move their car all the time because of parking. When we had our classes in the evening on O'Connell Street, students would be driving around for ages trying to find parks and then they would park far away, so they are walking back to their cars late at night in the dark. So even 12 car parks will help.

I did put in my original speech that North Adelaide Primary School had their first ever concert where all the family and grandparents were invited, and they had at least three phone calls from grandparents who had driven all the way from Parafield Gardens or Paralowie, a considerable distance, and they had driven around for 20 minutes to try to find a park to come to their grandchildren's concert, they could not find a park and they have driven all the way home.

Car parking is definitely an issue. I see this as one very small measure, which has no cost and is an easy way that you could open it up. I have spoken to an Australia Post franchisee owner; they do not have a problem with it. I think it is a win-win. It has no cost. It is in keeping with what the residents want. I support the bill, and I ask that members in the house think about this carefully and support it.

The house divided on second reading:

Ayes 17
 Noes 20
 Majority 3

AYES

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

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Caica, P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Digance, A.F.C.	Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.
Kenyon, T.R. (teller)	Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Picton, C.J.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.
Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.	

PAIRS

Marshall, S.S.	Vlahos, L.A.	Tarzia, V.A.
Hughes, E.J.	Williams, M.R.	Brock, G.G.
Wingard, C.	Piccolo, A.	

Second reading thus negated.

*Motions***RATE CAPPING**

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:32): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes the level of local government rate income increases over the past five years;
- (b) notes the concerns expressed by the local government sector of transfer of responsibility from the state government to local government and the associated cost impact; and
- (c) requests the member for Frome, as Minister for Local Government, confirm what legislative, regulatory or practical action he has pursued, investigated or implemented to keep local government rate increases to a minimum.

I have brought this motion before the parliament in a very serious manner. As the person who proposed the legislation of last year, in which local government rate capping was put before the house and defeated, and as someone who started working in local government on 2 January 1979, has held the local government shadow portfolio and taken an interest in local government matters for 38½ years now by virtue of employment or being a member of this parliament, I have done it in a very serious way.

It is intended to be a discussion about the level of increases over the last five years. It is my intention to put on the record just some of the increases from councils for the 2014-15 year through to, in some cases, the set declaration for this 2017-18 year; I know it is still a draft. I thank the member for Unley and his office for providing me with those updated figures.

It is important also to reflect on an opportunity where councils, by virtue of their advocacy body, the Local Government Association, have expressed concern for some time about the responsibilities transferred to them that they are required to fund, which has come from the state government in the main. Some of that comes from the document that was in for the 2017-18 budget submission for the state budget that the Local Government Association put forward.

The third part of the motion is about the direct question of the action by the member for Frome, as the Minister for Local Government, on what he has done to make a significant difference to the cost of rate impost upon all property owners in South Australia. The areas the motion addresses are a bit varied; however, there are very important areas where I think some responses are needed.

The member for Frome came to me before this motion was able to be put; unfortunately, he is rather unwell with a physical issue today and he has had to get treatment for that. I accept that, but it is unfortunate that the minister cannot be in the chamber to contribute to the debate because I know that was his intention.

I want to read into the record a summary of some of the rate increases from 2014-15 through to this year, projected. They paint a very interesting picture, which comes as a bit of surprise, but it is a picture that pleases me. Some examples are:

- Campbelltown City Council in 2014-15 had a 4.5 per cent increase, and this year the adopted figure is 2.6 per cent;
- the City of Mitcham had a 4.24 per cent increase in 2014-15, and this year 2.9 per cent is the adopted figure;
- the City of Playford had a 5 per cent increase in 2014-15, and this year the adopted figure is 2.8 per cent;
- the City of Prospect had a 4.4 per cent increase in 2014-15, and this year it is 2.75 per cent;
- the City of Unley had a 4.95 per cent increase in 2014-15, and this year it is 2.9 per cent; and

- the Town of Walkerville had a 7 per cent increase in 2014-15, and this year it is 2.68 per cent.

I did not intend to focus just on metropolitan councils—I could read in many more—but they paint a picture that is nearly replicated in most councils and also across regional council areas, where in 2014-15 the rate increase was a higher figure than it is for the 2017-18 year. I honestly think the Liberal Party can be held partially responsible for that good result. In February 2014, the Liberal Party put a policy of rate capping to the people of South Australia. Indeed, we took it to the election. The Liberal Party was not elected, but it has continued to hold that policy since.

In my previous shadow portfolio role, I have spoken to individual councils, collections of regional councils and a local government forum at Wayville that about 150 people attended. I put to them that the policy is based purely upon cost of living pressures. It is what I believe is the appropriate thing to do. I believe it is important for the people of South Australia that it is pursued because all sectors of government expenditure (and in this case I count state government and local government) need to ensure that they get the best possible outcome from the money that is spent because the money comes from property owners and taxpayers—from all people. Those people will demand, by virtue of giving the responsibility to others to raise that revenue and to expend those funds, an efficiency in how that is done.

While there are many sectors, particularly from the local government community, that are upset about rate capping and its principles, there are other sectors that are really grateful for it because they think that it creates a long-term benefit for them. I am a believer that it will ensure that the local government sector is efficient in what it does. I put on the record that there are 68 councils with about 700 elected members and nearly 11,000 staff. They control \$22 billion in assets and they have budgets each year of about \$2 billion, but the key issue that this motion relates to is the income that comes from property owners and the rates revenue that is collected, which is about \$1 billion.

In some of my discussions with councils I have used this argument continually, based on the fact that I expected the legislation that I put to the parliament last year to be somewhat challenged, and it was. The member for Frome, in what I saw as a key point on how he voted for it, said no—that was a continuation of the position he took post the 2014 election, when he had the compact with the Premier to form government on what he would do. I also had a briefing with the member for Waite, and I think there was a level of interest there, but he also decided to vote against it. So it was lost, and I understand that, but I think the continuing debate about it has been part of the reasoning behind—and I hope this is the case—the efficiencies that are occurring across councils.

The percentage figures that I just quoted to the chamber—that is, the rate increases for the 2014-15 year for some metropolitan councils compared with the 2017-18 declaration—show a downward trend. You could argue that that is on the basis that councils may subconsciously be considering the possibility of a change of government on 17 March next year and therefore the rate-capping policy becoming legislation. That is something they all have to work for, and therefore they are ensuring a continued drive for efficiency. That is what I proposed the legislation for. That is what Steven Marshall, as the Leader of the Opposition and the alternative premier, one month prior to the 2014 election put the proposal out there for—to ensure that efficiency existed.

Remember, it comes back to this \$1 billion in total rate income figure. If you can argue that the discussions that have taken place have created an increase of, say, if we round it off, a 1 per cent increase less than it might otherwise have been if you use the simple numbers again, that equates to \$10 million per year. That is \$10 million that remains in the pockets of property owners. It is \$10 million that remains in the pockets of an economy to spend in other areas to grow opportunity, and it has ensured that efficiencies are starting to be delivered through councils. Rate capping will be an extension of that, and that is what I believe is important to pursue.

An important part of the Liberal vision on rate capping is not to just say that there can be no increases. An opportunity exists for councils where they have long-term financial management plans and where they have community support for that. It is not just by the current legislation when it comes to community involvement but via a regulation that will be formed on the basis of what the Minister for Planning has as part of the charter of community engagement that comes from the planning, development and infrastructure legislation that passed through the parliament early last year for a greater range of community involvement to ensure the people who are involved, the decisions being

made and the guidelines that will be used by others who make decisions for them—that is what I think is the key thing.

Where councils with involvement with communities do have that level of support for a percentage that may, in fact, be higher than the local government cost index—the example of ESCOSA—if they can demonstrate that, they can get authority from ESCOSA for an increase above the ESCOSA-declared figure for an individual financial year based on the evidence of the previous year and a projection of what the future year will actually be to go above that for a five-year period. I think that is where the legislation provides an opportunity for councils and the community to really drive the outcomes they want because the long-term financial management plan is linked to what the needs of the community are. If a council wants to pursue a particular project, then put the cost of that into the long-term financial management plan.

I am very frustrated when I read part of the campaign that the Local Government Association puts out that talks about the loss of services. Those services already form part of the budget. It is amazing to me that the Local Government Association does not believe that there is any opportunity for a continuation of services already provided when rate capping will be based upon the cost of local government services they do provide and increases that those services are meeting. It is not general CPI; it is a particular local government cost index.

It is a very poor excuse, I believe, for a local government sector and a local government association in this case to come out and say, 'You are going to lose things like playgrounds, libraries, parks, gardens and all that sort of stuff.' The cost of that operation already exists. ESCOSA, or its equivalent, will ensure that it uses projected cost increases in the provision of those services in the percentage it allows for future years, so why suddenly is there an expectation that they are going to be lost?

It is interesting to me to see that, of the 68 councils, 50 have resolved to support the local government campaign. I try to take the positive from that: that there are 18 that have not. To me, that means that those 18 believe that it is a political campaign and that the Local Government Association, by virtue of being a sector of government and a child of the state parliament because it is an act of parliament that actually controls them, have chosen not to be involved in a political campaign.

To those 18, I say, 'Well done.' I believe they are freethinkers. I have no doubt that, from those 18, there will be individual members and staff who will talk to candidates from the Liberal Party approaching the election period and say that they do not want it. I understand that, but as a council they have resolved not to be involved in a political campaign, so I commend them. I have no doubt, even from the 50 councils that have decided to support it, that there are some who do not.

I know that in many cases it came down to a vote and what the position was going to be. I know that democracy is about freedom of speech. I completely respect that, but I tell this chamber and the people of South Australia, who might have a chance to review this and submissions made by others, that this is done on the basis of efficiency of service delivery and the projected cost being controlled to ensure that people are not paying more than they have to. Private enterprise has to do that already. It is important that the local government sector, as a billion-dollar per year revenue area, has to do the same, as Steven Marshall, as premier, will ensure that state government departments do the same.

I refer to paragraph (c) of the motion, which requests information about what the Minister for Local Government, the member for Frome, has done. In 2015, after he had been Minister for Local Government for about a 14-month period, as the then shadow I asked questions of the minister about what he had done to pursue the reduction of costs and efficiencies and to assist local government in controlling what they do and the revenue they need for what they do. The only response I received referred to the 2005 financial sustainability project. There was no demonstration of what had occurred in the minister's 14 months to assist councils, even though the minister himself has come from this sector. I have seen no real demonstration of it post 2015, when I asked the minister in estimates periods what he had done to try to assist councils to reduce costs.

I can quote two examples of where I believe the minister has let the local government sector down; one was in the significant rewrite of the planning, development and infrastructure legislation. It was the first time since 1993 that the legislation had had a review—legislation that had a significant

impact upon local government and its operations from an administrative point of view, in terms of the controls it had to put in place on development issues and how to consider and manage those. I would have presumed that the minister, the member for Frome, would have put forward the case for local government. He made no contribution at all—not a word said. That frustrated the life out of me.

Another example is in legislation that the minister proposed to bring to the parliament for changes to the Local Government Act. As part of the briefing provided to me as the shadow minister, I saw that there was a clause that reflected upon the requirement for councils to grant a rebate of up to 75 per cent on defined areas, an example of which is community housing authorities. At that stage, the minister recognised that as an issue and on the day that the legislation was tabled, that clause was removed.

This is a significant issue for councils across the state, particularly metropolitan councils. They are concerned about the cost implications of having to provide this rebate. 'It is on the basis of one-on-one discussions, as I understand it,' was the comment made by the Minister for Urban Development about how it was going to be addressed, but I think that leaves the local government sector at a significant disadvantage because there are not long-term agreements in place.

In considering this motion, I urge the minister and the government to ensure that they work with councils to control future growth in costs and to ensure that some assistance is provided so that there is not a responsibility transfer from state to local. Yes, there might be some dollars attached to it at the very start, but then those dollars suddenly disappear for three years, and councils pick up the remainder of that cost in the long term. This is an appropriate motion and I hope that it is supported by the house.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:47): I rise to support the motion of the member for Goyder and congratulate him on bringing this to the house because this is an important issue for households. I take this opportunity to remind the house that this was an election policy at the last election to tackle ever-increasing council rates. We were very disappointed, of course, when we attempted to do that from opposition, after not being successful in being able to form government at the last election. Those opposite voted to stop it from happening. They voted for the status quo and for the continuation of council rates over and above community expectations and well over inflation. The Liberal Party will take to this election the same policy we took to the last election: we will cap council rates according to the local government index.

I pick up on the points made by the member for Goyder. There is absolutely no doubt that the public debate that has been driven by the Liberal Party over the last couple of years on cost of living and council rates has forced a number of councils to re-evaluate the way they do business. I thank the member for Goyder for bringing to the attention of the house the number of councils that have actually reduced their rates in the lead-up to this crucial election period.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PISONI: Yes, their rate increases have been reduced, in some instances by half what they were just a few years earlier, so those are being reduced closer to the CPI. I am sure that this has happened because of the debate in the community about the way councils operate, about the way they use rate increases as the default position to fund their programs, rather than looking at the way they deliver those programs. I am pleased that as a team, through public pressure and through taking this challenge on in the media, on social media and in our own communities, we have been able to put pressure on many local governments to look at other ways of doing business.

The point I want to make is that, time and time again, we hear from the Local Government Association that rate capping will reduce services. I ask the Local Government Association: what services have you reduced to achieve the current lower rate increases compared with what you had two or three years ago? What services have you reduced? That in itself is evidence that the LGA scare campaign is nothing more than a lie. The fact is that public pressure has forced councils to re-evaluate the way they deliver services so that they can keep their rate increases down.

That will dissipate after the election. Unless there is a mechanism in place to force councils to continue to have that discipline in their budgets, we will see the floodgates open and we will see council rates rising well and truly above wage increases and the CPI, as they did immediately after the last state election. Forget about the 2½ per cent increases we saw before the election from local

government. After the election, we will see 4, 5, 6 or 7 per cent increases because they will use it as an opportunity. They will argue that they need to catch up because of the reduced rate increases before the election.

There is no doubt that many in local government want to make a difference to their community. They want to ensure that their community is a better place to live in, and sometimes there is a blur as to what the responsibilities are. We have three tiers of government because there are three tiers of responsibility: the administration of communities, the administration of states and the administration of the country. Of course, it would be ludicrous for a state government to have a defence policy, so why do local governments seem to think that they need to have policies on areas over which they have no control, such as nuclear-free zones or the date of the Australia Day holiday? These are not part of the bailiwick of local government.

Local government is about delivering local services to local people. That is where the focus should be. Whenever councils move away from their core business, there is a cost involved because a report will be called for and a staff member will have to come away from delivering community services to prepare that report. There is a debate in the chamber and, while that debate on which flag they can fly or when they can have the Australia Day holiday is going on, there is no discussion of how councils can deliver better services, additional services or new infrastructure projects for their local communities.

I can understand that people use the opportunity of being on a council to be heard on issues that are important to them, but I can tell you that doing so is an indulgence. Can you imagine somebody at a board meeting at BHP, or even a small family company, getting up and making a speech about something that is important to them that has nothing to do with the decisions of the board? They would politely be told to sit down and perhaps have that discussion over a cup of tea afterwards.

But we see this going on time and time again in local government. I think it was in the West Torrens council where it was decided that pushbike riders should wear safety vests. So does that mean only in the City of West Torrens? When you cross the Parklands, heading west, you would have to pull your bike over, open the satchel on the back or your backpack, and pull out your safety vest and continue that trip. I think it illustrates that there has been a lack of discipline in local government in relation to their core business. When I was on local government all those many years ago now, there was a—

Members interjecting:

Mr PISONI: I was in my late 20s—there was a focus on infrastructure. As a matter of fact, those trees you see on Main North Road were from a motion supported by the council, put by David Pisoni, as the Nailsworth Ward. That is how long ago I was on council. Those jacarandas are beautiful big trees now. That was a successful motion and a motion that the council had control of. It could deliver the outcome and the outcome is there for future generations to share.

That is what I encourage councils to do. That is why I support this motion because this motion is all about encouraging councils to focus on their core business, to keep their costs down, to be aware of the cost of living challenges that are out there for South Australians and to look at ways that you can make your business, as local councillors and council officers, that of servicing your constituents and getting the best results with the finite money that is out there in the community to pay for these services.

I congratulate the member for Goyder for bringing this debate to the parliament. It is a debate that will continue to happen between now and the election. I am sure there will be debate after the election as well if we are successful, as we start to implement this program. We will see improvements in the delivery of services under the Liberal Party's rate-capping policy because the councils will have no choice but to look at the way they are doing business in order to be more effective and more efficient.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:57): I want to start off with a quote because this is a topic that I have canvassed before and it is a topic that the member for Kaurana and I have canvassed before in the public square in relation to how councils operate and conduct their business. In 2013, the

government undertook a Local Excellence Expert Panel into local government. In speaking about councils, the Hon. Greg Crafter AO made the following statement:

To make no decisions and trying to continue in the same way as today will simply set local government on the path of steady decline.

Basically, what he was saying was that if we make no change to the local government sector, we are going to see that sector on a steady decline in the way that they provide services and their ability to go about and conduct their everyday business. That statement very clearly says that the status quo cannot be allowed to continue. I am very proud to be a part of a party that has a proactive plan to look at how local government undertakes its business and ways that it can do that better.

Decisions are best made when they are made as close as possible to the people affected by the decision. That is why I am a committed federalist and why I sit in the state parliament, as opposed to aspiring to any federal parliamentary representation, because I believe that here at a state level we are much closer to the people whom we serve, and local government are even closer again within the remit that they have. A fundamental tenet of the Liberal Party is decentralisation. Again, that is where state and local government are very important to us. We are the key custodians of it, realising that they are important sectors that need to be looked after.

We have set out a very clear mechanism by which we would like to help councils improve the way they operate. We want to give ESCOSA the ability to set rates for councils, doing so cognisant of the cost pressures that councils face, and doing so cognisant of the transfer of responsibilities that seems to have happened under this government in relation to litter and nuisance, in relation to pets and in relation to costs around e-planning and costs in a whole host of areas, such as rubble royalties. All these pressures that the state government has put on local government go towards the cost of how local government operates, and our mechanism takes those costs into account.

Those on the other side are not clean when it comes to looking at council rate increases. I think that, when we look at who needs to take responsibility for council rate increases, we have to look at the mayors of councils. We have a couple with us in this chamber at the moment. The member for Light was formerly mayor of the Town of Gawler. Over his time as mayor, rates increased by an average of 6.1 per cent. This is against a backdrop of inflation running at 3 per cent. The member for Light had rates increase at twice the rate of inflation over his time as mayor. We go to the Independent member for Frome, who was formerly the mayor of Port Pirie Regional Council. Over his time as mayor, rates had an average increase of 6.76 per cent against an inflation average of 3.1 per cent—over double.

It is definitely mayors who need to be held to account for this, and those two mayors stand condemned. If you are in favour of rate capping, as we on this side of the house are, then you are at least willing to help be part of the solution rather than just be part of the problem. When the member for Light and the member for Frome have previously voted against our push to have council rate capping, they, too, have continued to be part of the problem.

This is where I think the system needs to change, because rate capping is not an end in itself. Rate capping is only one half of the equation that is trying to put constraints on the increase in taxation placed by councils upon households in South Australia. Rate capping, to my mind, is actually a way to start a conversation about how councils undertake their business. Rate capping provides the impetus, it provides a line in the sand to start to say, 'Instead of simply increasing your rates year after year, how about we look at how you do business.'

Let's work together—state government and local government—and look at how we can fundamentally reform the sector so that it can become more effective and more efficient and keep within its remit of the powers that it should undertake. I think that discussion will only be taken seriously against the backdrop of a council rate cap.

At the federal level, the federal government is constrained by economic activity. Corporate taxation and personal income taxation goes up and down in line with employment and in line with company profits, so there are natural balances in the federal budget that cap the real revenue growth of the federal government.

At state level, we have the same thing. Our taxation, based around payroll tax and increases to payroll tax, relies on increased employment growth. Taxation around land tax or the emergency services levy relies on increases to land valuation. Stamp duty relies on economic activity in the property sector and other transactional sectors to be able to provide increased revenue. When the economy is doing poorly, there are natural limiters to the state government's revenue base. Similarly with the GST, we see that lower levels of growth in retail spending and economic activity lead to lower levels of taxation.

At a local government level, this does not happen to that extent. At a local government level, councils are able to set budgets by figuring out how much they want to spend. They then work out how much money they need and by how much they need to increase their rates, knowing that their taxation base is there, it is fixed and easily collected. That is unlike the other two tiers of government where we have to look at what we get and then at how much we can spend. Local government is more able to look at how much it wants to spend and then figure out how much tax it needs to collect.

I think that rate capping is a fantastic first step to being able to look at the way the local government sector goes about its business because we need that financial impetus. We see how federal government is dealing with budget deficits and the fact that it has to rein in spending. We hear conversations about the huge difficulties they are having with that, especially the multitude of ideas that the Coalition has brought forward that the crossbench, the Senate and the Labor Party have sought to oppose. When we look at this place, there probably should be greater fiscal restraint. Again, there are some natural limiters in there, but it does not happen at a local government level.

The other reason I say that rate capping is a good idea is that at both the federal and state level there are natural structures in our system of government that provide greater levels of scrutiny over these two tiers of government. There is a huge amount of media interest in federal and state budgets. There is a two-party adversarial system that provides scrutiny of state and federal budgets. I look at us sitting in this chamber with one party sitting across from the other, where an opposition's job is to scrutinise the spending of the government and the executive. That manifests itself in the estimates process and through FOI and constant media scrutiny. We see that at a federal level with Senate estimates committees and their two-party adversarial system.

However, that does not happen at a local government level where there is no government and there is no opposition. Technically, every elected member of a council is part of the government. Because we are talking about a range of smaller entities, we do not see the same level of scrutiny. In fact, the only time we really see scrutiny is when some outrageous bit of spending pops up, such as we have seen at the Onkaparinga council, or when there is a really unfair rate increase, such as we have seen in the Playford council in their desire to increase agricultural rates, and you see the community stand up and push back against that.

In closing, I would say that, yes, there are problems in local government and, no, we cannot continue to see average increases of 5-plus per cent when inflation is running at about half that level. I believe that rate capping is a great idea to start a conversation that will lead to true reform of the local government sector so that it can be more efficient, more effective, more cost-effective for households to deal with the cost of living pressures that we know exist in the community because we have had low wage growth since the GFC.

In the words of the Hon. Greg Crafter, we should not sit back and allow local government to stay on a path of steady decline but instead see a vibrant, controlled and constructive local government sector in South Australia.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:07): I rise to support the motion by the member for Goyder:

That this house—

- (a) notes the level of local government rate income increases over the past five years;
- (b) notes the concerns expressed by the local government sector of transfer of responsibility from the state government to local government and the associated cost impact; and
- (c) requests the member for Frome, as Minister for Local Government, confirm what legislative, regulatory or practical action he has pursued, investigated or implemented to keep local government rate increases to a minimum.

Rate increases are a cause for concern right across communities throughout everyone's electorate. I note that over the last 10 years in the Coorong District Council the rate money that I pay for my farming property has doubled. Along with other ratepayers, I ask, 'What do I get for those rates?' In my local government area in the Coorong, we pay for our rubbish pick-up. I am fortunate to be on the Parkin Hall Road, which abuts the back of my property. The rubbish run goes down there: we have the recycling pick-up, the garbage pick-up and, if we were going to deliver green waste, we could have that pick-up.

That is all good, but that is not covered in the rates. I acknowledge that that is paid for by a separate fee. Out of the traditional things that councils deal with—roads, rates and rubbish—rubbish is out, but rates are definitely in because they keep increasing. The issue that concerns many ratepayers, not just in the local council area where I reside but across the community, is the maintenance, rebuilding and sealing of local government roads. I note that there has been an increase, not just in Coorong but across the area.

I have had contact with several constituents in Alexandrina as to the state of some roads, and they are appalling. I had to contact the mayor with regard to Parkin Hall Road at the back of my property. I said, 'Look, in the 54 years that I have lived there, this is the worst state this road has been in.' I struggle to think that a phone call like that has to be made to the local mayor to make sure that your road is kept to a decent standard. I drive Prados, and when a Toyota Prado bounces continuously left or right on a local government road you have a problem.

On some roads in the area, people will not drive their standard two-wheel drive cars for fear of destroying them. That is what it has come to. I receive all sorts of excuses. I have certainly taken it up with my local council and other councils. I acknowledge that in my local council there is over 1,500 kilometres of a rubble road network. We have some pretty handy rubble in a lot of the area. It gets a bit depleted when you get to the south of the council area, further into MacKillop down around the Tintinara area and Salt Creek, but at my end we have plenty of rock and plenty of good rubble.

However, I am concerned when the blame is put on state government funding or the lack of these grants or the lack of those grants. I want to put on the record part of a response from Vincent Cammell, the chief executive officer at Coorong. I talked about the issues of some local roads that had been brought to me by local constituents, and one of the last lines in his letter stated:

In particular we bring to your attention that the Coorong District Council has not received any funding from the State Government through its Special Local Roads Program for the 2017/18 financial year.

Your assistance in rectifying this issue would be appreciated.

Certainly, on good advice and my understanding, this is actually federal money that has come back into play most recently from the federal government. It is distributed by a committee with Local Government Association representatives and it is based on applications from across all regions and is prioritised on need. It is obviously part of the Financial Assistance Grant (FAG) money and, as I indicated, this is federal commonwealth government money.

The issue I face—and not just in my council but across councils—is that ratepayers simply want their roads managed. From what I understand, this is a mandated operation of local government: to fix their roads, repair their roads and keep them up to speed. However, there is always this pushback, 'We're doing this, we're doing that.' As the member for Goyder said, the Local Government Association is talking about cutting services if they have to work under rate-capping arrangements. As the member for Goyder said, all those services are there: libraries, looking after park lands and a range of other services that councils do.

However, when you live in a broad agricultural electorate, those ratepayers, especially the bigger ones—and there would be some ratepayers paying upwards of \$20,000 and some would be paying \$30,000 in rates—just want their road. That is all they want. They want to have access so they can get to those better bitumen roads, some of which are local government roads but also state roads. I think a lot more attention needs to be taken there.

I note that the Local Government Association is about to run a significant campaign against our rate-capping initiative. It is a policy that we on this side of the house have developed to address cost of living pressures for South Australians. We understand that the Local Government Association is going to spend at least \$800,000 of ratepayers' money to take up this fight, which I find interesting.

If ratepayers think that is a good way to spend their money, perhaps they need to talk to their local government people.

We also understand that the transfer of responsibility from state to local government, as has been a habit of the Labor government, must not continue. We do need this rate capping to pull down the cost of living to people across the state. We believe that council elected members and staff have a duty to their ratepayers to ensure local government expenditure is responsible and in line with what the community supports.

Under our proposed scheme a body such as an independent regulator, ESCOSA, will set the rate rise that individual councils are allowed to apply, based on the costs of services that council provides. The rate cap determined by ESCOSA will be determined on a region by region basis, not just the one figure across all of South Australia, as the Liberal Party has recognised different cost pressures apply depending on the region location. I note that there are councils in my electorate, or coming back into my electorate, that have a different ratepayer base; they have to raise their funds on a smaller population. So, there is a quite a difference sometimes in the amount of rates coming into the region.

A fundamental component of our rate capping scheme provides flexibility in allowing for individual councils to apply to ESCOSA for a rate increase above the determined percentage when able to demonstrate the support of local communities. Consultation demands above the current legislative demands will be based on the charter for community engagement being prepared by the government for development plans.

Examples in which variations may be sought by councils include funding projects of regional significance, dealing with high-growth areas, population and industry, the challenges presented funding the development and/or maintenance of essential community infrastructure or backlogs and funding new and enhanced services to meet growing demand in the community. We are committed to this policy.

I just want to note that the Local Government Association makes a lot of noise about what has happened in New South Wales over the last 40 years that they have had rate capping. If rate capping has been such a disaster in New South Wales, why has their local government authority or association not lobbied governments of different colours—and they would have had plenty in that 40-year time—to change that policy? That is as simple as it gets. If it is so bad, why has it lasted 40 years?

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

NATIONAL FOOTY COLOURS DAY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:18): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges that 2 September is National Footy Colours Day;
- (b) encourages everyone to wear their favourite football team's colours to help raise money for children living with cancer;
- (c) assist in making a difference to the lives of children fighting cancer by donating to Fight Cancer Foundation; and
- (d) notes the fantastic work done by our sporting community in South Australia to raise funds and awareness of cancer.

Each year, the South Australian community gets involved in Fight Cancer Foundation Footy Colours Day. From community groups to schools and businesses, throughout September, money is being raised to help kids fight cancer by people wearing their footy team's guernsey, scarves, beanies, hats, or whatever colours they can find. Each year, South Australians are part of hundreds of thousands of Australians standing shoulder to shoulder to unite in the fight against cancer by wearing with pride the team colours of their team, their state or their nation throughout September at their school, workplace or club.

Of course, there is the now famous McGrath Foundation Pink Test series, as well as the one-day international, wearing pink clothes, using pink balls, pink stumps, pink bats, and the many pink banners. The theme that comes with that day is now famous in Australia's sporting scene, and it is one of the great calendar events anywhere in the world.

Many businesses have become involved over the years, and I know that Holden workers have proudly worn their Central District guernseys to raise money for the good cause and a number of schools hold a variety of events. Many of the Riverland and Mallee schools take part in the Footy Colours Day, whether that be through raising funds with a sausage sizzle lunch, cupcakes decorated with their footy colours, kicking the footy and handball contests or lollies in a jar game, or simply wearing their favourite team colours at a national, state or local level.

Some of the schools that have taken part in recent footy seasons include the Renmark Primary School, Our Lady of the River in Berri, Cobdogla Primary, St Albert's in Loxton, Kingston-on-Murray Primary School, Pinnaroo Primary School, Waikerie High and Ramco Primary. It is a very long list and I could go on with the many schools that I have particularly in my electorate.

One year, for example, at St Albert's School in Loxton, the SRC organised a Footy Colours Day to raise money for cancer and changed it slightly so that students and teachers could wear any sporting colours, such as footy, netball, tennis, basketball, hockey, soccer—any sport that any child supported. It is a very good cause, and the SRC was very passionate about it all. All money raised went to the Cancer Council to help find a cure for cancer.

During treatment and recovery, young Australians with cancer often miss a lot of school and fall behind in their education. Footy Colours Day directly supports Fight Cancer Foundation's education support program, which works with major paediatric hospitals to keep kids with cancer engaged with their education. There is a bit of history with the Footy Colours Day. Since 2005, Fight Cancer Foundation and Footy Colours Day have helped young learners continue with their education while they receive treatment for cancer.

Fight Cancer Foundation's education support program was developed in 2005 in partnership with the Royal Children's Hospital Education Institute in Melbourne to address the gap in educational support for kids and young people living with cancer. Today, the programs operate in major paediatric hospitals in Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia. In South Australia, the program runs through the Women's and Children's Hospital.

In 2016, almost 334,000 people united in the fight against cancer by wearing their team's colours with pride to their club, workplace or school, raising more than \$300,000. In July this year, young learners from the Fight Cancer Foundation education support program in Adelaide joined some of the Manchester United and Liverpool legends from Battle of the Reds for a special morning tea at Government House, kindly hosted by His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le and his lovely wife, Lan.

The Governor of South Australia and his wife are supporting many sporting clubs also taking part in other areas of fundraising for cancer and other worthy causes. Of course, we have talked about the pink breast cancer awareness, the Riverland Make-A-Wish Foundation, the Cancer Council of South Australia and the Riverland Relay For Life to name a few. They have raised \$14,000 in 2017 alone, and we are only halfway through the year.

I would like to acknowledge the recent Lions Love Lani Greatest Shave fundraiser. The 15-year-old Lani is from Renmark, and she was recently diagnosed with Ewing's sarcoma, a rare form of bone cancer. She and her mother, Saffron, now need to spend the next six to nine months in Adelaide so that Lani can undergo intensive chemotherapy, possible surgery and/or radiotherapy to fight the cancer. This fundraiser was organised by the Lyrup Lions football and netball clubs and Lani's family, in the hope of raising funds to assist with the costs associated with Lani's treatment and temporary living arrangements in Adelaide.

I am sure that regional members know just how inconvenient it is to travel to Adelaide for medical procedures, particularly for an extended period of time. There is the cost of being away from home, from friends, from their school and from their local community. The community rallied and raised \$15,000, with hundreds of people at the Lyrup Community Club, and the Lyrup football and netball clubs, rallying around the fellow Lion. About 15 people shaved their heads for the cause on

that night. That is an example of how local sporting clubs can play an important role in helping those in need and raising funds for cancer and other important fundraising ventures.

The Renmark Rovers hosted a charity game. About a week ago, the Renmark Football Club—or the Renmark Rovers as they are affectionately known—raised money for the Make-A-Wish Foundation, by hosting a charity day at its home game against Barmera-Monash. The Renmark Football Club President, John Persinos, said that the idea was a way to utilise the strengths of the club to raise money for charity. It also shows resilience: it is about a community club coming together and supporting people in need. It is about a regional community footy and netball sporting club supporting people in their community who are dealing with cancer. He said:

We are in a position as a major club in the community to help assist people who are going through tough times. We are in a situation where we can help the Make-A-Wish foundation put smiles on people's faces and that is something we really want to get on board with. We have so many connections through the footy club and there are so many parents involved in the footy club, so it is a great opportunity to do something for people who are [tackling tough challenges through their life].

The Renmark Paringa Council and the Renmark netball and tennis clubs also got on board, and it is great to see that as a community, as a town, they all rallied to make a difference. They also played a Make-A-Wish Foundation cup on that day. There were plenty of fundraising activities during the day with Specky Magee, clowns, face painting and jumping castles for all the kids, and a dinner and auction that night. The club is hoping that it will become an annual event. Dallas Zeliff from the Riverland branch of the Make-A-Wish Foundation said:

I think it as an extraordinary effort by the footy club to organise this event...We rely very heavily on our fundraising in the Riverland and local businesses have been extremely generous to us in the past. For a sporting club to come on board like this is just terrific.

If people want more information to register or donate, please visit the www.fightcancer.org.au/footy-colours-day and remember to use the hashtag #FootyColoursDay when posting your picture wearing your footy colours or your sporting colours on social media.

I encourage everyone to get involved and donate to a wonderful cause. Whether it is a sporting club, a business, a school or a local community coming together to support those people who are less fortunate and who are dealing with cancer, an insidious disease, it is a show of support and a good gesture. I support Footy Colours Day.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (12:28): I have the pleasure today of rising and speaking in support of this fabulous motion brought to the house, and I commend the member for Chaffey for bringing it to us. Education is an important social determinant of health, and I strongly believe in the importance of providing learners with cancer exactly the same opportunities for education as other children and students who are not suffering from this disease.

Fight Cancer Foundation was formed in 1989 as the Bone Marrow Donor Registry, by a small group of families affected by leukaemia, with the aim of establishing a donor registry to give hope and save lives. The organisation now supports cancer research, focusing on leukaemia and other blood cancers. It also provides accommodation centres for people undergoing cancer treatment and, as mentioned, education programs.

Cancer treatment, such as chemotherapy, surgery and a bone marrow transplant, with its ensuing recovery, can be challenging and may result in prolonged absences from school. This can have effects on the social and emotional wellbeing of learners with cancer, particularly when transitioning back to school. It is also extremely disruptive to relationships in the developmental stages of life. Many children experience a loss of self-esteem, loneliness, depression and may drop class levels when they return to school, finding it difficult to engage with their education.

Since 2005, Fight Cancer Foundation has asked all Australian school organisations and sporting clubs on national Footy Colours Day to unite and wear their favourite football team colours and make a donation. The day is usually held on the first Friday in September or any day of their choice. Last year, over 334,000 people united in the fight against cancer by wearing their team colours with pride. The funds raised through Footy Colours Day are used to work with major paediatric hospitals to keep kids with cancer engaged with their education.

In South Australia, this is provided through the Women's and Children's Hospital and has a multidisciplinary approach involving patients, their families, medical teams and teachers supporting children with cancer to stay connected and make the transition back to school as easy as possible. It is a flexible, tailored education program that works around their illness and treatment, allowing them to resume their lives as quickly as possible.

I would also like to congratulate the Department for Education and Child Development on helping to form this amazing partnership, which really would not be possible without their commitment. I also pay tribute to and thank the fantastic teachers who work in this environment and go above and beyond every single day that they are working with children there. At this time also, I would love to acknowledge the huge contribution generally made by the sporting community in South Australia, raising funds and awareness of cancer by participating actively in initiatives such as Footy Colours Day, the Pink Sports Day organised by Breast Cancer Network Australia, and the Beat Cancer Tour, organised by the Cancer Council SA during the Santos Tour Down Under.

Sports communities also get behind many other wonderful causes. Recent events I have been involved in and attended include the Port Power AFL round at Adelaide Oval that was dedicated to Welcome to Australia, which provided a great opportunity for fundraising and awareness for our multicultural programs. Also, many clubs get involved in the White Ribbon rounds, at both local level and league level. This past weekend, the Showdown game was played during DonateLife Week. I participated in the awareness-raising campaign, albeit very briefly until we were nearly blown away out the front in the plaza. That provided a great opportunity, using other advertising medium within the ground, to create awareness about organ donation, a cause close to my heart.

Over the last couple of years, I have had the opportunity to attend the local Red Ball at the town hall, representing the health minister. I have met the chair of Fight Cancer Foundation, Leonie Walsh, who has a particular personal connection with cancer, having had her own experience and a bone marrow transplant in 1989. Since then, she has also taken on great leadership roles as Victoria's inaugural Chief Scientist, and she has also been given an honorary doctorate at the Swinburne University of Technology. I have been hosted on both occasions at these events by one of the managing directors, Eric Wright, who cannot say enough about the great work being done in a number of hospitals across Australia by Fight Cancer Foundation.

I thank the member for Chaffey. These are partnerships that need to be recognised by all members in this place, and I thank him for bringing forward the important issue. I commend the motion to the house.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I would like to welcome to the gallery today, the student leadership team from St Patrick's Technical College, who are guests of the member for Light. We welcome them to parliament today and hope they enjoy their time with us.

Motions

NATIONAL FOOTY COLOURS DAY

Debate resumed.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:33): I rise to also support this motion from the member for Chaffey. I think he made an excellent contribution, as did the member for Fisher. I listened closely and I found that to be a terrific contribution from a government member and I really do appreciate that.

The core of this motion is about acknowledging National Footy Colours Day. I would like to add my comments that throughout the electorate of Stuart—not every single town, and every single club, but largely throughout the electorate of Stuart—football clubs and netball clubs are very closely linked, and I know that netball clubs would have every willingness to participate in this sort of thing as well, and for such an important cause, that is, children living with and fighting cancer. My sister died of cancer at 16, so this is a topic that is very dear to my heart.

I would like to focus on the fact that the motion talks about children living with cancer. A lot of work, a lot of effort, massive contributions of thought, science and technology are going into finding cures, and of course that is very important, but putting some effort and resources into just supporting the ongoing lives of children actually living with cancer is also very important, and I appreciate that that is the cause of this motion.

When it comes to footy colours, I think about the many teams that play football throughout the electorate of Stuart. I will not be able to mention all of them, but certainly in Port Augusta we have three teams: the Souths Bulldogs, who are in red and white; the Centrals Bloods, in red and black; and the West Augusta Hawks, in purple and white. They fight it out with the Port Pirie teams every time, and I know that those three teams are extremely proud of their colours, as are many people throughout Port Augusta.

Moving on to the northern areas league, which is the district within which I live, at Wilmington, the first that comes to mind are the mighty BMW Lions, who wear traditional Lions colours. We also have the Orroroo Roos, wearing black and red; the Jamestown Peterborough Magpies, in black and white; and the Southern Flinders Tigers in black and gold, as you would expect. Into the north-eastern league other teams that come to mind are the BBH Rams, in red, white and blue; the BSR Tigers, in black and gold, as you would expect; and then for the south the Kapunda Bombers, in black and red; and the Eudunda-Robertstown Saints, who wear the St Kilda colours of red, black and white.

Just while I am on this, you will notice, Deputy Speaker, that most of these teams are combined teams, with many towns—two or typically three—coming together to form one football club and usually one netball club in a combined fashion, and that is a feature of what is happening all over country South Australia. It is interesting to notice that the mighty Kapunda Bombers a year or more ago celebrated their 150th anniversary, which is an extraordinary achievement for any club.

I know that the other clubs, which are combined teams as well, would certainly all unite behind this motion from the member for Chaffey. I am sorry that it is not possible to mention all the footy teams and all their club colours in the electorate of Stuart, but I know that all of them, the ones I have mentioned and the ones I have not been able to mention, would support this activity, would all support the member for Chaffey's motion and would all want to do everything they possibly could, particularly in their local communities, to support children living with and fighting cancer.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:37): I rise to support the member for Chaffey's motion:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges that 2 September is National Footy Colours Day;
- (b) encourages everyone to wear their favourite football team's colours to help raise money for children living with cancer;
- (c) assist in making a difference to the lives of children fighting cancer by donating to Fight Cancer Foundation; and
- (d) notes the fantastic work done by our sporting community in South Australia to raise funds and awareness of cancer.

Obviously 2 September is very close to the move-in date for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, and there may be some synergies that could be done there. Regarding Footy Colours Day, since 2005 Fight Cancer Foundation and the Footy Colours Day have helped young learners continue with their education while they receive treatment for cancer. Each year, hundreds of thousands of Australians stand shoulder to shoulder to unite in the fight against cancer by wearing their team's colours with pride throughout September at their school, workplace or club.

Show your true colours and make a difference in the lives of kids and young people living with cancer by registering your Footy Colours Day activity. You can find fundraising tips and ideas about how to make your event bigger than the grand final, and of course there is a website that people can go to and look at that. The Fight Cancer Foundation's education support programs were developed in 2005 in partnership with the Royal Children's Hospital Education Institute in Melbourne to address the gap in educational support for kids and young people living with cancer.

Today, the programs operate in major paediatric hospitals in Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia, with plans to extend to other hospitals to ensure no child or young person living with cancer is educationally disadvantaged by their illness.

Fight Cancer Foundation is a national charity dedicated to providing care, treatment and support for cancer patients and their families, and funding vital research into cancer treatment and cures. Founded in 1989, as the Bone Marrow Donor Institute, to establish Australia's first bone marrow donor registry and find a cure for leukaemia, the organisation's broader scope now provides support services for patients with blood and other cancers. Support services include affordable accommodation for rural and interstate patients accessing major treating hospitals around New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria.

The face of Footy Colours Day 2017 is Luca. Luca, now 10, was a typical six-year-old boy in 2013 when he began to complain of a sore knee. Following scans, he was diagnosed with osteosarcoma, an aggressive type of bone cancer. The only way to save his life was to amputate his right leg. During treatment and recovery, Luca was involved in Fight Cancer Foundation's education support program. The program helped him stay connected with his school and at the same education level as his class mates. Luca loves footy, gives everything his all and does not see himself as having a disability. He really is a champion.

Recently, Collingwood Football Club star and Footy Colours Day ambassador, Adam Treloar, made a surprise visit to Luca's school footy team, and you can see those photos on the website. Adam held a special question and answer session with the school football team, which Luca is part of. Luca and Adam got along so well that Luca almost switched from his beloved Richmond Tigers to the Magpies. Of course, the Magpies are that type of team: you either love them or you hate them. I have a few friends who are passionate Magpies' supporters; I am not one of those, unfortunately.

I also want to talk about sporting clubs and their contribution to a range of fundraisers, and I want to single out a person in Mount Gambier by the name of Bill Burley. Bill Burley is a very talented sportsperson who runs the Mount Gambier Golf Club. On numerous occasions, he raises funds with charity nights for any local resident who is going through a tough time with cancer. In fact, about three or four months ago one was held for a family whose very young baby had been diagnosed with leukaemia. I believe the night raised \$28,000 to \$30,000 off the back of one community-minded person, Bill Burley, putting the event together, getting all the auction items and promoting it. It was truly a marvellous effort, and I think Bill needs to be congratulated.

Down in the South-East we have two leagues: the Western Border League and the South Gambier Demons, where I played. They quite often have fundraising events for people who are doing it tough in our community and who need to travel to metropolitan areas to receive treatment, particularly cancer treatment, which is something for which we need to keep striving. A great example is over in Warrnambool, where a program called Peter's Project was developed.

The community made a pledge to raise \$5 million as a community if the federal government would put in \$10 million and the state government put in \$5 million for a cancer treatment and rehabilitation hospital. Peter was diagnosed with cancer and had to travel to Melbourne to receive that treatment. His widow and family made a conscious decision to raise \$5 million knowing that, if they achieved that target, the state government would match that dollar for dollar and that the federal government would then match that dollar for dollar, so a \$20 million build.

It is very pleasing to report that that centre was actually built about two years ago. It is amazing what can happen when a community is empowered, has an objective and is well led, as that team was by Peter's widow. I would like to see something very similar occur in the South-East. If there were a project like a cancer rehab centre matched with a federal and a state government commitment based on the ability of the community to fundraise that amount of money, then of course many people in the South-East would not need to travel to Adelaide—taking up the Patient Assistant Transport Scheme, which is three-fifths of very little in terms of rebates—and would be able to care for their loved ones in the surroundings that they are most accustomed to.

With those words, I commend the motion to the house. I congratulate the member for Chaffey on bringing this to the house. I would like to see its swift passage.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:46): I acknowledge all the speakers for their valuable contribution to what I consider a very important motion that not only acknowledges those suffering and experiencing cancer but is also about national Footy Colours Day to thank those who are supporting those who are experiencing cancer and the effects that it has on them. Of course, national Footy Colours Day is about communities, clubs, schools, businesses and individuals coming together to raise money to help those who are impacted. Without further ado, I commend this motion to the house.

Motion carried.

TRANS-AUSTRALIAN RAILWAY CENTENARY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:46): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the 100th anniversary of the opening of the Trans-Australian Railway at the 'joining of the rails' site near Ooldea on 17 October 2017;
- (b) recognises the national significance of the completion of this railway; and
- (c) congratulates the work of the National Rail Museum and Regional Development Australia in Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula in commemorating this historic event.

I am, in fact, very fond of trains. I am a train buff and was first approached a couple of years ago by, firstly, a resident of Ceduna and, secondly, a resident of Adelaide, who indicated to me that the centenary would be coming up, so I have been keeping an eye on the development of this and am pleased to support it.

In 1912, work began on a new railway line between Port Augusta in South Australia and Kalgoorlie in Western Australia. They were the two railheads and, interestingly, both those towns were connected to their capital cities by narrow-gauge railways. I will come back to that. The Trans-Australian Railway stretches 1,693 kilometres—or, as it once was, just over 1,000 miles—of Australia's driest and most isolated terrain. It was completed on 17 October 1917 and provided a link between the Eastern States and Western Australia. It gave the newly formed commonwealth a sense of national unity. Treasurer Sir John Forrest said on that day:

Today, East and West are indissolubly joined together by bands of steel, and the result must be increased prosperity and happiness for the Australian people.

People were happy that they could catch a train right across Australia. It was arguably the first major work of a federated Australia. Before Federation in 1901, Western Australia had made the construction of a railway linking the nation's eastern and western colonies a condition for joining the commonwealth. At the time, the west was linked to the eastern cities only by a rough sea voyage and a single telegraph line. Quite rightly, many argued that this inhibited commerce between the colonies and made it difficult to quickly move troops to defend Australia's southern and western shores.

In 1907, surveyors and engineers began marking a route across the Nullarbor Plain. Four years later, the Australian government authorised construction of the railway. In 1912, the Commonwealth Railways were established to oversee the planning and implementation of the Trans-Australian Railway. On 14 September 1912, Governor-General Lord Denman turned the first sod at a ceremony in Port Augusta to officially begin construction of the railway from the eastern end. Tracks were being built simultaneously in both directions—west from Port Augusta and east from Kalgoorlie.

Of course, the outbreak of war in 1914 made it difficult for the Commonwealth Railways to source labour and materials, but by 1916 more than 3,400 workers were employed on the project, so in fact this construction project was being undertaken at the very time when Australia's resources were being stretched maintaining the war effort. Maintenance crews lived along the line at intervals and were supplied by the weekly tea and sugar train, which later serviced railway workers and their families. In fact, it was quite an institution and well known throughout Australia not only for bringing supplies but also because each and every Christmas, Father Christmas would board the tea and sugar train and visit all the families that lived at the siding settlements along the way.

It took five years for the teams of rail workers to lay 2½ million hardwood sleepers, and 140,000 tonnes of rail were needed to finish the 1,700-kilometre job. The last railway spike was hammered into place outside the tiny settlement of Ooldea in South Australia on 17 October 1917. Five days later, the first passenger train set off from Port Augusta, arriving at Kalgoorlie 42 hours and 48 minutes later. The Trans-Australian Railway line radically shortened travel and communication time. Mail delivery from Adelaide to Perth was cut by two days and east-bound travellers who took the train arrived in Melbourne three days earlier than those making the journey by ship.

Many people, including federal politicians and members of the royal family, travelled on the line. They enjoyed the first hot showers ever installed in a rail carriage, ate meals in the dining cars, sang along to the piano or had a quiet drink in the lounge car before resting in comfort in the sleeping cars. It sounds like quite a hoot. The railway was not only for the wealthy. It also provided Australians with greater opportunities for recreational travel and helped Western Australia become a tourist destination.

In 1969, the standard gauge railway network was extended east from Port Augusta as far as Sydney and west of Kalgoorlie all the way to Perth, making it possible to catch a train from the Pacific Ocean and cross the continent to the Indian Ocean without changing trains. This has led to the naming of the *Indian Pacific*, the passenger train which now runs along that line.

Ooldea, a remote soak amongst the sandhills that mark the eastern edge of the Nullarbor Plain, is part of the lands of the Kokatha people. For thousands of years, it was the centre of a vast Aboriginal trading network and a reliable source of water. Ooldea became a vital stopping point for the railway, providing steam engine locomotives with fresh water for their boilers. Although there was brackish water along the way, it had to be of a suitable standard to boil for the locomotives. In the very early days, up to half of the weight of the train was taken up carrying water for its own use—extraordinary.

During the line's construction, Aboriginal people arriving at the soak began interacting with the rail workers, and by 1917, a semipermanent settlement had formed. When a train arrived, Aboriginal people would gather around the passengers' windows trading handmade tools, such as boomerangs, spears and shields, for sweets, money and clothing. By 1926, servicing the trains had drained the soak dry and it no longer supported the population. Daisy Bates, a self-taught anthropologist, linguist, journalist and author, lived at Ooldea from 1917 until 1934. She worked to provide food, clothing and medical attention to the local people and entertained many Trans-Australian Railway visitors to Ooldea.

My congratulations go to the RDA and also to the Railway Museum in organising an event to celebrate this. I note with interest that the first seven prime ministers of Australia are all memorialised in the naming of sidings along the way. It will be an exciting day for all those who are able to get there and for train buffs, I am sure, all over Australia.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:54): I am very grateful to the member for Flinders for putting this motion forward. I know he has great interest and great knowledge in this area. It was very interesting to hear the many comments he made and the information he shared with us.

Deputy Speaker, as you know, many towns in the electorate of Stuart have a very strong railway history. I think about Port Augusta, Peterborough and Terowie to begin with. I think about all the towns along the old *Ghan* railway. We had a very extensive network of rail that was used for freight and passengers throughout our electorate. Alas, most of that is not there at the moment, but the Trans-Australian Railway certainly still is, and that is what this motion is about.

While I join with the member for Flinders in supporting this motion, I would also like to support and recognise Mr Kym Welsby from Port Augusta, who, over the last few years, has put an enormous amount of work into arranging a commemorative weekend in Port Augusta, on 21 and 22 October this year. That will be an absolutely outstanding event for local people, for people from further afield in South Australia and many interstate and international people, no doubt, will be very interested in that. I thank Kym enormously for putting together this event to celebrate the commemoration, which the motion of the member for Flinders celebrates as well.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:56): Thank you for the opportunity to put this motion to the house and for the support of the member for Stuart, through whose electorate some of the railway passes. I note that he mentioned the upcoming celebration in Port Augusta, as well as the one at Ooldea on the actual day, 17 October 2017. Those celebratory events are being organised at the moment.

The intention is to have a South Australian sculptor design and build two identical sculptures using the existing concrete and steel bases of the original monuments. The sculptures will be constructed in robust, long-lasting materials, preferably steel, and based on a design concept that uses the linking of the railway as a symbol or motif to represent the economic development and regional growth.

There was a similar event for the 50th commemoration of the rail linkage on 17 October 1967. Unfortunately, the monument that was unveiled at that time has fallen into disrepair. I am not sure that it is even still there. The new sculptures will commemorate this significant achievement, which is a real milestone in the development of Australia as a country and as a nation.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today students from Pennington primary school, whom I was pleased to give a trip around Parliament House today representing their local member, the member for Cheltenham. I also welcome pupils from Peterborough Primary School, including students from the Yunta Campus, who are guests of the member for Stuart. I also welcome to parliament today student leaders and staff from St Patrick's Technical College, who are guests of the member for Light.

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*. It is from 3 November 2016 for the member for Bragg.

Mr Marshall: From whom? Who finally got around to replying?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Higher Education and Skills—one of your favourites.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Referral of the Work Health Safety (Industrial Manslaughter) Amendment Bill 2015—
Response to the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation
and Compensation

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

Inquiry into Work Related Mental Disorders and Suicide Prevention—Response to the
Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and
Compensation

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Land Agents—Simplify No. 2
Second-hand Vehicle Dealers—Simplify No. 2

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Police Superannuation—General
Superannuation—Transfer of Electricity Industry Members

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Vinehealth Australia—Annual Report 2016-17
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Aquaculture—Simplify No. 2
Fisheries Management—
Abalone Fisheries—General
Blue Crab Fishery—Simplify
Charter Boat Fishery—Simplify
Demerit Points—General
Fees—General
Fish Processors—General
General
Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Simplify
Marine Scalefish Fisheries—General
Miscellaneous Broodstock and Seedstock Fishery—Simplify
Miscellaneous Development Fishery—Simplify
Miscellaneous Fishery—Simplify
Miscellaneous Research Fishery—Simplify
Prawn Fisheries—General
River Fishery—General
Rock Lobster Fisheries—General
Vessel Monitoring Scheme—General
Primary Industry Funding Schemes—Langhorne Creek Wine Industry Fund—
Simplify

By the Minister for Forests (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Forestry—Simplify

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Retirement Villages—
Fees
General

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Animal Welfare—Electrical Devices and Animal Ethics Committee

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Air Transport (Route Licensing—Passenger Services)—Simplify
Fire and Emergency Services—Simplify
Motor Vehicles—
Modification of Act
Simplify No. 2
Roads (Opening and Closing)—Simplify

*Ministerial Statement***LAND SERVICES SA**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am pleased to inform the house today that the state government has appointed Land Services SA as the exclusive provider for transactional land services. Land Services SA comprises globally recognised investors Macquarie Infrastructure and Real Assets and the Public Sector Pension Investment Board, which both enjoy distinguished track records of long-term investing in the provision of essential services. Under the commercialisation contract, the government will retain key legal, policy and regulatory functions and responsibilities, while the private sector takes over the processing of transactions for the next 40 years.

The government will continue to set prescribed fees and charges for land services. The change will reduce future operating costs to government, drive innovation in customer service, promote investment in systems and reduce risks to government in future ICT upgrades. The government will receive \$1.605 billion in an up-front payment, which includes certain optionality for the life of the contract.

The government will also receive an ongoing royalty stream that can be invested in critical infrastructure and essential services, benefiting all South Australians. Land Services SA has agreed to establish an innovation hub in Adelaide, provide \$35 million in ICT investment in South Australia and work with local digital start-ups. This is an absolutely outstanding result for the state. I am also very pleased to say that all protections for the people of South Australia, which I announced in the 2016-17 state budget, will be achieved. These include:

- the government continuing to guarantee indefeasibility of property title, supported by the statutory assurance fund;
- no change to Torrens titles or other legal status of land;
- the Registrar-General, Valuer-General and the Surveyor-General continuing as statutory officers;
- the government continuing to set regulated fees and charges, with no changes other than the standard annual increases applied;
- the government retaining ownership of tilting and valuation data and associated intellectual property;
- stringent service delivery standards, data security and privacy protections, with penalties up to termination of the contract for breaches; and
- maintaining existing terrestrial and online access arrangements, including the Adelaide office of the LTO and over-the-counter services.

The new service provider is expected to make offers of employment to a significant number of staff currently performing transactional and land services. The majority of remaining staff will either assist with the transition to the new service provider or be placed in positions or functions retained by government following consultation, which is underway. A small number may be placed in alternative positions in the South Australian public sector or managed in accordance with usual government practice. Importantly, the general public and customers of transactional land services will not notice any difference to the service following the transfer.

The appointment of Land Services SA is the result of an open, competitive, multistage selection process, which included strong legal and probity oversight. Land Services SA submitted a binding bid that compares favourably with other land registry transactions, including the recent commercialisation by the Liberal government of New South Wales. Land Services SA is a highly qualified provider with significant technology and change management experience.

The new operator will adopt the existing Lands Titles Office information technology systems, and the contract will see the bringing forward of innovation and investment in transactional land services, including creation of new product offerings to the market. Responsibility for land registry and property valuation services will gradually be transferred during the coming months, with Land Services SA receiving exclusive rights to commercialise related data, subject to government approval.

I welcome the fact that debt funding for the transaction has been provided by leading national and international banks. Clearly, South Australia is a very attractive investment destination for financial institutions. The deal involves debt funding from three of the five major banks which are subject to the South Australian major bank levy. Acts speak louder than adverts, especially those advertisements by the Australian Bankers' Association, which seek to disparage the state. This is the reality: not only are banks willing to invest in South Australia but they are actually doing it.

NATURAL DISASTER RECOVERY ASSISTANCE

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) (14:10): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: On 25 November 2015, the Pinery fire inflicted terrible losses on the affected region—most significantly, the tragic loss of the lives of two members of the community, Allan Tiller and Janet Hughes, and some 31 people injured, five of them very seriously. The fire burnt across 82,600 hectares of land, destroyed 97 houses and damaged a further 49. The fire destroyed or significantly damaged 546 sheds and outbuildings, 413 vehicles and pieces of machinery, and some 18,000 sheep were confirmed lost, along with 600 other stock and 54,000 poultry. Approximately \$30 million of crops, hay and paddock feed were destroyed. Insurance claims totalled \$172 million.

Numerous community members and organisations immediately set about helping those affected. However, it was clear from the outset that support in coordination of recovery initiatives and resources would be required. For 19 months after the event occurred, the state government provided coordination through the State Recovery Committee, the State Recovery Coordinator, the State Recovery Office and Housing SA's Emergency Management Unit.

On 30 June 2017, my role as duty minister and the formal state-coordinated arrangements for the Pinery bushfire both concluded. The recovery centre has ceased operations as demand for face-to-face services declined to the extent that alternative contact methods became appropriate. In addition, the Local Recovery Coordinator, Mr Alex Zimmerman, completed his role on 30 June, and I am advised that his report on recovery following the fire will be completed in the near future. PIRSA, DEWNR and SA Health continue to deliver programs to address the needs of communities.

Community members continue to be able to access further assistance and advice through the recovery website and recovery hotline on 1800 302 787. The 30th of June also saw the conclusion of my role as duty minister for the state-coordinated recovery effort following the Virginia floods. The extreme weather events of September/October 2016 resulted in the flooding of much of the Northern Adelaide Plains, particularly affecting some 250 horticultural growers, causing losses in the order of \$51 million.

As with the Pinery communities, those affected by the flooding can continue to access advice and assistance through the recovery website and hotline. I would like to acknowledge the untiring efforts of many leaders of the affected communities and thank them for the untold hours that they have given. I also thank the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion and the many agencies that so effectively helped and advised community members through their recovery.

I also take this opportunity to commend the South Australians who volunteered to provide recovery assistance to Queensland, following Tropical Cyclone Debbie on 28 March 2017, in response to the Queensland government's request for assistance. The feedback we have received from Queensland is overwhelmingly positive: the South Australian team showed great leadership

and professionalism. In the words of the Queensland operations manager, our teams 'helped them keep up to speed with recovery'.

The community itself was also very appreciative of the efforts made by our teams, who sacrificed family time to assist recovery efforts. 'You are angels,' said one lady to the South Australian outreach team who visited her and her young daughter at their apartment where they had been stranded without electricity. Through this work, staff members have also contributed to furthering South Australia's capacity to organise and manage emergency relief operations in the aftermath of a disaster. I pay tribute also to the good work done by the members for Goyder and Light in assisting the communities rebuild.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: It has been a privilege to support all the affected communities in their recovery from these significant disaster events.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Schubert to order.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:15): I bring up the 572nd report of the committee, entitled Port Lincoln Wastewater Network Capacity Upgrade Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms DIGANCE: I bring up the 573rd report of the committee, entitled 'Bolivar wastewater treatment plant, activated sludge reactor plant, supervisory plant and data acquisition and controls upgrade project'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms DIGANCE: I bring up the 574th report of the committee, entitled City Tram Extension Project AdeLINK.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Treasurer. Did the Treasurer refer to BankSA CEO, Nick Reade, as a four-letter word starting with C and ending with T on Friday last week?

The SPEAKER: The house will not tolerate a cunctatory answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:18): No, sir.

MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): Supplementary: in the discharge of his public duties, does the Treasurer at all times comply with the requirement of the Premier's code of ministerial conduct not to recklessly attack the reputation of any other person?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:18): I regularly attack the reputation of the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite. I believe that they are unfit to govern and will continue to do so.

MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): Supplementary: as someone who has been found by ICAC to have used profanities during the course of meetings with public officers, does he understand why many people seriously doubt this denial this afternoon?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:19): I invite the member to repeat the allegations outside.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

Mr Marshall: You are on the record as saying that you didn't say it.

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. Is the use of abusive language and intimidatory behaviour consistent with the Ministerial Code of Conduct?

The SPEAKER: It is a question in the abstract. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:19): Well, that's right. Of course, the deputy leader knows the answer to that question, and it's a mischievous question in the light of the answers that were given by the Treasurer.

Members interjecting:

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

MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Supplementary: given, Premier, that the Treasurer has already been found to have abused public servants, is the Premier concerned about the current allegations against the Treasurer that he has used abusive and intimidatory behaviour towards private citizens at a charity event?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:20): That has been denied. It's as simple as that.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Premier. Given the Chief Psychiatrist's public statements that Ward 18 at the Repat may have ongoing use—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr MARSHALL: They seem pretty excited about this question, sir. Hopefully, we will get an answer today. Shall I start again?

The SPEAKER: Away you go.

Mr MARSHALL: Given the Chief Psychiatrist's public statements that Ward 18 at the Repat may have ongoing use as part of Older Persons Mental Health Services, will the government exclude Ward 18 from the sale or negotiate with ACH for the government to retain the asset for the medium term?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:21): No, we won't. It is part of the contract that we have with ACH Group, who no doubt will put those facilities to very good use. It is important to put the remarks of the Chief Psychiatrist in context. He noted that Ward 18 was one of a number of options and required modification to be used for the purposes that the Leader of the Opposition is indicating.

I stand by what I have said, and the advice I have had is that Ward 18 wouldn't be suitable for the long-term needs of patients, such as those who were previously at Oakden. We have a good

outcome with those patients being relocated to Northgate and, of course, the commitment in the budget to build a new facility.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): Supplementary: has ACH given the government any indication as to what the current Ward 18 will be used for going forward?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:21): They are going through their master planning at the moment. No doubt we will see, but it will be consistent with what the government has already indicated that the Repat site can be used for, and that is for aged care, health care, community health type purposes.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): When will the master plan be presented to the government?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:22): I will check on when the exact date is, but there are contractual requirements with regard to what ACH is required to provide and there needs to be a sign-off from the government for that to proceed.

AGED-CARE FACILITIES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question again is to the Minister for Health. Given the Chief Psychiatrist's public statements that around eight older people, who would previously have been transferred to Oakden, are stuck in acute hospitals, can the minister advise the house whether this access block issue is one of the causes of chronic overcrowding at our emergency departments in South Australia?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:22): I think what the Chief Psychiatrist would have been referring to—I have not seen those remarks—would not have been patients stuck in emergency departments; they would have been patients in inpatient beds in our hospitals. It is an issue having patients in our hospitals who require alternative accommodation. Generally, the biggest issue we have is patients requiring admission into an aged-care facility, so it is not unusual for this to be an issue in our hospitals, that we have people in our inpatient beds who would be better accommodated elsewhere.

I don't think the Chief Psychiatrist would have been referring to patients in our emergency departments because we have been very successful in having a massive reduction in mental health patients stuck for long periods of time in our emergency departments, and it is now only very occasionally that we see mental health patients in for longer than a day. I get a daily update on the length of stay of mental health patients in our emergency departments, and I have to say that the incidence of mental health patients waiting in our emergency departments for longer than a day is very occasional.

AGED-CARE FACILITIES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): What is the government's plan for the eight patients currently staying in acute beds in our hospitals to be moved from those facilities to more suitable long-term placements?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:24): We will be working very hard to make sure that those patients are accommodated appropriately. That would either be through an appropriate private aged-care or not-for-profit aged-care facility that is able to take those patients, or find alternative accommodation. But that is something that we work very assiduously to try to reduce the incidence of. Where we do have patients in our inpatient beds in our hospitals, we work very hard to find the appropriate accommodation for them as quickly as possible.

STATE MAJOR BANK LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Just a question to the Treasurer: in view of his recently stated ministerial statement to the house, will he be urging the Premier to immediately withdraw his allegations that the banks are money launderers to organised crime and terrorist groups?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:25): They are not his allegations: they are the allegations of an independent commonwealth office, AUSTRAC. AUSTRAC have 53,000 charges, 53,000 accusations of breaches of—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Okay, as I was trying to say yesterday, the ACCC and other independent bodies at one stage or another over the last few years have investigated all four major banks. Currently, one of the largest banks in Australia that just posted a \$9.9 billion profit is, wait for it, facing 53,000 allegations of breaching anti-money laundering and antiterrorism provisions under commonwealth statutes. I have to say—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Members opposite say it's the same as an internal report. I have to say there is a fundamental difference between a bank saying that we are uninvestable and then piling in—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —\$1.6 billion into South Australia when they have been telling people on TV that no-one would invest here, other than Elon Musk, other than Sanjeev Gupta, and now other than three of the five major banks subject to the major bank levy. I also point out to the house that, in all the bids for the commercialisation of the Lands Titles Office, all the banks subject to the major bank levy were part of offers to be part of this commercialisation, putting to a lie their adverts that they would never invest in South Australia again.

STATE MAJOR BANK LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): A supplementary: is the Treasurer saying that he supports the Premier's comments regarding the banks yesterday and today, that they are little more than money-laundering organisations for terrorist groups?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:27): I support the Premier in all things.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order. The member for Davenport is called.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:27): Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Health. Given the statement by the minister to the house yesterday indicating that two more Oakden staff have been referred to AHPRA since the budget estimates period, what were the reasons for the referrals and when did the alleged conduct occur?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:28): I would need to get a report back. I am not even sure if I would be able to provide that information to the house because we wouldn't want to do anything that might compromise the investigations, but if there is any other information that I can provide I will get advice from the minister's office and provide it.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:28): Further, given your statement yesterday indicating that two more staff at Oakden have been dismissed since estimates, what were the reasons for the dismissals and when did the relevant incidents occur?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:28): Same answer as previous: I am happy to have a look and see what information can be provided to the house, but I might be restricted in terms of what I can provide. If there is other information to provide, additional information I can provide, then I certainly will.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:28): A further supplementary: just confirming, minister, surely you can provide us with the dismissal dates?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:29): As I say, I will get advice about what I can provide.

Mr Marshall: Cover-up.

The SPEAKER: The leader, I warn.

Members interjecting:

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

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given that the number of urgent cat 1 elective surgery cases has increased by 50 per cent to 85 since the ramp down of the NRAH began, what immediate action will the minister take to ensure that patients receive their urgent surgery on time?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:29): We have only postponed less urgent or non-urgent elective surgery, so cat 1 surgery shouldn't be affected at this stage with the deferrals of surgery we have undertaken in order to reduce the capacity of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. We are very confident that, once the Royal Adelaide Hospital is up and running and we have the extra capacity with the extra theatres at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, we will be able to make inroads into patients who are overdue for their elective surgery.

The 30 June figures were very good in the north and, from recollection, in the south as well with regard to patients overdue for elective surgery, but there is still work to be done in the centre. We will make sure we work very hard to address that and deal as quickly as possible with any patients who are overdue. As I said previously, we are asking patients to please be patient. We do need to ramp down. We do need to reduce capacity at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. That affects not only patients in central Adelaide but also patients in the north and the south because we need to create additional capacity in those hospitals, but we are doing this in a sensible, planned way, taking advice from our clinicians to make sure that at all times patients are kept safe.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:31): Supplementary: minister, your answer to those urgent cat 1 elective surgery cases is for them to be patient?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:31): No, that's not what I said. I said that cat 1 patients, priority 1 patients should not be affected by the ramp down because it is only the lower priority, less urgent elective

surgery patients who are having their surgery deferred. To my knowledge, triage category 1 patients aren't having their surgery deferred.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:31): Further supplementary: minister, how many surgeries have now been deferred or relocated?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:32): I am happy to get that information for the house

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:32): My question is again to the Minister for Health. What is the cost of modifications to the technical suites of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, and will the cost be borne by the state?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:32): Very minimal. These are very minor modifications. It was always anticipated that there would be some modifications necessary and they would be met within the existing budget. We always had a budget—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Davenport.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —for any minor modifications that needed to be made to the hospital, and these will be met from within that existing budget. There certainly will not be any necessity to go back to Treasury to get any additional funding. They will be met within the existing budget.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given the evidence of the chief information officer of SA Health before the Coroner's Court that the EPAS system is prone to widespread and repeated freezing, can the minister assure the house that this problem will be eliminated before EPAS is rolled out at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:33): Yes, I can.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Supplementary: how can the minister continue to assert that the EPAS is safe when three out of the five recommendations made by the Coroner in the Herczeg inquest relate to EPAS?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:33): The Coroner makes, I think, five recommendations, two of which have already been implemented. The three others present a pretty significant change to the way doctors and nurses work—their clinical practice and the way they have always provided their practice—not only using EPAS but using paper records as well. I am more than happy to have a look at the recommendations of the Coroner, but I will be taking advice from our doctors and nurses about the advisability of implementing those recommendations.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Supplementary: given that Mr Herczeg died on 19 September 2016—and whilst the minister indicates that some of these recommendations have been implemented—is he satisfied or has he conducted any inquiries as to whether anyone else has died as a result of the circumstances in relation to this EPAS reading or lack thereof?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:34): Let me make very, very clear: the deputy leader is completely

misrepresenting the Coroner and the Coroner's report. The Coroner has not made any finding that EPAS had anything to do with this gentleman's tragic death and specifically makes the finding that it was persons or persons unknown that led to this death. He certainly makes no recommendation that EPAS (or any finding) had anything to do with his death.

Having said that, he does make additional findings with regard to EPAS. All three of the recommendations are technically possible and can be implemented easily within the EPAS system. However, each of the recommendations may have unintended consequences in addition to the intended consequences. The recommendations will be referred to SA Health's clinicians through the established clinical advisory committee for EPAS for their consideration and advice before we make any decision whether they are implemented or not. Can I repeat that the deputy is completely incorrect in her assertion that the Coroner has made any findings—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: She's got an elbow problem.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —with regard to EPAS having anything to do with this gentleman's tragic death.

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland will not advert to the elbow remark or any other part of it, and I warn him.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): My question again is to the Minister for Health. What is the projected cost of paper storage and retrieval of patient records for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital pending the full rollout of EPAS?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:36): I am happy to get that information when and if it is available. Let's be quite clear: the mixed system will only be for a period of time, only a matter of months while we continue to use paper records. The reason we are doing that is because, while EPAS is ready to be rolled out in full at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, as I have said repeatedly in this house before, we want to make the move as simple for our clinicians as is possible.

We don't want them having to deal with the new complex IT system at the same time as they are adjusting to a new environment in the new hospital. The advice was very, very clear—that we should make the move as simple as possible and the safest way to achieve this was by having a limited activation of EPAS at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital when we move and then to proceed to full implementation or full activation of EPAS some time after.

The issues with paper records, we have been working through with our clinicians to make sure that they have paper records provided to them in a timely way when they need them, particularly in the emergency department. Let me be quite clear: we have paper records being shuffled around the state all the time; that is why we are moving to an electronic health record so that that does not happen. I find it a little bizarre that the opposition, who have been condemning EPAS and expressing a love or nostalgia for old paper-based records, are now complaining that we are going to have paper-based records for a limited period of time at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): My question again is to the Minister for Health. What is the total cost of the public relations campaign currently underway in relation to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:38): I don't have that on me, but I make no apologies for the government—

Mr Duluk: Wasting taxpayers' money.

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —providing important information to the South Australian public about our new hospital. When confronted with a barrage of lies and misinformation, it is incumbent

upon me—a responsibility I take particularly personally—to make sure that every South Australian has the information that they need about our hospital system.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: They can bleat all they want, but I will never, ever step back from making sure that appropriate information is provided to make sure that South Australians are not misled by, to be honest, some outrageous lies and misinformation that we have seen.

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Morialta and Kavel, I warn the members for Schubert and Morialta and I warn for the second and final time the members for Davenport, Morialta and Schubert. Deputy Leader.

The Hon. P. Caica: Fair enough, sir.

The SPEAKER: And I warn the member for Colton.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): When the minister is obtaining the answer to that question in respect of the total cost, will he also seek particulars as to the cost, or at least included in the cost, of advertising on bus shelters, newspaper advertisements, social media, letters to households and television and radio advertisements?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:40): I would be very, very happy to do that.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): A supplementary again to the Minister for Health: are any public relations campaigns scheduled after the hospital opens and, if so, what is the budget?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:40): I will need to check whether the information campaign will continue after. I see no particular reason why it shouldn't, because people will still require information. It is very, very important that we have clarity in the community about the opening date. I repeatedly say, when there are media interviews, that the key date for the South Australian public to keep in mind is 7am on 5 September. That is the time that the new emergency department at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will open and the old one will close. It is very important that people understand that date. We don't want people presenting to the wrong emergency department. Having said that, I will check to see the schedule for the advertising campaign to see how long it continues.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Health. How is the investment in rehabilitation services at Modbury Hospital improving health services for the residents of our north and north-eastern suburbs?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:42): I do know the answer to that, and I thank the member for Wright and acknowledge her advocacy for the health needs of the people of the north-east.

As the house would be aware, since 2014 the state government has invested \$32 million at Modbury Hospital to build brand-new facilities, including significantly expanded rehabilitation services in the north and north-east. I'm pleased to say that after months of clinical planning, this week SA Health started the transfer of patients and staff from the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre and the Royal Adelaide Hospital to Modbury's brand-new rehab facilities.

This transfer has seen more than 20 patients and over 30 health staff moving to Modbury Hospital. I am told that it went safely and smoothly, thanks to the hard work and collaboration between staff from all three health sites. This transfer of services enables stroke, orthopaedic and

amputee patients, as well as those recovering from surgery or other illnesses, to receive their care closer to home in modern, state-of-the-art facilities.

This major boost to rehab services at Modbury Hospital means that it is now well and truly the major rehabilitation hub for the north and north-eastern suburbs. Investment in our state's rehab facilities is so important because, as our population ages, the demand for rehab services will continue to grow. In response to this growing demand, our state's best rehabilitation doctors, nurses and allied health professionals have developed a new model for providing rehab care, ensuring consistent, modern and quality care.

The contemporary model includes increased inpatient and ambulatory rehab services within our hospitals. Rehab patients at Modbury Hospital have access to upgraded wards, 52 rehabilitation beds, 18 treatment rooms, a gym, a hydrotherapy pool, a therapy garden, a laboratory to analyse patient mobility, prosthesis services, a kitchen and laundry where clients can re-learn and practice every day tasks, and cutting-edge tele-rehab facilities so that our country patients can receive care at home.

This upgrade of Modbury Hospital's rehab services means that our patients can access care and first-class modern facilities much sooner after recovering from acute hospital treatment. It allows our patients to go home safely and sooner than ever before. Previously, the majority of north and north-eastern residents needing continued rehab services had to travel significant distances to access them. Now the community has access to top-level rehab care right on their doorstep.

The government is delivering modern, forward-looking health services based on real evidence and projections about the health needs of our community. We know that our population is ageing, we know how important early rehab services are for our patients and we know how much the community is interested in the improvements at Modbury, with hundreds of people seeing the impressive rehab building at an open day earlier in the year.

LAND SERVICES SA

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer outline to the house what the annual value of ongoing royalty streams will be for the government, following the announcement today of the commercialisation of land services?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:45): That's a very good question. Currently, we receive royalties from the commercialisation of data, which make up about 1 per cent of what we receive from fees and charges out of the Lands Titles Office, so about \$6 million per year. The arrangement we have in place now with the new operators is to receive an annual percentage of 12½ per cent of everything they commercialise.

It is important to note that these bodies are much more sophisticated than we are, as a government organisation, about commercialising this data. They are much more entrepreneurial than we are, they have larger markets and they know how to commercialise this data a lot better than government does. It is a good way of making sure that not only are we saving money on processing, getting a very large up-front payment for this service but, importantly, we are maintaining a 12½ per cent royalty on whatever they commercialise. That 12½ per cent rate is locked in for the life of the agreement. I think the government expects to receive a lot more than we are currently receiving from our own attempts to commercialise that data.

LAND SERVICES SA

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Supplementary: can the Treasurer provide the house with any information on the estimated saving in terms of operational costs to the government by commercialising this land services division?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:46): I don't have that here, but I am happy to provide that to the member.

LAND SERVICES SA

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Supplementary: how many state government employees or public sector employees are currently employed within this division?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:46): I will give you the entire breakdown: about 30 staff will be retained within government, about 70 staff are likely to be offered employment by the new provider and a further 60 staff will remain to transition those services. There will be no excess employees in the State Valuation Office; in fact, they will be under-resourced, so there should be some room for growth there. About nine FTE positions will be excess at the Lands Titles Office, which will, of course, be rerouted throughout government. We do not expect that there will be any forced redundancies at all out of this process.

LAND SERVICES SA

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:47): Supplementary: given that 60 people will be retained for the transition time frame, what is that time frame and what will be the fate of those public servants after that transitional period has ended?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:47): Either they will stay with the operations because they will obviously be under-resourced—the new providers want to see how they operate, so they will either receive an offer to stay, or they can return to government and be used internally within government—or they can take voluntary redundancies, but there is no plan to give any forced redundancies.

LAND SERVICES SA

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:47): Will all property valuations going forward be conducted by the private sector?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:47): Yes, but the Valuer-General, the Registrar-General and the Surveyor-General retain their independent statutory powers to disagree at any time. The Valuer-General is supreme in this area. If the Valuer-General disagrees with a private valuation made by the new consortium operating our lands titles service, the Valuer-General will have the final say on that. That is a risk they took when they purchased this asset.

LAND SERVICES SA

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): Can the Treasurer provide the house with any information regarding how he plans to control any increases in fees charged by the new private provider?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:48): Former treasurer Lucas developed something called Treasury indexation adjustments, I think is the terminology. It is the way we index fees and charges every year. The way we have indexed the fees and charges at the Lands Titles Office over the last 15 years will remain in place, and the consortium, having bought them, have accepted that that will be the indexation rate. The government retains control of that. We will be setting the same fees and charges we have always set every year with this annual indexation.

LAND SERVICES SA

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): When is settlement on this contract and the payment likely to be made by Land Services SA?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:49): Imminently.

LAND SERVICES SA

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): Will the government be using this money to repay state debt, or does the government have other plans for this money?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:49): You will eagerly be awaiting the Mid-Year Budget Review.

LAND SERVICES SA

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): Will there be any legislative requirement for this transaction?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:49): Not that I am aware of.

LAND SERVICES SA

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): Will the government provide a copy of the contract to the opposition for their perusal?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:49): I have to check with Crown to make sure that there aren't any legal requirements to maintain confidentiality, remembering that there is a competitive process now in place in the Victorian Lands Titles Office, which is one of the reasons we received such a significant offer for our Lands Titles Office, so I will check to see what provisions are in place. I am more than happy to be as transparent as possible, but where there are confidential aspects of the sale process, then we must honour those.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): Does the government have any further plans for privatisation of South Australian government services or assets?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:50): No, we absolutely rule out the privatisation of SA Water and its associated assets, something the opposition have yet to do—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —something the opposition has yet to do.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We won't privatise the hospital, we won't privatise schools, we won't privatise the police force. We won't be privatising any essential services.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

SA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): Will the Treasurer remind the house how much the state government spent on investigating the privatisation of SA Water assets?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:51): I don't know what Treasury spent investigating the preparation for the incoming Blue Book, had you been successful

at the last election. Every four years, during that beautiful period that Treasury love so much—the caretaker period—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

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

Mr Whetstone: Doesn't the truth hurt.

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Every four years, Treasury and the agencies prepare incoming briefs. They make assumptions about what they think certain political parties will or won't do and no doubt, given the history of members opposite, as we speak, somewhere they are planning to see—if they are successful—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Communities is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We have no plans to privatise any other assets.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

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

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given that the budget papers indicate that the government is moving to implement EPAS at Mount Gambier, can the minister advise whether cabinet has decided to roll out EPAS to the rest of country South Australia and what the cost of that rollout will be?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:52): No, the reason why we have done this with Mount Gambier is because of the review that was done on the problems at the Mount Gambier emergency department and the recommendations of that review that we move to electronic patient health records, particularly because of the issues that were being faced at the Mount Gambier hospital. We have only extended the scope by that one hospital at this stage but, of course, once we have successfully rolled EPAS out to the current scope, so basically the rest of our metropolitan hospitals, then we certainly would be looking at rolling EPAS out to our country hospitals as well.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:53): Minister, what is the total cost of rolling out EPAS to the Mount Gambier hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:53): I am happy to get that, but it would be, in the course of things, a relatively minor amount of money. We certainly didn't have to go to budget for an additional allocation. It's been done within the existing EPAS budget.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:53): What is the time line, then, for the rollout of EPAS to country hospitals?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:53): We don't have one at the moment. We need to complete the rollout on the current scope, then any future rollout to country hospitals will be the subject of a budget bid. We would have to go to budget to do that rollout.

HEALTH ADVISORY COUNCILS

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister immediately lift the threshold at which HACs need central approval for expenditure from \$25,000 to \$75,000, as recommended by the Social Development Committee?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:54): We will have a very good look at the Social Development Committee report. I know that they have done an extensive piece of work. Obviously, we need to get advice from Treasury as well because one of the issues we have is that, when the HACs spend money, it does have an impact on the budget that we need to take into account. I am more than happy to have a good look and get some advice on those recommendations in the Social Development Committee report.

FOOD LOSS AND WASTE

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. How is the South Australian Research and Development Institute initiating programs to reduce food loss and waste?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:55): I thank the member for Torrens for the question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I am pleased to report that Primary Industries and Regions South Australia is taking a nation-leading role in the important issue of reducing food loss and waste. If the member for Schubert stopped yelling out, he might learn a little bit about what is happening up in his area; and the same goes for the member for Chaffey.

Due to damage from weather, disease and pests, inefficient food chains and the high cosmetic standards imposed by the major supermarket chains in Australia, approximately a quarter of horticultural produce, and up to 40 per cent of some crops such as potatoes, is lost on South Australian farms, used for low-value purposes or dumped in landfill at significant cost. In total, it is estimated that more than \$50 billion, or about 40 per cent of total food production, could be lost before it gets to the consumer, or wasted by the consumers in Australia each year. This is part of a much larger \$US1.3 trillion problem worldwide.

The state government, through the South Australian Research and Development Institute, is working in partnership with industry and the commonwealth government at a national and international level, to understand and address the issue of food loss and waste. SARDI recently delivered the project 'Transforming Riverland food loss and industry waste into profit' as part of the South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program.

The project aligned with the state government's premium food and wine produced in our clean environment and exported to the world economic priority, by utilising waste to develop new products and industries in the Riverland, Murraylands and the Murray Mallee regions. It involved 10 industry partners and mapped agricultural and processing food loss and industry waste throughout these regions.

The project also assessed actual and potential waste transformation infrastructure in the region and determined what valuable food and wine bioactives and industry waste could be turned into higher value-added products or bioenergy. The project is now leading to new business and product development opportunities and will further support the region's environmental credentials and enhance regional capabilities, investment and employment.

Industry support providers include Tarac Technologies up in the Barossa, and CEO, Jeremy Blanks, and his team need to be congratulated because they have done a number of things to use waste from the wine industry to turn it into things where you can really value-add. One of the latest things they have come up with is using wine waste as a superfood to feed abalones, so helping the seafood and aquaculture industries here in South Australia. Tarac Technologies already aggregate waste streams from wineries through grape seeds and skins, and end users, such as Swisse

Vitamins, are looking for clean and green Australian sources of bioactives. These industry partners will ensure the immediate uptake of the results of this work.

While the characteristics of each of our food and wine regions vary, these principles can clearly be applied more broadly. A similar approach is being planned to investigate opportunities in the Northern Adelaide Plains. This would be fantastic for the region, complementing the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme, which we hope to commence with the support of the Australian government very soon.

PIRSA is also leading the development of the proposed national Fight Food Waste and Fraud Cooperative Research Centre bid. This \$160 million, 10-year bid involves 59 participants, and 17 of those are based here in South Australia. The SRC aims to protect and profit Australia's food and wine industry, and it will adopt the UN Sustainable Development Goal 12.3, to halve per capita food waste by 2030.

MARINE DISCOVERY CENTRE

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister update the house on the work of South Australia's Marine Discovery Centre and its links to education?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:59): I am delighted to answer this question. I am pleased to have been asked it by the member for Colton, in whose company I have visited the Marine Discovery Centre twice now.

For those unaware, the Marine Discovery Centre, located at the Star of the Sea School campus at Henley Beach, has been operating for some 20 years now, and during this time it has developed a very good reputation in the quality of the education provided not just to the students of Star of the Sea but to far more students than that.

We know that science, technology, engineering and maths and the connections between these fields are becoming increasingly important for our students. The more opportunities we offer students to study these subjects, particularly if they are presented in a hands-on and engaging manner, the stronger their interest will be.

I am pleased to inform the house that this government will continue to support the work of the Marine Discovery Centre. The centre gives students in this state the opportunity to make a real-life connection with the marine environment that is such an important part of their world, and this is an opportunity that they may not otherwise get.

With a grant of \$20,000 from the state government for this financial year, the centre will be able to continue its valuable work. The centre is open to all students and last year welcomed students from 150 government, independent and Catholic schools. With its aquariums, activities, models and experiments, it brings to life the sea and its surrounds and demonstrates a part of our ecology that is so very important to this state. Each year, the centre receives approximately 9,000 visitors, the vast majority of whom are school students. These visitors are assisted by a team of 43 volunteers who support the centre by supervising students, feeding the creatures, cleaning aquariums and installing displays.

The centre helps students understand marine life and its connection with the rest of the planet and, as we know, the more we continue to understand the environment, the more we will value it. This is particularly important as we try to come to grips with climate change, the likely effect on the environment and the steps we need to take to slow it. I am continually impressed at how readily students grasp concepts such as sustainability and direct their own learning to how they can implement it. The Marine Discovery Centre will continue to play an important role in stimulating and aiding this learning.

Furthermore, the centre ensures that these visits by students have firm and specific links to the Australian curriculum. All visiting teachers are provided with curriculum-linked activity packs for their year level, with the focus being on discovery, learning and higher level thinking skills. Furthermore, Aboriginal culture is promoted at the centre, with Kurna volunteers providing links to their culture and language.

I am proud that this state government is contributing to the continuing and valuable work of the centre in South Australia, and I am pleased that it will continue to play an important role in the education of our children in the increasingly important fields of science, technology, engineering and maths, with a particular focus on the natural sciences which, at times, risks being overlooked in the obsession with robotics.

THEVENARD PORT

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:02): My question is to the Premier. What has the government done thus far, and what is it intending to do, to support the many people whose jobs and families have been impacted by the closure of the Port Thevenard wharf?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:02): As the member for Flinders would know, we have received a briefing from Flinders Ports about what is going on with the Port of Thevenard and, in particular, the failed piece of infrastructure that they have experienced in recent weeks. Indeed, they put out a press release dated 8 August, a couple of days ago, saying that reparatory works have commenced at the port.

We obviously have been following this quite closely. I think from the member for Flinders' perspective, not just because it is in his electorate but of course many of his constituents either own operations or work in operations that rely on the use of those export facilities in order to get product to market, the inability to use this infrastructure is causing several businesses severe dislocation in their operations, particularly in getting their various products to market.

Of course, the government finds itself in a position where we have limited direct ability to insert ourselves into the process, given that Flinders Ports owns, manages and operates this infrastructure, but certainly I, as well as the Mayor, Allan Suter, and the member for Flinders himself, have made it abundantly clear to Flinders Ports that not only do they need to repair this infrastructure as quickly as possible and get it back open for the benefit of all those operations but, while they are working on that process to fix this infrastructure and get it back open for use, they need to be reaching out to all the operations that otherwise rely on that infrastructure and make alternative arrangements with them.

I must say that we as a government have not been kept abreast by Flinders Ports on their dealings with those operations that rely on that infrastructure. However, I do understand from some of the verbal advice I have received from my department that some of those discussions have been underway over previous weeks. As to the specifics of that, I am not sure exactly what they have done and implemented, but I am more than happy to find out all those details, whatever details we can, and bring that back and provide that to the member for Flinders.

I do share his concerns that this is not just a great inconvenience for those operations but this is costing them money and it's putting full-time, ongoing and casual jobs at risk, jobs which are used by those operations to flex up and flex down as they seek to get their products to market.

ANDERSON REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General release the Anderson gaming review, which he has now had for over three months, and if not, why not?

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) (15:06): I thank the member for Bragg for her question. The document that the member for Bragg is talking about is something that I am considering and it's also something I have to in due course, after I have reflected on it, discuss with my colleagues to work out what the government's view about these matters might be.

It is my view that the document, ultimately, will probably be a document that should be released, in part at least, and I say in part, or at least a summary of its recommendations. The reason—and I will put this on the record now—is that Mr Anderson in that report was very forthright

in making certain statements and recommendations to me and, in due course, through me to the government.

I think it is important that when we get a report of this nature, if some of the comments are very direct and forthright, they may or may not be appropriate for broader public distribution on the basis that some people might not like these sorts of forthright remarks. I am very loath to be putting these things into the public domain, if to do so would be unfairly prejudicial to individuals or groups of people.

That said, my intention is that once the government has had an opportunity to consider the recommendations and form a view, then I would intend to inform the parliament that the government had reflected on the matters contained in the report and indicate to the parliament what the government intended to do or not to do, as the case might be, pursuant to those recommendations. The basic proposition is that I have to seek the advice of other government agencies and to have a discussion with my colleagues about where we land on this. When we do, it would be my intention to advise the parliament that we have had that conversation, we have thought about the matters and we have formed views about what we intend to do.

ANDERSON REVIEW

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:08): Supplementary: has the author of the report, Mr Anderson QC, requested of the government that any part of that report not be published? Can the Attorney confirm whether any of the references in that report relate to Mr Robert Chappell, EO of the Independent Gambling Authority, whose employment ceased a few months ago?

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) (15:08): As to the first part of that question, I do not recall Mr Anderson having said anything of that nature to me. I will check my notes, but I don't think Mr Anderson is of the view that anything he had to say is not his view.

But that said, I have mentioned already that if you're getting a frank and fearless report in relation to matters and a person writes in those circumstances, my only point is that may be perfectly suitable for particular purposes for which the report was sought and it may or may not be that that's appropriate for broader distribution in that format. That's really all I have to say about that topic.

ARTS FESTIVALS

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Minister, how are our festivals making South Australia both a national and international performing arts leader?

The SPEAKER: The cultural attaché.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:10): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and I thank the member for Reynell for her question. On 24 July, the annual Helpmann Awards were held in Sydney. These awards recognise the success of performing arts in Australia. I am extremely pleased that, following on from our whopping 19 nominations, South Australia well and truly punched above its weight. Rachel Healy and Neal Armfield promised big things for this year's Adelaide Festival, and they delivered our biggest success, winning seven awards, including six for its operatic masterpiece, Handel's *Saul*, directed by Barrie Kosky.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Bazza.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Big Bazza, that's right. I know that everyone is eagerly anticipating what the Festival's big ticket item will be for 2018, and I can assure you that you don't have long to wait, with the big reveal happening next Thursday. South Australia's Amber McMahon also saw success at the Helpmanns, winning best supporting female actor for her role in Windmill Theatre's *Girl Asleep*.

Internationally, South Australian artists are finding success through the Made in Adelaide initiative. Last week, South Australia took over the London Riviera before embarking on the

Edinburgh Fringe. Local cabaret star Anya Anastasia summed up her experience with Made in Adelaide last night when she wrote, and I quote:

I am so proud to be a part of the Made in Adelaide delegation here in Edinburgh, surrounded by so many great artists, movers and shakers from Adelaide here in Edinburgh strengthening the connection between our festivals and being ambassadors for our city and cultural scene abroad. It's a really amazing initiative, and I hope it exists and grows for years to come.

I also know that our adopted German superstar Hans is also having an exceptional time, receiving numerous five-star awards as he offends a whole new audience in Edinburgh. The Adelaide Fringe is making their presence felt with an Edinburgh-flavoured version of their popular Goosechase game, pop-up information tents and Adelaide-themed black cabs hitting the road.

On the back of this year's Fringe Fling, Sonya Feldhoff from the ABC and Janice Forsyth from the BBC are teaming up again to present a joint program from Edinburgh. These programs will promote Adelaide right across Scotland and will be played back here next Tuesday and Wednesday.

I know these initiatives have a great impact on both artists and tourists who come flocking to Adelaide every summer. Can I finish by wishing the Edinburgh Fringe and Festival both a happy 70th birthday. Last year, we signed a memorandum of understanding to formalise what has already been an incredible bond between our two cities. I look forward to continuing this engagement as our Fringes and Festivals go from strength to strength.

ALCOHOL SUPPLY TO MINORS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Education. What work is being done in schools to promote the new laws against the secondary supply of alcohol to minors that recently passed the parliament?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:13): I will obtain detail and bring that to the chamber.

CHILD PROTECTION INCOME MANAGEMENT

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How many families are now subject to child protection income management, as per recommendation 22.6 of the Chloe Valentine inquest, that was agreed to by the government over 2½ years ago?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:13): The most recent date I have is for between the beginning of October last year and May this year: there were 67 referrals by our department for income management. As to whether there have been any subsequently, I will bring that back.

CHILD PROTECTION INCOME MANAGEMENT

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:13): Supplementary to that: if we could have a total. We know that it was 33 at April 2016, so if that 67 is on top of the 33, or what the actual total is.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:14): I am almost certain it is, given the dates that I recorded, but I can confirm that.

CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:14): My question again is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. When will the government fix their systems so that they can report the number of children in care with case plans, as required by the Productivity Commission?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:14): I am not sure about the timing; I will bring that back to the chamber.

CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:14): Supplementary: will the minister also provide the house with a figure of how many children in her care have case plans as required?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:14): It may well be that that can't be answered without the work on C3MS and therefore, by the nature of not having had that work yet done, if that is indeed the case, I will not be able to provide that information as yet. C3MS is not a spectacularly useful system for generating answers on a systemic level. It is useful for managing an individual child's case, which is what it is designed for. There are occasions when what is asked of it is a summary across different cases. It is not designed for that purpose and is often not able to produce the kind of material people are asking for.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:15): My question is again to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Will the minister inform the house how many Department for Child Protection staff (formerly Families SA staff) were suspended on full or part pay during both the 2015-16 and the 2016-17 financial years, and what the total cost was?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:15): There is a degree of detail there that will require me to bring that back to the chamber.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:16): My question is again to the Minister for Education and Child Development. What strategies or incentives is the government utilising to fill long-term vacancies in the APY lands in the child protection sector?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:16): We are going through a process at present of determining how to create a greater incentive for workers on the lands. While we are managing to cover a good proportion of the work, it is important that we have a sustainable model, and I know that the current—and reasonably recently appointed—head of child protection has been working very hard not only from Adelaide but by going up and having meetings in the regions to determine the best ways to create a working environment that is going to be manageable in a sustainable way.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:17): Supplementary: will the minister also provide a list of all the positions for government workers in the child protection department based in the APY lands and the positions by title, date last filled and whether they are currently filled or vacant?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:17): I am having a sense of why these questions weren't asked in estimates because they are highly detailed and we might have been able to provide further explanations when we had all the relevant public servants present. These are extremely detailed. Nonetheless, we will take that on notice and provide the information we are able to.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:17): My question is again to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Will the government release the series of recommendations made after the review of the solution-based casework?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:17): I will have a look at the nature of that document before making a decision.

The SPEAKER: The opposition was able to ask 52 questions in question time today—a great improvement on the position of the opposition during the Brown, Olsen and Kerin governments, which was allowed to ask an average of seven.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, I can recall very detailed answers from ministers at that time—about 10-minute diatribes.

Grievance Debate

ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:18): Last night, the Adelaide Hills Council met and undertook what was a disappointing, foolish and, I think, disgraceful decision to ignore for the third time the 95 per cent of respondents to community consultation who said that they want to retain wards in the Adelaide Hills Council area. Ninety-five per cent of what I understand to be in excess of 500 responses from the community opposed the abolition of wards. The Adelaide Hills Council—six of the 12 councillors and the mayor with his casting vote—have decided that they want to again go to report, so that the Adelaide Hills community's views will be ignored once again.

Ninety-five per cent out of more than 500 responses—this was after the Adelaide Hills community had been ignored twice previously when, again, in excess of 90 per cent of community consultation responses had been against the abolition of wards. On one of those occasions we were looking at in excess of 600 or 700 responses, more than 90 per cent of which were against the abolition of wards.

There are good reasons that people in those communities believed that wards should be retained, particularly people in those communities that are not part of that central area where so many of the voters in the Adelaide Hills Council are concentrated, in areas like Gumeracha and Kersbrook that were formerly part of a different council area. It was undertaken that those electors when their council merged and became part of the Adelaide Hills Council would retain local representation. They have been ignored. Hundreds of responses from those communities were ignored.

The fact is that six councillors have been listening to their communities. Six councillors have been supporting the decisions of their communities but, unfortunately, once again the majority on council—the six other councillors and the mayor—have ignored them. This is disappointing particularly because it undermines faith whenever the council is going to go to community consultation again. This is a matter on which I have spoken previously, as have the members for Kavel, Heysen, Bragg and Schubert. We have all spoken strongly against this council's desire.

Of course, when the council made this decision only a few months ago it went off to the Electoral Commission for action, and it turned out that they had made a technical mistake and had to go back to community consultation again. The shocking thing is that, that consultation having been undertaken with hundreds of responses having come in against the abolition of wards, we are told now that they are going to consult with the community again in the coming weeks before the council will make a final decision that will go to the Electoral Commission for final approval.

I make this call: I asked questions of the Minister for Local Government about this the last time the council decided to abolish the words. I asked him if he would use his considerable powers to intervene. He gave a noncommittal answer, suggesting that he was not aware of the issue. I call on the Minister for Local Government now to look at what powers he can use to make sure that the considerations, the wishes and the demands of the overwhelming majority of the community in the Adelaide Hills Council area, are taken seriously.

There is another step that can be taken, and this is an opportunity for all members of the Adelaide Hills community. There are a number of people on Facebook already who are expressing their anger and their concern. There are Facebook groups expressing anger and concern, from the Morialta Residents' Association to the other coalitions having their voices heard on Facebook, but they can also have their voices heard by going directly to those councillors.

All those councillors who claim that they are representing their community's interest, I do not think they are doing that, but the members of those communities have an opportunity to have their voices heard. Contact their councillors directly. I would encourage all residents in the Adelaide Hills community to contact those councillors directly to make them understand, before this comes to a

final vote in either two weeks' time or four weeks' time when the report from council staff, which they have been instructed to prepare, comes through, and to make their voices heard.

I know that some of the member for Newland's electorate contains a bit of the northern part of the Adelaide Hills. In fact, I note that he did make some representations to the council himself, and that is to be applauded. It would have been easy for him to go down the road from his house in Bridgewater to get to the Adelaide Hills Council and make those representations, but he can make his voice heard. Of course, the member for Waite is a resident in the Heysen electorate and he can make his voice heard. I encourage them all to do that, as I encourage all members of the community.

I know that all the Liberal members who represent these areas and who continue to live and be part of these communities will make their voices heard. I have discussed this issue with the mayor. I have discussed this issue with councillors. I am very disappointed that they continue to ignore the wishes of the majority of the electors in their areas, and I urge all community members to contact those councillors and urge them to overturn their decision from last night.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: There is one more chance, member for Newland. I can inform you that there is one more chance for councillors to reverse their decision, and I urge councillors to do so.

MITCHAM SPORTING CLUBS

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:23): Recently, I had the great pleasure to attend a civic reception held on Wednesday 26 July in the Mayor's Parlour at the Civic Centre, Torrens Park. The reception was in honour of and as a thank you to sporting groups within the City of Mitcham. It was hosted by the Mayor of Mitcham, Mr Glenn Spear. I understand this was just one in a series of several receptions the mayor has hosted over recent years.

The reception was a way to thank all those who ensure local sporting clubs not only continue but also flourish and grow. It was indeed wonderful to know that so many dedicated club members from a wide variety of clubs were invited to attend including football; tennis, being the Hawthorne, Reade Park and Pasadena tennis clubs; bowling clubs, including Colonel Light Gardens; croquet, being the Reade Park Croquet Club; and baseball, the Goodwood Indians. Recognition of the important role that leaders of these clubs play cannot be underestimated, as the value of sport to local government and communities extends beyond sport for sport's sake. It is fair to say that sport plays a role in bringing communities together, having a social and cultural impact, developing social capital and reducing crime and antisocial behaviour.

Regular involvement in sport is widely acknowledged as being beneficial to individuals and communities. It contributes to a range of positive outcomes. It is generally accepted that involvement in local sporting clubs encourages more local people to participate as volunteers in community life. It gives local people a greater voice and influence over decision-making and creates a more cohesive, tolerant and inclusive community that values diversity and instils a sense of belonging and local pride. There are also the benefits of deterring antisocial behaviour with an increased culture of respect and tolerance. The building of community that these clubs enable also sees a reduction in crime and in alcohol and drug misuse, as well as a reduction in the fear of crime.

Of the near on two dozen clubs invited, it was pleasing to see both Mercedes College and Mitcham Girls High School involved, as both schools field many sporting teams across a wide range of sports. It was a vibrant event and I met members from so many clubs, all representative of the passion and enthusiasm of all in attendance. It was great speaking with Reade Park Croquet Club members represented on the night by the president, Tom, and the secretary, Don, who told me they have around 100 members involved in a very active and social club.

Also present were members from the Denman Tennis Club, founded more than 80 years ago and built on a great sense of history and tradition. Colonel Light Gardens and Kenilworth football clubs and Mitcham Hawks Football Club were also invited, with the Mitcham Hawks Football Club remaining one of Adelaide metro area's most durable and historic clubs, without merger or loss of identity. Five players have played over 300 games, and Ray Murray holds the club record with 427 games.

Another vibrant football club of note, with over 300 members, is that of the Kenilworth Football Club, being the second oldest amateur league football club in the state, fielding three senior teams, five junior boys teams and four junior girls teams. Of course, it was also a delight to speak with the wonderful social ladies from the Pasadena Tennis Club, who gather on a regular basis for friendship, fellowship and fun.

The guest speaker for the night was Bronwyn Klei, Deputy Chair of Sport SA and General Manager, Commercial, Events and the Adelaide Strikers at the South Australian Cricket Association, who gave a very engaging and enabling presentation, citing the multidimensional value of sport and the importance of local sporting organisations. Bronwyn has helped create a successful, high-profile sporting business that regularly attracts more than 40,000 people to home games, with more than one million more watching on TV. Bronwyn is also president of both the Adelaide Hills Netball Association and the Aldgate Netball Club, where she continues to play and umpire.

All in attendance clearly enjoyed the reception and the mayor's hospitality in recognising the value of local sporting clubs with the support and passion of volunteers and their important role in building community.

BALAKLAVA EISTEDDFOD

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:28): I would like to briefly report on an event that occurred last weekend. It had nothing to do with sport, so was not about football, even though the great team won on Sunday. I am talking about the 21st Balaklava Eisteddfod.

Members interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am pleased that there are some people in the room who are pleased about this. It is a wonderful event, I must say. I have been going for the last 12 years that I have had the honour of being a member of parliament. I believe I have missed one, potentially two, for which I will forever be apologetic. However, I had the opportunity to open the finale concert on the Sunday about five times.

It is a three-day event and it is a wonderful forum for young people in particular—that is where the focus is—but across all ages. It challenges people through acting, dancing, singing, music—all expressions of what is perfect about the human species performing—and being brave enough to be in front of others and being critiqued on their performances and the community being so wonderfully respectful of it.

Balaklava on the first Sunday in August is most certainly the place to be if you are from the Mid North. I recognise that the Hon. Geoff Brock, the member for Frome, as the local member for Balaklava, opened last Sunday's event, but unfortunately could not stay; he had to leave to go to that other activity that occurred last Sunday. From information provided to me by Mrs Bronny Cottle, who is the long-term president of the Balaklava Eisteddfod, something like 1,500 students from schools were involved and there were 492 different entries for the year.

Those 1,500 students came from about 30 different schools not just from the Mid North but from as far away as Encounter Bay, the Barossa and Kadina. I am told that the Encounter Bay students walked off the stage at 10 o'clock on the Saturday evening before travelling back to Encounter Bay. There were 400 competitions on Saturday alone, and those who participated came from 92 different postcodes across South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are not that many, are there?

Mr GRIFFITHS: True. In total, there are 2,000 performers, and the equivalent of 25 different concerts were held over Friday, Saturday and Sunday afternoon. I commend all those wonderful people who were brave enough to participate. On Sunday, we had the opportunity to listen to the finalists of the Adelaide Plains Male Voice Choir scholarship, which is a \$1,000 cash payment. There were also champions' performances from a variety of areas and the Combined Mid North Primary Schools Festival of Music Choirs. I know that the member for Florey has been to the Festival of Music quite often at the Festival Theatre and loves it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Three times a year.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, that is another uplifting experience from our young students. It is hard not to be grateful to those who make it possible. The committee of the Balaklava Eisteddfod might give themselves a two-week break, but then they start planning for next year's event. They are a hardworking group of people, a mixture of men and women, who make it possible, and I think it is important to put on the record the names of the committee members: Bronwyn Cottle, who is the president, Sally Cowan, Andrea Fisher, Jacquie Foale-Jacka, Trish Goodgame, Meriel Lane, Trish Langdon, Kathy Niejalke, Jarrad Thiele, Jenny Tiller and Heidi Zerk.

Beyond that, I know that 15 people from across South Australia become the adjudicators on the quality of the performances and therefore judge these people on their performances. I have been a sponsor for some time and, as encouragement, I make a cash payment available, traditionally in an area where schoolchildren are involved. The Balaklava Eisteddfod has 87 financial supporters, and in many cases these sponsors have been doing it for a long time. They do it because they recognise not just what the Balaklava Eisteddfod brings to the local community but the opportunity it provides.

To those involved, congratulations; to those who make it possible, absolutely well done; and, to the team of volunteers beyond the 170 officially known volunteers, well done to you. I know that just about every public facility in Balaklava of sufficient space for a performance is used. I think that at least six churches and halls are involved; they all make their buildings available and they do it for the greater good of giving people a chance to perform and for all of us to be proud. It is a wonderful event, and I encourage all members who have a chance in the future to go on the first Sunday in August.

LIGHT ELECTORATE

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:33): I would like to use the few moments I have available to talk about a couple of matters relating to my electorate. The first thing I would like to talk about is an initiative being supported by the Munno Para Kindergarten, the Munno Para Primary School, the City of Playford and Renewal SA. We are also working closely with them to initiate a community market in the Munno Para area.

This is the older part of Munno Para, which is on the eastern side of Main North Road, not to be confused with the Munno Para that is part of the Playford Alive project. This area has not had a lot of public or private investment and, as a result, the community is doing it a bit tough. We have been working together as a group to see how we can support this community, as we are supporting a number of initiatives in the north together as well.

The purpose of the market is to give residents a place to meet and chat with other people in their local area while they browse through the various stalls. It is one of those old traditional community markets, often run in the old days by churches and other community organisations. It is designed to bring a sense of community, such as a traditional old town square community, providing a variety of items from fresh produce and home-baked food to bric-a-brac.

In addition, a number of emergency services will set up displays to educate people about community safety. A number of local service clubs will be involved not only to fundraise for their own purposes but also to promote what they do in the community and recruit some new members. The market is organised by the kindergarten, which has taken on the lead role. They are looking for stallholders, and we are working with them to find some for the market that will held on Saturday 2 September.

It will be badged as a Spring Market. The aim is to hold a market at the beginning of each season, so obviously we will then have one in summer, autumn, and winter. As it turns out, the market will be held the day before Father's Day, so it will be an ideal time for people in the community to buy that last-minute gift for dad. We are hoping to have the local Men's Sheds involved, as they make a number of items that can be sold to raise funds for their projects and they also make things available for the community.

I would like to put on record my thanks to the City of Playford and Renewal SA. Both organisations have provided financial support for this event, which is great to see. I would also like to acknowledge Life Church because the community market will be held in their car park in Currie Street. I should also acknowledge the fact that Life Church run a number of community programs

without any financial support from the government. They use funds raised from their own church community and run a food event twice a week where they provide food for people who are doing it a bit tough. They run programs for bubs and mums and also men's projects. This project is doing some wonderful work in the Munno Para community, so it did not surprise me when they came on board to support this event.

Another thing I would like to bring to the attention of the parliament is the launch of a new book. I was proud to be invited last week to launch *This'll Do*. The book is written by Jeff Turner, a local resident, and he was assisted by Ms Anne Richards, history librarian at the Gawler Library. They have written about the stories of migrants who were housed and accommodated in the Williston hostel post-World War II. The hostel was built on an old RAAF base and is now the location of the Williston Oval.

Migrants included those people fleeing persecution in Europe, particularly Eastern Europe, first from Nazis and then the Russians. It is interesting that people had to go to a number of countries before they came to Australia. What we collectively know as the ten-pound Poms were also there; I think they were called 'passage assisted migrants'. This book is a wonderful record of the individual experiences of people in the town of Gawler, the first place they visited when they arrived in Australia. I commend the two historians.

INSIDER TRADING

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:38): I want to refer to some information from an interview between Mr Alan Kohler, a well-known commentator, and Mr John Sergeant, the managing director of KI Plantation Timbers in the Constant Investor on 31 July. It has been put to me that there are allegations of insider trading. The reason is that on 31 July this information came out, and it was some three days later before information was provided to the ASX. I do not believe that Mr Kohler did his homework on this. I believe he failed to check the claims made before the interview went any further.

I am given to understand that this matter has been reported to the ASX in relation to possible insider trading, which is a very serious matter, and that concerns me greatly. In his discussion with Mr Kohler, Mr Sergeant stated:

The biggest coup for KIPT is the approval to build a wharf which will allow their products to be sent to their customers in China and Japan. Plus, they [KIPT] have the cash on hand to pay for this capital investment.

He also went on to say that they would be able to recoup some of the costs from the wharf by allowing cruise ships to dock. There is no approval for that wharf whatsoever, so the statement by Mr Sergeant is blatantly untrue. There is no approval, and any approval is a long way off. It has major development status, and I have talked about that on a previous occasion.

In relation to the financial aspects of it, the cash is not on hand. They have a bank approval, which is of itself misleading. I have no doubt that Mr Sergeant and his company KIPT are anxious to boost their share price, but you cannot go out and make statements similar to this without backing them up. If you are misleading the stock exchange and misleading investors—and I will not be the one making the decision on this, but it has been reported to the ASX—I sincerely hope that they pick up on this and investigate the matter. It could be a matter for ASIC.

The way this company operates seemed unprofessional to me right from the start, and I am concerned that investors may well be damaged and lose their money. It is also alleged that our good old friend and stalwart of the Labor Party and lobbyist, Nick Bolkus, is involved somewhere in this murky deal. They are entitled to have a lobbyist, and I guess they would probably want a Labor lobbyist with there being a Labor government in South Australia. There are lots of claims that have been made by Mr Sergeant. Mr Kohler asked:

Can you explain the benefit of the wharf, the Smith Bay Wharf, to the company?

And Mr Sergeant replied:

Well, I'll do more than that. The benefit to the company is that it enables us to get our timber off the island...But they're also enormous benefits to the South Australian community because Kangaroo Island is the—the premier calls it the arrow head of South Australian tourism...

Mr Kohler then said, 'It allows cruise ships to dock then' if the wharf is put in. I think it is absolutely absurd. That is what was put to him, and he said:

Indeed it does. At the moment the cruise ships do visit in mid-Summer and try to get their passengers ashore in small boats. But if the weather is choppy, they just sail right on past. So, it should be a huge thing for Kangaroo Island tourism because it should enable year-round cruise ship visits.

What a load of codswallop! The cruise ship business does not operate in southern Australia over the winter for the very reason that the weather is foul. Anyone in their right mind knows that you would not take a cruise ship in to Kangaroo Island in the middle of winter, and the last couple of weeks have proven that.

Let me just say in relation to that matter that Tourism Kangaroo Island have never, ever discussed cruise ships going into Smith Bay. It has never been discussed by them, and they are the key organisations for tourism on the Island. So all in all, I want to find out whether these allegations of insider trading are correct. I want the ASX to investigate, and in the best interests of everyone, that needs to happen very quickly.

CHRISTIE DOWNS COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:43): I rise today to firstly speak about an important issue for our beautiful southern community and how, together with community members, it is being progressed. Our train stations and our trains are so important to so many of us. They connect us to work, to study, to family and friends and to other parts of our city. Our station is a meeting place that brings us together and the trains and our stations give us possibilities of places and people to visit and to explore. All our stations must be places that people feel safe coming to, that people want to come to, that serve us and that are great meeting hubs for our community.

Thank you to the many people in Christie Downs who have been raising their voice about the need for us to have a station at Christie Downs that is safe, accessible and welcoming. I have been calling for improvements to this station since just before having the privilege of being elected. I have been calling for a station that is the welcoming place that we want it to be and I know that others have been calling for this for decades. We know that we effect change when our collective voice is strong, loud and consistent. Thank you to all of our Christie Downs community members who have contributed to that strong collective voice.

Last year, I held a first community meeting to bring Christie Downs residents together to hear more about what they would like to see. Since then, a remarkable group of Christie Downs community members have been working very closely with me on this. Thank you to Craig Gordon, Llewellyn Jones, Connie Giacoumis, Allison Emmerson, Jules Ferguson and Artie Ferguson for their advocacy for our community. Their work has been crucial to getting to where we are now.

I am very proud that our South Australian Labor government has heard their voices and committed \$1.12 million to make improvements at the Christie Downs Railway Station, improvements which will include a CCT upgrade, landscaping, a lighting upgrade, station enhancements, improvements to our ramps to the station, facilities for bike storage and pedestrian crossing works. I am also delighted that this funding will include a community mosaic project and the set-up of a rail care group so that we can maintain our station as a community.

Last Saturday, I met again with many community members about these agreed improvements and how they would like to see them implemented at the station. It was excellent to see so many people interested and committed to making our shared spaces enjoyable and accessible to everyone in our community. Thank you again to Christie Downs Community House for their generous support of our community meeting and for providing a sausage sizzle for attendees. I know how significant this community house is for locals in Christie Downs and the important work they do to support and empower local people to engage in every aspect of community life.

I also briefly update the house on the important work done by Reclink Australia, an outstanding organisation which compassionately contributes to the rebuilding of lives through connecting people with community through sport and arts. Reclink provide evidence-based programs to disadvantaged Australians and, in doing so, they create socially-inclusive, life-changing opportunities.

Reclink delivers specialist sport, recreation and arts programs for at-risk youth, people experiencing mental illness or disability, people experiencing homelessness and domestic violence and those facing alcohol, gambling and substance addictions. In partnership with more than 200 community organisations, Reclink Australia's programs create pathways to improved health and wellbeing, education and employment outcomes. Reclink Australia's social inclusion model has incredible reach.

I was thrilled to back their work in by recently participating in the Reclink Community Cup, an iconic event with a game of grassroots footy and live music to raise funds for the organisation. The football game, which I very proudly and quite badly played in but nonetheless had a great time in, was preceded by a debate at their annual pie night.

This year, the debate focused on whether live music needs the media more than the media needs live music—a debate that this year I was very proud to adjudicate and which saw the Rockatoos (those on the affirmative for music) defeat the Anchors (those arguing for media). The debate was held at the fabulous Wheatsheaf Hotel, one of the many generous sponsors of the event.

It was excellent to play and help fundraise, alongside my colleague from the other place Tammy Franks, the Anchors coach; fabulous organisers, Libby and Matt Trainor; our captain, Jessica Braithwaite of Channel Nine; Christies Beach Football Club star, Monique Hepden; and many, many other generous players. It was also wonderful to play whilst brilliant local band, The Toss, entertained those gathered.

In excess of \$20,000 of funds was raised through the Reclink Community Cup, which will provide programs for some of our community's most disadvantaged members. Their programs include the Transformational Links program, run in partnership with the Office for Rec and Sport, which provides support and targeted opportunities to assist individuals to move beyond Reclink's programs into mainstream community activities, such as volunteering, education, training, employment and active ongoing participation in community centres, sporting groups and clubs.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (SIMPLIFY NO 2) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:49): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend various acts to simplify administrative and other processes or to remove obsolete or out-of-date matter or practices; to repeal various obsolete acts; and for other purposes.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:50): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to insert the second reading explanation into *Hansard* without reading it.

The *Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify No 2) Bill 2017* is the key feature of the Government's Simplify Day program to reduce red tape and simplify regulation for businesses and consumers.

This occasion marks the second simplify bill following the passage of the first bill in March this year, which implemented a broad range of important legislative changes and initiatives to reduce the regulatory burden in South Australia.

The State Government is committed to making South Australia the best place to do business. We are committed to creating an environment in which our businesses can operate competitively in the global economy.

Over the course of this term and in our most recent Budget, the Government has delivered significant reforms in the areas of State taxation, the Return to Work Scheme, transport, planning and the delivery of public services.

Since Simplify Day 2016, the government has also delivered on a broad range of regulatory and business process reforms on procurement, worker health and safety and screening processes for employees and volunteers. Today's focus is on further reducing the regulatory red tape burden imposed on business.

The government's red tape reduction strategy is all about supporting businesses by putting into place efficient processes. This approach supports innovation in how government regulates and interacts with business to the greatest

extent possible. Simplify Day represents a process of continual regulatory review—to ensure that our regulatory frameworks remain effective and relevant to the South Australian community.

Regulatory barriers can also hinder competition and prevent small businesses from starting up. Inefficient regulation costs more than just time and money—it makes the economy less responsive to economic trends and global market forces.

Simplify Day also supports the government being able to respond more quickly to the demands of the community and to promote commerce and innovation in the business sector.

In our second round of Simplify Day changes, there are four elements—1) legislative changes being introduced today; 2) regulatory changes made this week; 3) current reforms being delivered by the government as we speak; and 4) reforms to be delivered in the future.

The Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify No 2) Bill 2017 makes a number of changes, including to the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, the Irrigation Act 2009, the Stamp Duties Act 1923 and the State Procurement Act 2004. 29 Acts are also being amended to allow a website to be used for communicating public notices.

The Bill contains some important reforms which I will now detail.

A feature of the Bill is the various amendments to the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*. Pleasingly transport reforms have been a feature of both the inaugural Simplify Day and Simplify Day 2017. The package of initiatives reflect an ongoing commitment to supporting passenger transport, motor vehicle and goods transport improvements to support the local economy.

The transport reforms in this Bill include:

- Enabling automatic progression of a motor bike license after a period of 12 months, that is, removing the need for clients to attend a Service SA centre to have engine capacity restrictions removed from a motorcycle licence after completing 12 months on a restricted motorcycle licence,
- Offering an additional option for vehicle owners to register their light vehicle trailers, including boat trailers and caravans, for 6 month periods. This is delivering on the commitment made as part of Simplify Day 2016.
- Providing more flexibility in the accepted means of verifying a learner's test that has been passed online. This means that an applicant for a learner's permit will not be required to produce a certificate. We will also allow testing to be conducted by more delegated government employees, this will expand services, add to flexibility and create efficiencies.
- Amending the Act so that vehicle owners, once the registration has expired, can destroy the plates, surrender them voluntarily to DPTI or keep them in a safe place, not on the vehicle. This will provide cost savings for the department associated with postage and administration and save a person's time by not having to attend Service SA.
- Allowing government departments the ability to use photographs taken for driver's licences to be used for other government issued licenses. This will provide for costs savings to business and households and to agencies in having to get photographs taken and submit them to multiple government departments.

We will amend the *Road Traffic Act 1961* to allow low-risk public events to occur without the need for closing off public roads. In addition to this legislative change DPTI has implemented other policy changes which include reducing the duplication in the medical fitness to drive assessments; streamlining the multiple forms and processes so that the assessment of fitness to drive can occur without motorists going through multiple hoops. In addition, before registering as a passenger transport operator, new unmodified light vehicles –other than buses or taxis, will be able to apply for an exemption from inspection for use as a passenger transport vehicle. A valuable time saver for business.

The *Irrigation Act 2009* will be amended to facilitate new investment in South Australia's irrigated agriculture sector, by enabling irrigation trusts to adopt more efficient and fit-for-purpose business models. This is an industry driven proposal responding to market barriers under the existing legislative scheme that will positively impact on irrigators' water supply and business productivity.

The *Stamp Duties Act 1923* will be amended so that stamp duty will not apply to a family farm transfer transaction that involves family members. Stamp duty is an impediment to family farm transfers in a company structure, As such this requirement will be abolished, subject to standard conditions regarding family farm transfers being met. This issue was raised by a constituent with the Minister for Regional Development.

The *State Procurement Act 2004* will be amended to make for greater consistency across both procurements of goods and services and grants to the not-for-profit sector and to make the process for grant applications for not-for-profit businesses more efficient. This will reduce red tape by aligning as much as possible the different government policies for procurement, grant application and approvals. The Government has been working with the not-for-profit sector to implement the South Australian Not-for-profit Funding Rules and Guidelines. This work has identified a lack of clarity relating to the definition of procurement and grant.

The current definition of procurement operation in the State Procurement Act is very broad and can capture Government payments which would ordinarily be considered a grant.

The proposed amendment seeks to clarify the definition of procurement operation and provide a mechanism so that the Government can work with the not-for-profit sector to agree on a clear definition of a grant that will be specifically excluded from the procurement framework. The treatment of grants are set out in the Treasurer's Instructions established under the *Public Finance and Audit Act 1987*.

The *Fisheries Management Act 2007* will be amended to give courts clear discretion to reduce the number of demerit points where a person is found guilty of multiple offences from a single court action that together would result in disqualification from holding a fisheries license. The amendments will also ensure that fees may be collected for more than 1 year at a time saving business time and costs in renewing their fisheries licenses.

The Bill includes amendments to 29 Acts to create flexibility and include an option to publish notices online but these amendments do not remove publishing in print where it is considered the best approach. These changes follow a review into public notifications and community notices, which was announced as part of the inaugural Simplify Day.

The public notices reform is in line with the government's 'Digital by Default' objectives and aims to decrease the cost associated with public notices advertisement and the time taken to publish those notices. Where it is considered the best option, publication of notices in newspapers will continue to play an important role, particularly in rural and remote communities where internet access is not always available. There are also amendments to five regulations associated with changes to public notices.

In addition, this week the Governor has made regulations to further support Simplify Day and this Bill. The measures of note I will briefly describe to the House.

We will implement the following changes to the Second-hand Vehicle Dealers industry:

- Exemption for dealers from contributing to the Second-hand Vehicles Compensation Fund where that dealer has contributed to the Fund for other registered premises in the same financial year.
- Reduction in the prescribed amount for contribution from the fund from \$350 to \$200 for motor vehicle dealers and from \$100 to \$60 for motor cycle dealers.
- Reintroduction of the dealer handling fee. This fee relates to the costs associated with the dealer organising transfer of registration of a vehicle. A maximum fee of \$385 will be set in cases where roadworthy certification is required and a maximum of \$100 in all other cases. These changes have been supported by the Motor Trade Association.

There will be changes to the land agents regulations to remove the requirement for certain commercial property owners from needing a real estate licence. Large commercial property owners tend to rely on their experience and access to legal and other advisory services in conducting their property transactions. This amendment was announced as part of Simplify Day 2016 and is expected to reduce costs for businesses.

Changes to motor vehicles regulations will enable 3 monthly and 12 monthly direct debit for vehicle registration and the release of the name of the Compulsory Third Party insurance provider on EzyReg to simplify the insurance claims process.

The aquaculture regulations will be amended so that tuna farmers' applications for new lease area, within a tuna zone, can be exempt to be assessed by the Aquaculture Tenure Allocation Board. This assessment looks at whether the applicant's proposed operation will be viable, which is superfluous for existing tuna farmers who have been in the industry for many years. This change is possible because the pool of people or companies able to undertake tuna farming is very limited as they must hold tuna quota. This change will save the tuna industry 2 to 3 months for each application.

Fisheries Regulations will also be amended to allow for the transfer of pipi licenses from fishers to companies. This amendment is a fantastic opportunity for Aboriginal communities to enter the fishery through formation of a company. It also provides greater flexibility for licence holders who fish pipi and will contribute to ensuring the sustainability of the Lakes and Coorong Fishery.

There will also be multiple amendments to fisheries regulations to provide flexibility for the communication of information from fishers to fishery regulators either in writing or by electronic means and commits the government to publish the collected information at an industry level on a government website.

This *Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify No 2) Bill 2017* proposes the repeal of 11 spent and redundant Acts; these will be removed from the State's statute books as they have fulfilled their purpose or are no longer required. The number of repealed Acts was also 11 in last year's Simplify Day – of course this applied to different Acts that are no longer required.

Two similar acts, the *Bank Merger (National/BNZ) Act 1997* and the *Westpac/Challenge Act 1996* will both be repealed. These two Acts enabled the transfer of assets and liabilities to new banking structures and as such have served their purpose.

The *Water Resources Act 1997*, which had previously been partially repealed, no longer has any of the remaining powers assigned to it, as they now lie within the framework of Natural Resource Management legislation.

Two rather antiquated pieces of legislation will also be repealed, the *Statistics Act 1935* and the *Redundant Officers Fund Act 1936*.

The amendments, repeals and announcements of today's Simplify Day are the result of concerted and extensive engagement and collaboration with the business sector and community at large to deliver beneficial reforms that improve the competitiveness of the State.

This engagement was done through the Government's YourSAy platform, through face-to-face meetings with peak industry groups, an online survey of business as well as encouraging written submissions from small business owners and individuals.

Today is the one part of the Simplify Day initiative. Many other ideas and reforms will be the subject of future work and partnership between business and government to continue to reach a resolution on the unnecessary regulations and burdens on business in South Australia. We will continue to seek more ideas for change in our discussions with business and the community.

To that end I can advise the house that the Government has already identified many issues to continue to work on and is committed to delivering the following future reforms.

Over the last few years the Industry Advocate has received significant feedback from businesses indicating they are overwhelmed with the amount of information required during tendering and quoting processes requiring businesses to complete a template for each Department. To address this, the Industry Advocate will work with the Chief Procurement Officer to investigate whether the concept of a single Business Identifier Number for businesses interested in working with government is feasible, including costs and benefits, and what type of structure and system would need to be deployed to make such a strategy become a reality. A critical consideration for what is proposed by the Industry Advocate will be that any such system would need to be able to integrate with existing systems being used by State government agencies and be scalable if proven successful following the application of a pilot project.

Reforms to the State's planning system will support the ongoing planning needs of business and the community. To date, the implementation process has consisted of a considerable consultation process on the application of the planning act through the design code.

The design code is currently in very early stages of development and when prepared, will be required to undergo detailed community consultation. That is the point at which any changes to the current definitions for development will be considered. This will address issues raised in the Simplify Day consultation process such as rural structures, planning applications supporting agricultural businesses and CBD development.

We will look at easing the planning burden for business seeking Development Approval for things such as permanent orchard netting over fruit trees, murals in the Adelaide City Council area and simple rural developments via amendments to the *Development Regulations 2008* or via other means. This will be done through conversations with Local Government and the community and complement reforms to the State's planning system.

We will establish a State and Local Government Red Tape Taskforce with representation from local councils, relevant government departments, as well as the Local Government Association with the aim of reducing red tape that affects prevents economic development and growth of small business. The taskforce will identify and remove duplication and overlap between State and Local Government regulations as well as consider, prioritise and deliver on red tape ideas put forward as part of the Simplify Day public and industry engagement. The taskforce will be established under the governance of my State/Local Government Forum.

The State's tourism sector is a significant contributor to the South Australian economy and it is vital to jobs and incomes in regional South Australia. Consultation undertaken for Simplify Day raised issues in the tourism sector, for example some regional caravan parks operators that have had difficulty raising finance and gaining approvals to progress development applications. In the context of these issues, the government will ensure an approach that supports high quality regional tourism developments so they can be approved in a timely and efficient manner.

We will consult with a number of tourism operators such as caravan parks, bed and breakfast operators and tourism experience providers to gain a detailed understanding of the administration hurdles they encounter with tourism development – such as development, planning and environmental approvals and ongoing compliance to regulations. We are currently implementing a major planning system reform and will ensure that the implementation of the reformed system supports tourism operators and investment in regional tourism development. In addition, the South Australia's Nature Based Tourism Strategy is committed to removing red tape to remove barriers to investment to help support existing and create new nature based tourism experiences.

We will investigate opportunities to ensure that state and territory payroll tax definitions are as consistent across Australia as possible. This would include reviewing relevant legislation and administration practices to identify opportunities to achieve greater consistency, less complexity and better compliance.

A longer term reform program will be undertaken to reducing red tape and removing outdated regulatory burden in key industry sectors.

This approach will involve Government working collaboratively with industry and business to process map the regulatory journey and reduce unnecessary barriers in key areas. One particular focus area will be small scale artisan food and drink producers, allowing the economic opportunities for 'paddock to plate' businesses to flourish by allowing small businesses a whole supply chain approach to their production, and enhance employment opportunities across the State, while maintaining our standards.

To complement work being done to the *Long Service Leave Regulations 2002*, SafeWork SA will implement a range of tools to assist to assist employers and workers to better understand and comply with their long service leave obligations. These tools will include guidance material on South Australia's long service leave laws, as well as an online calculator to determine a worker's long service leave entitlement and online forms to assist employers to comply with their record keeping requirements.

SafeWork SA is also developing simple, easy to understand information which will be promoted to small business outlining the requirements when it comes to inspection and testing of electrical plant. This will help small businesses increase their understanding of the changed requirements and about their obligations regarding inspection and testing of electrical plant.

The changes announced today continue the Government's regulatory reform agenda. Simplify Day is a commitment to continuously looking for ways to reduce the red tape burden on business in the State and to improving government processes to support the economy and services to the community.

The *Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify No 2) Bill 2017* is another important step in removing unnecessary red tape. It is removing the regulatory and administrative burden on business and the community and improving the State's competitiveness.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

This clause provides that, other than those provisions of the measure in respect of which it is specifically provided will commence on a date or on proclamation, the measure will commence on receiving the Governor's assent.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Aerodrome Fees Act 1998*

4—Amendment of section 6—Aerodrome operator may fix fees for arrivals, departures etc

The proposed amendment provides that if an aerodrome operator fixes fees, a notice setting out the fees must be published by the operator in the Gazette. The notice can also be published on the operator's website, or in a periodical publication prescribed for the purpose, or in a daily newspaper circulating in the State.

Part 3—Amendment of *Agricultural and Veterinary Products (Control of Use) Act 2002*

5—Amendment of section 20—Manner of making order

The proposed amendment provides that as soon as practicable after a trade protection order addressed as referred to in section 20(1)(b) is made, a notice setting out the date on which the notice is published, the terms of the order and the persons to be bound by the order, must be published by the Minister in a manner and form that, in the opinion of the Minister, will be most likely to bring the order to the attention of the persons bound by it.

Part 4—Amendment of *Air Transport (Route Licensing—Passenger Services) Act 2002*

6—Amendment of section 5—Declared routes

This proposed amendment provides that the Minister must ensure that a copy of the relevant notice relating to a declaration under section 5 is published—

- on a website determined by the Minister; or
- in a newspaper circulating generally in the State; or
- in a newspaper circulating generally in Australia.

Part 5—Amendment of *Aquaculture Act 2001*

7—Amendment of section 28—Granting of corresponding licence for pilot lease

8—Amendment of section 35—Granting of production leases and corresponding licences in public call areas

9—Amendment of section 36—Granting of production leases and corresponding licences if public call not required

10—Amendment of section 39A—Granting of research leases and corresponding licences

11—Amendment of section 50—Grant of licences other than corresponding licences

The proposed amendments provide for an alternative to current requirements for publishing various notices or publicising other information under the principal Act by means of publishing on a website determined by the Minister.

Part 6—Amendment of *Associations Incorporation Act 1985*

12—Amendment of section 43A—Application for deregistration

This proposed amendment would allow the Commission to publish a notice of an application under section 43A in a manner and form determined by the Commission to be most appropriate in the circumstances.

13—Amendment of section 44—Defunct associations

This amendment would allow the Commission, by notice published in a manner and form determined by the Commission to be most appropriate in the circumstances, to give notice requiring an association to show good cause why it should not be dissolved.

Part 7—Amendment of *AustralAsia Railway (Third Party Access) Act 1999*

14—Amendment of Schedule—AustralAsia Railway (Third Party Access) Code

The regulator must undertake public consultation when the regulator is undertaking a review or considering adopting a guideline. The amendment would provide the regulator with the option of publishing on a website or in a newspaper a notice about the matter on which consultation is to occur.

Part 8—Repeal of *Bank Merger (National/BNZ) Act 1997*

15—Repeal of Bank Merger (National/BNZ) Act 1997

This Act is to be repealed.

Part 9—Repeal of *Corporal Punishment Abolition Act 1971*

16—Repeal of Corporal Punishment Abolition Act 1971

This Act is to be repealed.

Part 10—Amendment of *Correctional Services Act 1982*

17—Amendment of section 81E—Notice to victims to be published

This proposed amendment requires the CE to publish in the Gazette a notice notifying victims. The CE may also publish the notice in other ways, including on a website determined by the CE.

Part 11—Amendment of *Crown Land Management Act 2009*

18—Insertion of section 18A

This clause inserts a new provision requiring the consent of the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Crown Land Management Act 2009* before a council resolves to exclude dedicated land from classification as community land in the circumstances described in section 193(4)(a) of the *Local Government Act 1999*.

Part 12—Amendment of *Dog Fence Act 1946*

19—Substitution of section 35A

35A—Establishment of local dog fence boards

New section 35A provides for the Minister, on the recommendation of the board, by notice in the Gazette, to establish a local dog fence board constituted of the persons specified in the notice for the area inside a dog fence specified in the notice, with the powers and duties specified in the notice.

20—Substitution of section 35C

35C—Variation and abolition of local boards

New section 35C allows the Minister, on the recommendation of the board, by further notice in the Gazette—

- to amend or vary a notice under section 35A; or
- to abolish a local board and make provision for incidental matters.

Part 13—Amendment of *Emergency Services Funding Act 1998*

21—Amendment of section 20—Sale of land for non-payment of levy

The proposed amendment gives the Commissioner the option to advertise notice of an auction on a website determined by the Commissioner.

Part 14—Amendment of *Environment Protection Act 1993*

22—Amendment of section 28—Normal procedure for making policies

23—Amendment of section 39—Notice and submissions in respect of applications for environmental authorisations

The amendments proposed would provide for the option of publishing notices on a website or in a newspaper.

24—Amendment of section 46—Notice and submissions in respect of proposed variations of conditions

This amendment would provide the option to cause public notice of a proposed variation to be published in a manner and form determined by the Authority to be most appropriate in the circumstances.

Part 15—Amendment of *Explosives Act 1936*

25—Amendment of section 25—Power to sell explosives

The amendment would allow a call for public tender under the section to be published on a website determined by the Director or in a newspaper.

Part 16—Amendment of *Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005*

26—Amendment of section 78—Fire danger season

The amendment would allow the Chief Officer's order fixing a fire danger season to be published in the Gazette and also on a website, in a State-wide newspaper or in a local newspaper.

27—Amendment of section 105F—Private land

A notice to take specific action may be published on a website or in a local newspaper if the responsible person cannot be served personally or by post.

Part 17—Amendment of *Fisheries Management Act 2007*

28—Amendment of section 44—Procedure for preparing management plans

The amendment would allow the Minister to publish notice of the intention to prepare a management plan on a website or in a newspaper.

29—Amendment of section 54—Application for licence, permit or registration

30—Amendment of section 57—Transfer of licence or permit

31—Amendment of section 64—Applications for registration

The amendments proposed to each of these sections remove the necessity for applications to be signed or are consequential on the amendments proposed to section 127 of the principal Act.

32—Amendment of section 68—Issue of duplicate authority

This amendment is consequential on the amendments proposed to section 127 of the principal Act.

33—Amendment of section 104—Demerit points for certain offences

This proposed amendment provides a court with guidance in deciding whether to reduce the number of demerit points incurred by a person on being found guilty of expiating an offence.

34—Amendment of section 116—Registers

This is consequential.

35—Amendment of section 127—General

This proposed amendment makes it clear that the regulations may—

- prescribe fees for the purposes of the principal Act and regulate the payment, refund, waiver or reduction of such fees; and
- prescribe various methods for the calculation of various fees; and
- prescribe fees which may be differential, varying according to any factor stated in the regulations; and
- prescribe amounts payable for the late payment of fees under the principal Act.

Part 18—Amendment of *Gaming Machines Act 1992*

36—Amendment of section 29—Certain applications require advertisement

The proposed change provides that the required notice—

- must be published in the Gazette and on a website; and
- may be published in a State-wide newspaper or in a local newspaper.

37—Amendment of section 42A—Advertisement of certain applications and objections

The publication by the applicant of notice must be advertised in the Gazette and on a website or in a State-wide newspaper.

Part 19—Amendment of *Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004*

38—Amendment of section 5—Designation of areas

The proposed amendment allows the Minister to choose between publishing the notice in a newspaper or on the Department's website.

Part 20—Amendment of *Geographical Names Act 1991*

39—Amendment of section 11B—Assignment of geographical name

This clause amends section 11B by establishing the publication requirements for a notice under the section to be in the Gazette and on a website or in a local newspaper.

Part 21—Amendment of *Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act 1996*

40—Amendment of section 11—Public notice of investigation

This clause substitutes section 11(1) of the principal Act to provide that the Commissioner may determine the manner and form of a notice of investigation.

Part 22—Amendment of *Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013*

41—Amendment of section 10—Other declarations for purposes of Heavy Vehicle National Law in this jurisdiction

This amendment updates the references to reflect recent changes to the Law to declare the Magistrates Court to be the relevant tribunal or court for the purposes of section 590D as well as section 556 of the Law. This amendment will not come into operation until 1 July 2018.

Part 23—Amendment of *Impounding Act 1920*

42—Amendment of section 25—Notice of impounding

The amendment will allow for the publication of a notice to be in a newspaper or on the Department's website.

43—Amendment of section 26—Poundkeeper may charge for service of notice

44—Amendment of section 32—Proceedings prior to sale by poundkeeper of unclaimed cattle

45—Amendment of section 33—Time and mode of sale of impounded cattle

The other proposed amendments are consequential on the changes made to section 25 of the principal Act.

Part 24—Amendment of *Irrigation Act 2009*

46—Amendment of section 14—Dissolution on application

47—Amendment of section 15—Dissolution on Minister's initiative

The proposed amendments to sections 14 and 15 of the principal Act facilitate the vesting or attachment of irrigation trust property, rights and liabilities in 1 or more persons on the dissolution of the trust. However, if that is not practicable or appropriate, the property, rights and liabilities will vest in or attach to the Crown or an agency or instrumentality of the Crown (including a Minister), as specified by the Minister.

48—Repeal of section 16

This clause repeals section 16 of the principal Act. Section 16 concerns the disposal of property on the dissolution of a trust. Those matters are now covered by the amendments to sections 14 and 15.

Part 25—Repeal of *Liens on Fruit Act 1923*

49—Repeal of Liens on Fruit Act 1923

This Act is to be repealed.

Part 26—Amendment of *Livestock Act 1997*

50—Amendment of section 37—Gazette notices

This clause amends the provision to enable the relevant notice to be published on a website determined by the Minister.

Part 27—Amendment of *Marine Parks Act 2007*

51—Amendment of section 14—Procedure for making or amending management plans

Publication procedures are updated and simplified in this amendment with Gazette and newspaper notices replaced by notices on a website determined by the Minister.

Part 28—Amendment of *Maritime Services (Access) Act 2000*

52—Amendment of section 43—Review and expiry of Part

The amendments by this clause to section 43 of the principal Act alter the publishing requirements for giving notice of a review of the operation of Part 3 of the Act as it applies to particular industries.

Part 29—Amendment of *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*

53—Amendment of section 24—Duty to grant registration

This clause amends section 24 to enable the period of registration of motor vehicles other than heavy vehicles to be prescribed by the regulations.

54—Amendment of section 38A—Reduced fees for pensioner entitlement card holders

This clause amends section 38A to remove the reference to the 'State concession card' which no longer exists.

55—Amendment of section 38AB—Registration fees for trailers owned by pensioner entitlement card holders

This clause amends section 38AB to remove the reference to the 'State concession card' which no longer exists.

56—Amendment of section 47C—Return, recovery etc of number plates

This clause amends section 47C so that the Registrar is not required to direct the owner of a motor vehicle to return number plates to the Registrar when the registration of the vehicle expires, is void or is cancelled other than on the owner's application. The amendment will allow the Registrar to direct the owner to destroy the plates or ensure that they are securely stored so that they can't be affixed to a motor vehicle that is driven on a road or allowed to stand on a road.

57—Substitution of section 72

This clause substitutes section 72.

72—Classification of licences

Subsection (1) provides that a licence must be assigned 1 or more prescribed classifications.

Subsection (2) provides that subject to the Act, if a person applies for the grant or renewal of a licence and the licence is granted or renewed (as the case may be), the Registrar must ensure that the licence is assigned the classification for which the person has applied.

Subsection (3) provides that if—

- (a) an applicant for the renewal of a licence applies for the licence to be assigned any further or other classification; and
- (b) the Registrar is satisfied that the applicant is competent to drive a motor vehicle in respect of which that further or other classification is required under this Act,

the Registrar must ensure that the licence, if renewed, is assigned that further or other classification.

Subsection (4) provides that if the Registrar is satisfied that a person who holds a licence is competent to drive motor vehicles for which a licence assigned a further or other classification is required under this Act, the Registrar must ensure that the licence is assigned the appropriate further or other classification.

Subsection (5) provides that Registrar may, for the purposes of this section, require a person who holds a licence or applies for the grant or renewal of a licence to provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Registrar of the person's competency to drive motor vehicles for which a particular classification is required under this Act.

Subsection (6) provides that the regulations may provide that, for the purposes of this Act, a person is to be taken to hold a licence that is assigned a particular classification if the person has held a licence of some other classification for a prescribed period (the *qualifying period*).

Subsection (7) provides that, subject to the regulations, a classification assigned to a licence must be endorsed on the licence.

Subsection (8) provides that for the purposes of the Act, in determining whether a person has held a licence for the qualifying period, any period during which—

- (a) the person's licence was suspended; or
- (b) the person was disqualified from holding or obtaining a licence in this State or in another State or Territory of the Commonwealth,

is not to be taken into account.

58—Amendment of section 77BA—Use of photographs taken or supplied for inclusion on a licence or learner's permit

This clause amends section 77BA so that a photograph taken or supplied for inclusion on a driver's licence or learner's permit can be used on a licence, permit or other authority issued under the Harbors and Navigation Act, the Passenger Transport Act or a prescribed Act, or for a purpose authorised by the person whose image appears in the photograph.

59—Amendment of section 79—Examination of applicant for licence or learner's permit

This clause amends section 79 to allow the Registrar to accept evidence (other than a certificate) that an applicant has passed a theoretical examination. It also broadens the definition of tester to include persons or classes of persons to be authorised by the Registrar as testers.

60—Amendment of section 80—Ability or fitness to be granted or hold licence or permit

61—Amendment of section 141—Evidence by certificate etc

62—Amendment of section 145—Regulations

These clauses make minor amendments that are consequential on the substitution of section 72.

Part 30—Amendment of *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*

63—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

The definition of *Director* is updated reflecting new appointment procedures in section 11A. *Public notice* is defined as notice published on a website determined by the Minister.

64—Insertion of section 11A

New section 11A (headed Director of National Parks and Wildlife) is inserted governing the appointment of the Director.

65—Amendment of section 38—Management plans

Publication of the notice in subsection (3) need now only be on a website determined by the Minister, and not in the Gazette or a newspaper.

66—Amendment of section 41A—Alteration of boundaries of reserves

Publication of the notice in subsection (2) need now only be on a website determined by the Minister, and not in the Gazette or a newspaper.

67—Amendment of section 49A—Permits for commercial purposes

Publication of the notice in subsection (1) and the recommendations in subsection (4) need now only be on a website determined by the Minister, and not in a newspaper.

68—Amendment of section 60D—Code of management

Publication of the notice in subsection (5) need now only be on a website determined by the Minister, and not in the Gazette or a newspaper. Publication of the notice in subsection (7) need now only be on a website determined by the Minister, and not in a newspaper.

69—Amendment of section 60I—Plan of management

Publication of the notices in subsection (4) and (7) need now only be on a website determined by the Minister, and not in the Gazette or a newspaper.

Part 31—Amendment of *Payroll Tax Act 2009*

70—Section 95—Assessment if no probate within 6 months of death

This proposed amendment replaces the requirement to publish the notice in a newspaper with a requirement to publish the notice on a website, with publishing in a newspaper to be optional.

Part 32—Amendment of *Petroleum Products Regulation Act 1995*

71—Amendment of section 34—Controls during periods of restriction

This would allow notice of the directions to be published in the Gazette, on a website determined by the Minister or in a newspaper.

72—Amendment of section 38—Publication of desirable principles for conserving petroleum

This amendment would allow desirable principles to be observed to be published in the Gazette, on a website determined by the Minister or in a newspaper.

Part 33—Amendment of *Phylloxera and Grape Industry Act 1995*

73—Amendment of section 18—Duty to prepare and maintain five year plan

This amendment would allow the Board to publish a notice of the date, time, place and purpose of a public meeting on a website determined by the Board or in a newspaper circulating generally throughout the State (or both).

Part 34—Amendment of *Prices Act 1948*

74—Amendment of section 12—Accounts and records in relation to certain declared goods and services

The proposed amendment would allow the choice between publishing the notice in the Gazette, or in a newspaper, or on the Commissioner's website.

Part 35—Amendment of *Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act 1998*

75—Amendment of section 9—Management plan for fund

This clause would allow the person or body administering the fund to publish notice of a public meeting to be convened in a manner and form that, in the opinion of the person or body, will be most likely to bring the notice to the attention of members of the public.

Part 36—Amendment of *Public Assemblies Act 1972*

76—Amendment of section 4—Notice of assembly

This amendment would provide for the option of publishing a copy of an objection to an assembly on a website determined by the Minister.

Part 37—Amendment of *Public Finance and Audit Act 1987*

77—Amendment of section 8—Special deposit accounts

This clause amends section 8 so that the power of the Treasurer to establish and maintain a special deposit account, and the power to approve a purpose of, or relating to, a government department for the purposes of section 8, can be delegated by the Treasurer.

78—Amendment of section 9—Imprest accounts

This clause amends section 9 so that the power of the Treasurer to establish an imprest account can be delegated by the Treasurer.

79—Amendment of section 21—Deposits

Section 21 provides that money accepted by the Treasurer on deposit from a person must be recorded in a separate account maintained by the Treasurer. This clause amends the section to enable the Treasurer to delegate the power to establish and maintain accounts.

80—Insertion of section 42

Proposed section 42 applies where the Treasurer delegates a power under the Act. The delegation—

- may be to a specified person or to a person occupying or acting in a specified position; and
- must be in writing; and
- may be absolute or conditional; and
- does not derogate from the power of the Treasurer to act in a matter; and
- is revocable at will by the Treasurer.

Part 38—Amendment of *Railways (Operations and Access) Act 1997*

81—Amendment of section 7A—Review and expiry of access regime

The amendment provides for the regulator to give reasonable notice of the review of the access regime, by publishing a notice in a manner and form determined by the regulator to be most appropriate in the circumstances,

inviting written submissions on the matters under review within a reasonable time specified for the purpose in the notice.

Part 39—Repeal of *Redundant Officers Fund Act 1936*

82—Repeal of Redundant Officers Fund Act 1936

This Act is to be repealed.

Part 40—Amendment of *Road Traffic Act 1961*

83—Amendment of section 33—Road closing and exemptions for certain events

This clause amends section 33 so that on the application of any person interested, the Minister may declare an event to be an event to which section 33 applies and may do either or both of the following:

- (a) make an order directing that specified roads (being roads on which the event is to be held or roads that, in the Minister's opinion, should be closed for the purposes of the event) be closed to traffic for a period specified in, or determined in accordance with, the order;
- (b) make an order directing that persons participating in the event be exempted, in relation to specified roads, from the duty to observe an enactment, regulation or by-law prescribing a rule to be observed on roads by pedestrians or drivers of vehicles.

Part 41—Amendment of *Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act 2008*

84—Amendment of section 10—Publication of notice of application

85—Amendment of section 12—Notice of declaration

86—Amendment of section 14—Revocation of declaration

87—Amendment of section 38—Service

88—Amendment of section 39B—Notice of registration

89—Amendment of section 39G—Notice of cancellation or expiry of registration of corresponding declaration

The amendments will allow notices under the principal Act to be published on the Commissioner's website or in a newspaper, as well as having to be published in the Gazette.

Part 42—Repeal of *Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act 1921*

90—Repeal of Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act 1921

This Act is to be repealed.

Part 43—Repeal of *Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation (South Australia) Act 1971*

91—Repeal of Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation (South Australia) Act 1971

This Act is to be repealed.

Part 44—Amendment of *Stamp Duties Act 1923*

92—Amendment of section 71CC—Interfamilial transfer of farming property

This clause amends section 71CC(1) of the *Stamp Duties Act 1923* so as to extend the exemption that currently applies where land used for the business of primary production is transferred between family members (including trusts with beneficiaries who are family members) to include transfers involving companies where the shareholders of the company are family members and a family relationship exists between the transferor and transferee. For the exemption to apply, the sole or principal business of at least one shareholder of the company must be the business of primary production, and there must have been a business relationship between at least one of the shareholders and the other party for a period of 12 months with respect to the use of the property for the business of primary production.

93—Transitional provision

This section provides that the amendments made by section 92 to section 71CC of the *Stamp Duties Act 1923* apply only in relation to instruments executed after the commencement of Part 44.

Part 45—Amendment of *State Procurement Act 2004*

94—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

The amendments will clarify the definition of *procurement operations* so as to include the procurement of the delivery of a service by a third party on behalf of the authority, but so as not to include—

- the provision of funding to a third party by the authority that, in accordance with Treasurer's instructions, is classified as a grant; or
- operations excluded from this definition by the regulations;

Part 46—Repeal of *Statistics Act 1935*

95—Repeal of *Statistics Act 1935*

This Act is to be repealed.

Part 47—Repeal of *Statutory Salaries and Fees Act 1947*

96—Repeal of *Statutory Salaries and Fees Act 1947*

This Act is to be repealed.

Part 48—Amendment of *Summary Offences Act 1953*

97—Amendment of section 72A—Power to conduct metal detector searches etc

This amendment would give the Commissioner of Police the option of publishing a notice of a declaration under section 72A on the Commissioner's website or in a newspaper.

Part 49—Repeal of *War Service Rights (State Employees) Act 1945*

98—Repeal of *War Service Rights (State Employees) Act 1945*

This Act is to be repealed.

Part 50—Repeal of *Water Resources Act 1997*

99—Repeal of *Water Resources Act 1997*

This Act is to be repealed.

Part 51—Repeal of *Westpac/Challenge Act 1996*

100—Repeal of *Westpac/Challenge Act 1996*

This Act is to be repealed.

Part 52—Amendment of *Wilderness Protection Act 1992*

101—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

The definition of *public notice* is amended to mean notice published on a website determined by the Minister, and no longer means notice published in the Gazette.

102—Amendment of section 12—Wilderness code of management

This is a consequential amendment preserving the status quo with respect to public notification of the adoption of a revised or substituted code of management (namely by notice in the Gazette).

103—Amendment of section 16—Prevention of certain activities

This amendment gives the Minister discretion to publish a notice under subsection (7) in a newspaper or on the Minister's website, whichever medium the Minister considers appropriate in the circumstances.

104—Amendment of section 31—Plans of management

This is a consequential amendment preserving the status quo with respect to public notification of the adoption of plan of management (namely by notice in the Gazette).

105—Amendment of section 33—Prohibited areas

This amendment preserves the status quo with respect to public notification of the declaration of prohibited areas or variation or revocation of such declarations (namely by notice in the Gazette) but also adds a requirement for the notifications to be on a website determined by the Minister.

Part 53—Amendment of *Work Health and Safety Act 2012*

106—Amendment of section 274—Approved codes of practice

This amendment would provide the Minister with the option of publishing notice of the approval, variation or revocation of a code of practice on a website or in a newspaper as well as in the Gazette.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

*Motions***STATE ENERGY PLAN**

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:50): I move:

That this house—

1. Recognises South Australia is taking charge of its own energy future under the South Australian energy plan;
2. Recognises South Australia is leading the world with the next generation of renewable energy generation and storage opportunities;
3. Recognises that South Australian power for South Australians in the only plan that will embed renewable base load energy to the electricity sector that—
 - (a) puts downward pressure on power prices for households across the South Australian community;
 - (b) provides system security by sourcing, generating and controlling more of our electricity network; and
 - (c) moves to a lower emission electricity profile to help meet our COP21 Paris commitments.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I move:

That the time allotted for the debate be one hour.

Motion carried.

The future of our energy system is obviously one of the key issues facing South Australia at the moment, perhaps a defining issue facing South Australians. It goes to the heart of much of what we can achieve as a state, everything we are building on today, everything we hope to explore and create and become as a state in the decades ahead.

What we need is a reliable, affordable and clean energy future for our state. In the short to medium term, of course, we want to put downward pressure on energy prices for businesses and households and to end the load shedding events such as that we saw on 8 February. We also want the energy capacity to carry out major projects, such as our future submarine project, the big new mines that are being planned in our north and Eyre Peninsula and, of course, the revitalisation of Whyalla.

We also want to be in a position to fuel, with green and renewable energy, the high-tech industries still to emerge in this country and beyond. Indeed, instead of having our traditional role of being a more expensive energy-producing state, largely because of our very long distribution networks and our relative poverty of resources such as the coal that was burnt here—there were natural reasons why there was an incrementally higher price here in South Australia—we want to turn that around to have a low-cost energy future, which is not only clean and reliable but actually gives us an increment on the rest of the nation and, therefore, attracts energy-intensive industries to South Australia.

We want to continue to demonstrate leadership on climate change and to fulfil our commitments to the goals set down in the COP21 summit in Paris in 2015. We want to do that because we want to be good international citizens, but also for the reputational benefit that that accrues to our state. The imperative for action has never been more acute, yet the National Electricity Market is broken and is serving badly not only us but the nation. Worse still, the absence of a coherent national energy policy has led to the crippling of investment in new energy generation.

That is, of course, the nub of the issue. What we have seen is a decade of public policy stalemate, where the Labor Party has consistently been advocating for a price on carbon. Indeed, it was the South Australian government that led a series of other state governments. We were a leader in setting up the Council of Australian Governments. South Australia led that process when all the state governments were Labor governments. We led that process, and we commissioned the Garnaut report. The Garnaut report was taken over by the incoming Rudd government.

Remember that the 2007 election was all about climate change; in fact, so much so that we even had John Howard, at the behest of Malcolm Turnbull, the then environment minister, committing

to a price on carbon. It is an extraordinary proposition that the now Prime Minister, then environment minister, had taken his own prime minister, John Howard, to that position—a position that many conservative leaders had arrived at, including even Margaret Thatcher—that there needed to be a response to climate change. Even if one did not necessarily share the view about the science, it was such an established consensus that it was a risk that had to be managed. That is what a conservative government would do.

Indeed, there is something quite bizarre about the fact that the propositions being advanced by Labor governments are propositions that are straight up and down, classical economic solutions; that is, an externality is causing market distortions. You put a price on that externality, so you get the efficient allocation of resources. This is straight up and down, classical economics, and it is being advanced by the Labor Party as a sensible and efficient way of responding to the proper allocation of resources yet, bizarrely, what are being advanced on the other side are solutions that can be categorised as command economy solutions, to the extent that there is any acceptance at all of the need to act.

In this environment, you would expect the public to demand bold plans and solutions from across the political spectrum, but that is not what is occurring here in South Australia. There is only one party—the Labor Party—that has a comprehensive, feasible and long-term plan in the form of South Australian power for South Australians. This plan, with its six key elements, has received broad support from across the business community and from across the commentariat that understands the question of energy policy.

What is extraordinary is we have a Liberal opposition in this state that has promised on more than one occasion that they would release an energy plan but have consistently broken every deadline that they have announced. First it was going to be May, then it was going to be upon the publication of the Finkel review, and now we know it is in the never-never. What we do know of their plan is it amounts to the abolition of the state-based renewable energy target, and what we know about that is that was announced on the same day as every other Liberal leader around the nation announced the exact same policy.

So it was not even a policy that was dreamt up. It was a policy forced on them by their federal colleagues to play into some national game that was being played to try to embarrass federal Labor. The essence of the Liberal Party policy in South Australia is for them to hand over control of renewable energy to those MPs who are handing around lumps of coal in the federal parliament. That is what the Liberal Party policy amounts to.

Our approach in March, consistent with the government's leadership on climate change and renewables, was to devise an energy plan, which was to ensure that more of South Australia's power is sourced, generated and controlled in this state because of the broken National Electricity Market. In the past four months or so, we have been implementing that plan and getting the results. For example, we have legislated to ensure that the energy minister has the power to direct electricity generators to turn on their plants if there is a supply shortfall.

We have distributed a new round of grants valued at \$24 million to encourage companies to extract more gas. With the assistance of Tesla and Neoen, we are building the world's biggest lithium ion battery, and recently I announced that a state-owned electricity power plant will be installed ahead of summer, initially at the Lonsdale desalination plant and Holden Elizabeth site. We have seen tangible evidence not just of this plan being implemented but of the benefits of it being calibrated to work consistently with the existing market.

The truth is that it is a market, whether we like it or not. We did not support the privatisation, but it is a private market so, unless the government is going to take back every element of that market, it needs to calibrate its interventions consistent with the market. The evidence that this plan is consistent with the market and is not sterilising investor confidence is the decision by AGL to build its first generator in South Australia for years. Another is the decision by Pelican Point to now be back on full operation after major capital expenditure.

Those private sector commitments would not be made if our plan had not been properly calibrated as an intervention that was consistent with private sector investment. This contrasts with those members opposite. What is extraordinary is this notion that somehow we should turn on the

old dirty coal-fired power station at Northern, the idea that we should ban unconventional fracking in the state's South-East for 10 years, the idea of building a nuclear power plant. None of these things is internally consistent. None of these things has any semblance of being able to make a relevant contribution to the challenges that South Australia faces at the moment.

What we need is national leadership. We need a state Labor Party together with a state Liberal Party that stand together and call for a national energy policy that integrates both climate change policy and energy policy. What we do not need is the Leader of the Opposition here essentially kowtowing to those in the Eastern States and indeed to the federal parliament, which is completely and utterly beholden to coal interests in this nation.

What we have seen in the debates that have occurred so far is that, every single step of the way when we have announced a positive contribution to solve the challenges that our energy crisis is throwing up to South Australia, we just see negativity and criticism when, on any view of it, the measures we are putting in place are sensible measures to advance South Australia's energy future. I commend the motion to the house. Our plan is working. It is being implemented as we speak, and there are further exciting announcements to come.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:02): The opposition takes the energy crisis in South Australia extremely seriously, but we do not take this motion seriously. It is just a political stunt by the government. The opposition wants to deal productively with this issue, but this motion is just a stunt by the government and a way of delaying debate on the Budget Measures Bill, which includes the bank tax. Deputy Speaker, as you would know, this is the last day of parliament for quite a while, and the government is doing everything possible to avoid time spent on that issue and is running this stunt instead.

We have just heard the Premier's version of events, but let me tell you the public's version of events—real, on the ground South Australian people's version of events. They have seen extraordinary price rises. They have suffered through blackouts. They have had job losses. There is extremely high unemployment across the state—embarrassingly high unemployment across the state, you would think, for this government. Perhaps worst of all, we have the highest level per capita of all states of outstanding electricity debt, payment plans for people in hardship situations and electricity disconnections.

That is the reality that South Australians are facing at the moment, so how did we get here? To evaluate the government's plan, we need to clearly understand why the government needs to put forward a plan. How did we get here? Sixteen years of Labor government—that is the first point to make. For nearly six years, the energy minister has had responsibility. The energy minister has had responsibility for exactly this for six years, and the government has actually been in place for 16 years, so it is very hard for them to turn and try to point the finger at other people.

Premier Rann was an active pursuer of popularity with the Green voters and he pursued wind farms for political purposes. There is nothing wrong with wind farms. There is no doubt whatsoever that we must make a transition away from fossil fuels towards renewables, but premier Rann started the current government, followed by Premier Weatherill, down this path of trying to jump overnight to an excessive level of renewable energy within our energy mix. He pursued wind farms which did not have storage, which meant that South Australia was awash with cheap electricity when it is windy but, of course, when it is not windy we do not have nearly enough electricity and it is very expensive.

This wholesale price volatility has been incredibly damaging to our nation. This wholesale price volatility has driven out base load generation because the base loaders cannot respond in a timely fashion to the ups and downs of the weather. Of course, this has resulted in very, very steep retail price increases. This has been going on for many years but, Deputy Speaker, you would be familiar that in July last year we had an average of a 12 per cent increase in retail prices and in July this year another 18 per cent on top of that.

That is the real-world outcome of the impact of the state Labor government's energy policy over the last 16 years. It flows through from policy, to generation, to markets, to retail prices, to customers, and they are the ones who are suffering and being punished by this government's policies. The Minister for Energy wants to blame everyone else for these problems. Last July, when

the retail market announced their 12 per cent increases, his answer to everybody was to shop around. He said, 'Just shop around; that will be okay. Just go and find a cheaper supplier.' That was his answer. Then he blamed the retailers. He said he wanted to get a study done and asked ESCOSA to get a study done to look into the veracity of the retailers' increases in prices.

To his shock and horror, ESCOSA came back and actually said that, from a market perspective, the price rises were quite justified because they were all linked to an increase in wholesale prices. The government's policy had increased the wholesale market and that was flowing through. That is a great shame. I am not supporting the fact that the retail price has increased, but I am saying that the government was very quick to blame the retailers. However, ESCOSA said, 'Actually, no. It comes back to government policy and into the wholesale market.'

Of course, the energy minister then tried to blame AEMO and the National Electricity Market. He said it was their fault, that they were not looking after South Australia nearly well enough and that it was everybody's fault except the South Australian government's. While the minister tried to blame the national market, back on 29 September 2016 the minister said:

We are the lead legislator for the National Electricity Market. We have a lot of in-depth, in-situ advice given to us constantly by world experts based here in South Australia—people whose lives have been dedicated to the management of the National Electricity Market and its establishment... We have designed it, we have built it...

At one point in time the energy minister wants to claim credit for the national market when it is going well, but at another time when it is not going well he wants to blame them for being the cause of all the problems.

The minister then moved on to call the major retailers—with an 's' on the end of that word—'monopolies'. The minister has said many times that the retailers selling electricity into the South Australian market are monopolies. He said, 'They are using their monopoly power.' Nothing could be further from the truth with regard to the definition of the word 'monopoly'. Clearly, by definition, if there is more than one of them in the market then none of them are monopolies. That goes directly to the energy minister's understanding of markets and of how things really work.

However, the biggest mistake of all was the government forcing the closure of the Port Augusta power station. When he spoke just a little while ago, the Premier said that of course he was never going to go back to coal and that of course he did not want to do that. I can understand that. I said earlier that we do need to transition away from fossil fuels, but the opportunity the government deliberately threw away to contribute \$8 million of South Australian taxpayers' money per year to keep the Port Augusta power station open for three more years—just temporarily—was one that should definitely have been taken.

That would not have plunged us headlong into a world of forever burning coal, but it would have allowed us to avoid many of the penalties that South Australians have suffered. The moment the closure of the Port Augusta power station was announced, forward contract markets rose. The moment the Port Augusta power station actually closed, spot wholesale prices rose significantly. That certainly could have been avoided on a temporary basis while the government worked their way through this problem sensibly. However, they decided, for purely political reasons, that they did not want to do that.

The Treasurer has made much of the fact that there was no guarantee that Alinta would keep the power station open. However, in their offer was a guarantee that, if they did not stay open, the government would not have to spend a cent towards that claim. It was an opportunity that needed to be considered, and should have been considered, and we know now the ramifications of not taking up that opportunity, that temporary opportunity to keep the Port Augusta power station open for up to three years as part of a sensible transition to where we need to be.

This government has punished South Australians with high prices, blackouts, job losses and unacceptably high unemployment in our state, and they say it is because they want to reduce emissions. They say that South Australia need to suffer at their hand so that they can reduce the emissions created in South Australia from the generation of electricity. However, buried deep in the budget, announced about six weeks ago, we see that the government is actually forecasting to increase emissions from the generation of electricity in South Australia.

Their own target for the 2016-17 year just ended was 55 per cent, and their own target for the 2017-18 year that we are in at the moment is 43.5 per cent. So they have caused all this harm for no reason whatsoever. For purely ideological purposes, they have punished all South Australians with high prices, job losses and blackouts, yet they, by their own budget, are going to increase emissions in South Australia.

After 16 years in government and trying to blame everyone else for the problem that they created, and after forcing the closure of the Port Augusta power station for purely political reasons, the government has finally accepted that they must address this issue. But very unfortunately for many people, it is too late. Deputy Speaker, I bring you back to the disconnection of houses. Thousands and thousands of houses across South Australia are without electricity, forcibly disconnected because they could not pay their bills.

There have been job losses, and employers are out of business because they are no longer able to offer employment to other people. I will give you an example of a jurisdiction that has taken on this issue. The province of Quebec in Canada in 2005 legislated that wind farms must provide appropriate levels of inertia into their electricity grid. It did that in 2005, but only now, in 2017, do we find our government trying to take responsibility for the problems that it has actually created.

Let us look at this plan. The first component of the plan is 200 megawatts of gas generation. We were told it would be in place by this coming summer. Just for the record, on 15 March this year on ABC 891, David Bevan asked the Premier very clearly, 'When will it be up and running?' The Premier said, 'By next summer.' When in March someone talks about next summer, they are talking about the very next summer to come.

Then we found out that, when it was not going to be ready by this summer, their plan was to burn diesel in generators instead. We have found out through the Budget and Finance Committee that they wanted to run diesel generators instead of gas. We also found out that it is going to cost, at that point in time, \$110 million of taxpayers' money. We are told that all of this, for several years, is going to be in the cause of trying to reduce emissions, but part of the government's solution is to burn diesel in their generators, which, of course, is going to increase emissions.

Then we found out that these diesel generators are not as good as the government initially said they would be. When they explained their plan to use the same generators, initially running on diesel and then running on gas, they told us that they would be 276-megawatt capacity, but we found out afterwards—the government did not disclose this information, of course—that in high temperatures, which is exactly when we need them, they will only provide 205 or 206 megawatts of capacity.

The government was caught out. It would have been better if they had just said at the time, 'When we need these generators at times of very high temperature, this is what they will deliver.' It would have been much better for the government to say that. They have told us that these will be up and running for two years, but we now know that they have entered into a three-year lease for these generators, so there is the capacity, if the government chooses, to run the diesel generators for up to three years. We will just have to wait and see how that turns out.

In regard to the 100-megawatt battery, the opposition leader has called many times over the last two years for something like this to be done in principle, but we wonder why only minimal details are being released publicly by the government. Why will the government not explain exactly who is involved, exactly how it works, exactly what the costs are, exactly what the capacity is and exactly what the connection needs are, etc.? They just will not do that.

The third component is the energy security target. We know that many organisations which the government have, on other occasions, said that they respect and whose advice is important have now said publicly that the government's plan for an energy security target will not reduce the price of electricity. We also know, through an FOI from my office, that three other submissions were made on the energy security target that the government has not yet made public.

I would not mind betting that they are the three that say that the price of electricity will be forced up because of an energy security target. We will wait to see if they release those. One of the organisations that says that the government's energy security target will not decrease electricity

costs, as the government says it will, is Tesla. Another one is Nyrstar. They are two very important players in South Australia now with regard to energy.

The fourth component is the minister's new ministerial powers. The minister said very clearly that he does not expect ever to use them; he just thinks that they need to be there as a backup. I support him having that backup if he thinks he needs it, but one of the key components of this much lauded by the government energy policy is the powers that the government says they will not use.

The fifth component is the \$24 million PACE grants, an additional \$24 million. I support the PACE program very strongly, and I support the government's plan to provide \$24 million for the exploration of gas, but let me tell you that there is nothing new in this. Here we have another component of the energy plan from the government. It is something that already existed and, yes, they put some more money towards it, but it is just an extension of the plan that was already in place. They had already offered \$24 million, and this is an additional \$24 million, but it is certainly nothing new.

The last component is the government's own-use contract. Again, this was something that was out well before the government announced their plan back on 14 March. The government's own-use contract for energy is again something I support, but I am not sure why it gets special attention in the government's energy program, given that it was already in place and given that it was going to be announced and made public by the end of the financial year just finished, yet none of that information has been forthcoming. All of this for \$550 million—\$550 million of taxpayers' money. That is what the government wants South Australians to pay for this plan.

Unfortunately, South Australians have not shown a great deal of confidence in this plan. Why? Because it keeps changing. They have changed components of the plan, or delayed components of the plan, several times. Another reason is that there is no longer any commitment that it will reduce electricity prices. Back in the middle of March, when they announced their plan, the Premier and the energy minister tried to lead everyone to believe that it would reduce electricity prices. You cannot find them saying that now.

In fact, when he has his opportunity to speak shortly, I challenge the Minister for Energy to say, if he would, that this plan will reduce electricity prices and, if so, tell us when it will happen. I think everyone in South Australia wants to know when they will see cheaper electricity prices in this state. Another reason people do not have confidence in this plan is that Alan Finkel, who did the report for the federal government, makes it very clear that going it alone is not the answer for South Australia or for any other state. He says that going it alone is not the answer.

Another reason why people are not comfortable that this plan will do what the government said it will do is that ASX forward contract prices still show South Australia significantly above the rest of the nation. ASX forward contract prices for electricity show that, as far down the track as March 2022, South Australia will be 18 per cent above the national average. When I raised this issue in question time recently, the energy minister's answer was, 'Well, they will be going down. They will be going down,' as if somehow it is acceptable to stay 18 per cent above the national average.

Deputy Speaker, let me share with you another quote from the energy minister. On 14 February 2017, the energy minister said, 'The best forecast we have, of course, is from the ASX forward prices.' The energy minister says that is the best indication of forward prices we have. I am sure that is right: that is what the market says. A week after the government made the announcement of their energy plan on 14 March, forward contract prices for electricity increased for South Australia compared with what they were immediately before the government made their announcement.

Even now, months down the track, they are still predicting that years down the track South Australia will be 18 per cent above the national average. So all this for \$550 million of taxpayers' money to fix the problem the government actually created themselves. Plus, there was \$5 million last year and this year, and more to come, for the cost of the implementation team, and that is on top of the \$550 million, and \$2.6 million for the advertising campaign. With all the changes and concerns, it is not surprising that people are not comfortable that it will come in within the \$550 million that the government has set for its price tag.

Deputy Speaker, let me just wind up by asking you the rhetorical question I posed in this place a few days ago. If I crashed your car and then told you not to worry about it because I was going to spend a lot of your money getting your car fixed, and then changed my plan about how I was going to get your car fixed, and then said to you, 'Look, don't worry. It will all be okay because it will come in within the high budget of your money that I plan to spend to fix your car,' I do not think you would be very satisfied with that.

I do not think that you would think that was a very good deal at all, but that is what the government is trying to do to the people of South Australia: spend \$550 million of their money, and possibly more, to fix the problem the government created. They could easily have given themselves some breathing room if they had allowed the Port Augusta power station to stay open for three more years as part of a sensible transition plan.

Let me be very clear about this. The government tries very regularly to goad me, goad the Leader of the Opposition and goad the public on this topic. The Liberal Party will announce an outstanding energy policy. It will be far more considered than the government's, it will be far more responsible with taxpayers' money and it will achieve a far better result for South Australians. Our plan will deliver affordable, reliable electricity for South Australians, which is what they deserve, and our plan will be announced well in advance of the election.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (16:25): First, I will just point out a couple of things that I want to clear up for the record.

The shadow minister said that the Premier had promised that a permanent solution would be in place by summer, but only went on to quote parts of it. To quote the Premier: 'If I can get the (gas-fired) generator here before summer that would be great, but that is going to be tough.' As it turns out, the Premier has achieved just that. The permanent solution is here before summer, but in a temporary location. Quite frankly, the opposition are unable to even tack when conditions change, when the facts change.

I have just heard the shadow minister say that their energy plan will be released well in advance of the election, and I thank him for that. It is important for South Australians that we have a debate—a debate of ideas, a contest of ideas—so that South Australians can look at it, hold it up to the light, compare the two policies and campaign. There is only one problem: the Liberal Party are keeping their plan secret. We all know they are going to have a plan, but they are keeping it secret. The question is why, especially when you have the Leader of the Opposition saying that we are five minutes before the election; the election is imminent.

The Leader of the Opposition I assume thinks about things before he says them. I am guessing. So if we are five minutes from an election, and his shadow minister just said 'well before the next election', the question then is: why not release it now? Why not, instead of perhaps the shadow minister going on radio and constantly attacking what we are doing, he for a change can be positive and go out and talk about the Liberal Party plan? Well, there is a reason he will not: because they are keeping it secret.

Their plan relies on a number of things that they plan to do: point 1, they refuse to rule out before they even get into government privatising the generator that we have bought; point 2, they want to hand over our renewable energy target to people who pass around lumps of coal in the commonwealth parliament. They have already established that; and, point 3, I suspect that what they really want to do is to attack renewable energy. The reason they want to attack renewable energy is that they do not believe in it.

They are climate sceptics. They do not believe that we need to decarbonise: they think it is all a myth. They mock the battery, they mock wind farms, they mock firming, they mock demand management, they mock the idea of a solar thermal plant, they mock the idea of tidal and they mock the idea of new advances, whether they be hydrogen, other forms of storage or pumped hydro. We have seen no plans. We can only assume that they are keeping them secret so as not to frighten South Australians so that they finally see the opposition for what it really is—that is, a bunch of climate sceptics who have hated every single new renewable energy asset built in this state.

Fundamentally, you have to ask yourself why. Why would an opposition that aspires to be the government be so opposed to over \$5 billion worth of investment that is here in South Australia that they cannot pick up and move, that is here operating and is the largest integration of wind and solar anywhere in the world? The opposition hate it.

I suppose it gets back to their core beliefs, and their core beliefs are not about diversifying the economy. Their core beliefs are not about government intervention. They believe that the market can deliver sustainable, cheaper prices better than the government. We have a very good period of time to compare what privatisation has done to electricity pricing compared to government intervention. Our \$550 million intervention in the National Electricity Market was absolutely needed. Why? As the Premier said, we needed to retake our economic sovereignty. Why? Because the monopoly rent seekers, who currently own our generators and who are charging us monopoly rent for an essential service—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: How many of those monopoly rent seekers are there?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I cannot think of any major energy commentator who denies that the major retailers in South Australia are charging monopoly rent on South Australia; otherwise, why is it, as the opposition say, that we have unsustainably high power prices? Which one is it? Either they are charging monopoly rent or prices are cheap. They cannot even sustain the same argument in the same sentence. Prices are too expensive, but they are not charging a monopoly rent—that is the argument the opposition are actually putting publicly.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: How many monopoly players are in this one market?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, look up monopoly rent and understand what it means. The idea of monopoly rent is, I believe and the government believes, that since the privatisation of ETSA, what has occurred is that the market has deliberately removed generation from it to create scarcity and to create a greater demand for their electricity, so they can charge more for it. It is a very simple formula and perhaps the shadow minister would understand it, but unfortunately we have someone who does not believe that the market could possibly fail.

However, our implementation is well and truly underway. I am glad that the shadow minister quoted Dr Finkel. Dr Finkel is someone who has devoted the last six months of his life to coming up with a road map for Australia. He was tasked by the COAG Energy Council, appointed unanimously by all states, Labor and Liberal, with a request from the commonwealth government to build a road map. You compare his road map to what we have done and there is an eerie similarity. Both have market mechanisms. Both have greater standards. Both want more generation and investment. Both are trying to return a surplus of supply to the market. Both want to decarbonise. Both want to take advantage of new technologies. Both want to see more investments in Australia, especially in things like batteries.

For me, the most galling part of the commonwealth government and the opposition's narrative on the battery came when minister Frydenberg was in Adelaide to co-launch what was at that stage the world's largest grid-scale battery in the Southern Hemisphere from AGL because they had given a \$5 million grant. I understand it was about five megawatts. But when we announced our 100-megawatt lithium ion battery, the largest grid-scale battery anywhere in the world, it was mocked by the same people. So five megawatts, massive breakthrough in technology; 100 megawatts, the big pineapple. This is what we are dealing with: hypocrisy.

Whatever we do, whatever we say, whatever plan we implement and whenever any independent analysis says we are doing the right thing, the opposition and the commonwealth government will say no. There is one fundamental thing that they cannot walk away from and that is the truth, and the truth is that every state and the commonwealth government have signed this country up to decarbonise through the Paris agreement—every single state. We are the only country in the world without a road map to get to that decarbonisation point.

What Dr Finkel has done is given us a road map through 50 recommendations, and this government—this cabinet—has endorsed those 50 recommendations. I was tasked to go to the COAG to support those 50 recommendations on behalf of the people of South Australia. We went there and we did it.

Of course, there was one very important target. As the Premier has constantly said verbatim, since the NEM has been established, we have lost over 5,000 megawatts of generation in untimed and unplanned closures. Why have they closed them? To maximise the return on their existing plant. Do not underestimate the impact on the sale price of other generators with the closure of Hazelwood. Do not underestimate the savings you get from lower operating costs, less wages, less mining costs and less generation but making more profits.

The shadow minister is fond of going to the ASX. Perhaps he should plot the share price of AGL, Origin and other major retailers in the Australian market over the last 12 months and see how those share prices have gone up and up and up to match the prices that they are selling to South Australians. They are pricing risk with us. Why? Because they have closed generation, made it more scarce and are charging a premium on risk in case a generator breaks down, because there is less redundancy in the system that they created.

The only way that we are going to get more base load generation into the system, to complement the transition to renewable energy, is through a mechanism that incentivises investment, which is what the Premier has been banging on about for as long as I can remember, through his advocating for an energy intensity scheme, which is basically an incentive for people to invest in generation that is synchronous and low-carbon emitting, so you get more generation and an oversupply of electrons that are subsidising the market, which lowers prices.

The beauty of this scheme is that it was not invented by the Premier or me or any Labor MP. It was invented by whom? Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull came up with it through the work of Danny Price from Frontier Economics. We hired exactly the same group that the Prime Minister hired when he was developing his energy and climate policy. We agree.

It is now national Labor Party policy to have an energy intensity scheme. Why? Because we want to see that investment. Because right now the only incentive in the market for new investment is a RET—not our RET; not the South Australian-based RET. The only renewable energy target in this state that pays new renewable energy to operate is the commonwealth government's renewable energy target.

Until you have another market mechanism in place to incentivise synchronous thermal generation to complement that transition, you will get more and more renewables. We support more renewables, but we also recognise the transition, which is why we brought in our EST, which has been mocked by the opposition. It will be very interesting, given that they are always thinking ahead by mocking the EST, if the commonwealth government adopts their CET. Will they mock that as well? They are very similar mechanisms, almost identical, designed to fold into each other.

Again, no doubt, the geniuses opposite who have been working on this have thought this through. Perhaps maybe, just maybe, Josh Frydenberg will win the debate, and just maybe they will introduce a clean energy target. Then what will the opposition say when they have been opposing a mechanism for investment into the system? What will they say then? 'That was then, that was different, we now support a CET; before, we did not.' Or, perhaps, they will actually release their policy rather than keeping it a secret and we will know exactly what it is that they are planning to hand over to Canberra.

We are on the side of the CSIRO, the Chief Scientist, the COAG Energy Council, AEMO, the AER, the AEMC, the Business Council of Australia, the Australian Industry Group, the Conservation Council and every other major employer, other than the Minerals Council, that supports all 50 recommendations of Finkel. In fact, I understand that Ms Clare Savage of the Business Council of Australia, has been appointed to the energy security board to work on the implementation of Finkel. Yet there are two bodies that do not support all 50 recommendations of Finkel: the people who commissioned the report and members opposite.

I have to say that it is one thing to complain—and I think oppositions have a right to complain; that is basically a large part of their existence—but they also have a responsibility to offer alternative policy. It is not sufficient to get up in August in 2017, a month after the opposition leader said we were five minutes from the election, and say they will be releasing their energy plan soon, when on numerous occasions they have said they will release their energy plan when the Finkel review is released and, once Finkel is released, they will await the response from the commonwealth

government. Now it is 'soon', it is 'imminent', it is 'well before the next election'. What does 'well before the next election' mean? The only thing I have to go on is what the shadow minister said previously during the last election about the resources policy.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Which shadow minister?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Before the last election?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, you.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: This will be interesting.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know where you are trying to go. I understand in that time the opposition was saying 'soon' and 'imminently' there was a whole range of policies that were not released, such as the public transport policy. I understand there was a resources policy that was not released. I also understand there were a number of other policies that were not released as well. I think it is very telling that the shadow minister does not have the courage to release something he has been working on. The question is why.

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) (16:41): I thank the Premier and the Minister for Energy, the Treasurer. We have a comprehensive plan to take charge of South Australia's energy future, to support reliable, affordable and clean energy for all South Australians. As we know, we are making rapid progress in its implementation. That is not all we are doing, however. We also have a number of important energy efficiency and energy affordability initiatives aimed directly at consumers.

Recently, we announced the energy discount offer for concessions customers. It prioritises those most vulnerable households to ensure that the people who can least afford to meet the increased cost of energy and who often end up with the most expensive energy plan, are provided with the option of a better deal. The state government will invite energy retailers to submit expressions of interest to become preferred suppliers to low-income South Australians who currently receive the concession.

We know that the majority of people receiving energy concessions are on standing contracts and we will seek to negotiate a much better deal for this group of people. Energy retailers will be asked to offer benefits for eligible customers, including better prices, bill smoothing, removing late fees and flexible payment options that do not involve additional costs to customers. As part of this process, retailers will also be asked to demonstrate how they will facilitate the change of retailers for concession holders.

It is important that these customers are provided with better pricing without any hidden costs. The procurement group has held its first workshop to scope the terms for the expression of interest that will be released to the market. The group is looking closely at the issues involved in ensuring that South Australian concession customers get the best deal for them.

This is not all that we are doing to help energy consumers. Just yesterday, the government hosted the Energy Efficiency Expo at the Adelaide Convention Centre. The event connected South Australian businesses looking to improve their energy productivity with South Australian businesses offering energy-efficient solutions. The expo built on the ever-increasing demand for energy efficient products and services, and at the same time promoted local energy-efficient companies and therefore supported local jobs.

At this expo the Premier and the assistant minister to the Treasurer, Chris Picton, launched the EnergySmart South Australia initiative. Under this program, social entrepreneur and energy efficiency expert Jon Dee will be running a series of energy-efficiency workshops across South Australia aimed at householders and small businesses.

The workshops will provide consumers with straightforward advice to help them to reduce energy consumption and save money on their energy bills. Attendees will learn how to negotiate a

better energy deal for their home or business, how to cut the cost of lighting, heating, cooling and hot water, and how to save money with insulation and solar energy. Those who cannot attend in person can access this advice from the *EnergySmart South Australia* booklet. It will be available at libraries, community centres, electorate offices and online at the energysmartsaver.com.au website.

This program builds on other energy-efficient programs introduced by this government. For example, our Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme has been supporting households and businesses since 2009. The scheme, which is administered by the Essential Services Commission of South Australia, requires larger energy retailers to help households and businesses save energy and reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. This is achieved through energy efficiency and audit targets that need to be met by electricity and gas retailers. More than one in three households has benefited from the scheme since it commenced.

Since its commencement, energy retailers have installed a huge volume of energy-saving items in South Australian homes and businesses: over 2.5 million energy-saving light globes; more than 340,000 standby power controllers; more than 170,000 water-efficient showerheads; and, on top of this, more than 45,000 home energy audits have been delivered to low-income households through the scheme. Consumers can access our energy advisory service for free.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:46): I rise to respond to some comments mainly from the energy minister and what he had to say regarding policy going into the last election. Not only that, now he wishes to blame everyone else as to power prices and why we have this energy debacle in this state. He has said that in the past, but now he is saying that everyone supports the government's plan, the overly expensive \$550 million taxpayer-funded plan. You cannot have it both ways.

The Minister for Energy has blamed everything from AEMO to generators and everyone in between for the crisis that has hit South Australia. It is the green ideology that has destroyed businesses and business confidence in this state. Not only that, it has knocked out people who just cannot afford to pay their electricity bills. The energy minister wants to have a crack at the previous energy policy, or the lack of it—as he states it—from the previous shadow minister for energy. This was before the last election.

That is interesting because the previous shadow energy minister was the member for Waite, his own cabinet colleague, who he is now having a crack at. Again, the energy minister is trying to have it both ways; he is trying to be cute and have a crack at the opposition; and he is having a go at his most recent found friend. The simple fact is that the spokesperson on this side of the house for energy policy before the 2014 election was the member for Waite, who is now, I guess, the very good friend and cabinet colleague of the energy minister. What hypocrisy.

We have seen this state plunged into darkness because of this ideology. We have seen what happened on 28 September with the statewide blackout because of one circuit breaker, which was essentially how it worked, and the whole state went out, which is outrageous. There was a power pole breakdown 250 kilometres north of Adelaide, yet we had all the lights go out and all the transmission go out all the way to Mount Gambier. We had issues on 8 February this year when we had load shedding, and my electorate was caught up in that. It is out of control.

The shadow minister has rightly said that, for \$24 million over three years, we could have supported the power station at Port Augusta. This would have been a far better and a far cheaper response from the government, as an interim measure as we transition to cleaner fuels and cleaner generation into the future. In anyone's language, \$24 million is far better than committing \$550 million of other people's money. It is taxpayers' money.

Governments do not have their own money; it is taxpayers' money, yet once again we see how Labor socialist governments want to splurge, throw caution to the wind and throw money to the wind. They do not care—whatever it takes. We were going to have a permanent gas-fired power station at one stage for \$360 million. Now we have seen that we are going to run out nine power stations, couple them together on B-doubles and that will supposedly be the saviour for the state. However, we must be reminded that this is diesel generation, which throws their ideology right out the window.

As the shadow minister said, we will have a comprehensive policy, which will be coming out soon. We will show the way to keep the lights on in this state, to promote investment, to keep jobs in

this state, to stop people exiting this state and to stop people reeling back in horror at the prospect of paying 150 per cent more for their power costs into the future based purely on unreal expectations of green energy and not taking the time to transfer in the appropriate way so that we can have affordable lifestyles, so that our businesses can function in this state and so that South Australians can have a decent future and just keep their lights on and keep their businesses running and so that the most vulnerable can at least switch on their heaters at this time of the year to keep warm.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:52): This motion is just one more cruel hoax on the long-suffering power consumers of South Australia. Instead of patting himself on the back, as this motion seeks to do, the Premier should be apologising to each and every South Australian. This motion refers to the government taking control when it should never have lost control of power and reliability of electricity supply here in our state in the first place.

This motion refers to an energy plan that the Premier announced in March with the promise, 'This plan will reduce the price of electricity absolutely.' It is no wonder that Labor has run out of time and run out of trust on this question because, far from power prices going down, as the Premier promised the people of South Australia, the current ASX forecast of future electricity prices shows that for the next four years South Australian prices are expected to remain 18 per cent above the national average.

How is this self-serving motion helping those thousands of South Australians who are on electricity hardship repayment plans, if they have not already had their supply disconnected? About one in 50 South Australian consumers are now repaying debt under a retailer's hardship program. This is absolutely appalling. The average electricity debt of customers entering a retailer's hardship program is now \$1,081. The average debt of those on hardship programs is \$1,706, the highest in Australia.

These are not just statistics. Behind them are thousands of stories of hardship, even hopelessness, of the elderly frightened to keep a heater on during a cold winter night and of businesses having to lay off workers because of crippling power bills. The Premier went off to preen in Paris about his 'international experiment with renewables' while back home thousands of families suffered because of the incompetence of his policy and his government.

This motion oozes with hypocrisy. This motion refers to an energy plan which, piece by piece, is falling apart, and not only on the test of whether it reduces power prices. When he announced it, the Premier said that his brand-new gas generator could be available before this summer, when we now know that for the next two summers we will have instead temporary, dirty, expensive diesel generation. A central element of the plan was the energy security target. Its implementation has been delayed by at least six months while Tesla, a company the Premier fawned just a few weeks ago, has said that the target will not drive more emissions or low cost electricity generation.

Over time, this government has also fawned before the likes of Arnold Schwarzenegger and Al Gore in talking about energy policy. It would prefer to cuddle up to celebrities than produce sound and practical policies in this state. When everything has fallen apart, it has blamed everyone and everybody else: the weather, the federal government, AEMO, generators, retailers. What this government has never had the guts to do is to own up to the mistakes that it has presided over, the sky-high prices and the unreliable grid. This motion is an absolute disgrace and should never ever have been brought before this parliament.

Motion carried.

Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. J.R. Rau.

Bills

LABOUR HIRE LICENSING 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) (16:56): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for the

licensing and regulation of persons who provide labour hire services; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (16:56): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

On 10 July this year, the government announced that it was drafting a bill to introduce a state-based licensing scheme for labour hire providers. The Labour Hire Licensing Bill 2017 seeks to establish a scheme that will make it unlawful to operate as a labour hire provider without a licence and for employers who engage labour hire workers to use an unlicensed operator.

On 4 May 2015, the ABC *Four Corners* program aired an investigative report regarding the alleged exploitation and underpayment of migrant workers employed at various companies in Australia, including two in South Australia. The principal focus of the *Four Corners* story was labour hire companies exploiting migrant workers on farms and in the food processing industry. In response to the *Four Corners* program, the Premier announced that he had asked the parliamentary Economic and Finance Committee to look into the labour hire industry, including underpayment of wages, harassment and mistreatment of workers.

In a moment, I will move that the remainder of these remarks be included in *Hansard* without my further reading them, but before I do that can I say that it is the government's intention, having regard to the parliamentary calendar for the balance of this year, that this bill now be formally introduced. I want to place on the public record that in the long break that we have between now and when the parliament resumes, if people who have an interest in this matter wish to make submissions to the government about refinements that might be made to this bill, I am open to hearing those things, and I again place on the record that if necessary I am comfortable in government amendments being moved when we return if there is a good reason for so doing. With those few words, I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without reading.

Leave granted.

The Economic and Finance Committee handed down its report (the Report) on 18 October 2016.

A total of 13 submissions were received by the Committee from various parties, including government departments, industry groups and unions. In addition, witnesses representing different organisations. Written requests were made by the Committee to three Commonwealth departments and agencies. The Committee also held a public hearing in the Riverland region and visited several companies who engage labour hire workers.

At the public hearings the Committee heard from three private citizens with first-hand experience of exploitation in the labour hire sector. They relayed to the Committee their experiences of being underpaid wages, receiving no superannuation and the troubles they faced trying to recover their entitlements with the individuals that operated the labour hire services dissolving the entity they were employed by and starting up new entities and continuing to operate.

The Report made seven recommendations, including that, in the absence of the Federal Government establishing a national licensing scheme, the South Australian Government institute a State-based licensing scheme.

Inquiries into the labour hire industry were also completed by Queensland, Victoria and the Commonwealth. Each of those inquiries recommended some form of licensing or registration scheme for labour hire providers.

The Commonwealth Government's current policy is focussed on compliance and enforcement, as opposed to the introduction of a licensing requirement.

In the absence of the Commonwealth Government having the courage, through a national licensing scheme, to stand up to protect the rights of labour hire workers, many of whom are the most vulnerable in our community, this Weatherill Labor Government has drafted the Labour Hire Licensing Bill.

The objectives of this Bill are to protect workers from exploitation, to protect licensed labour hire businesses from predatory business practices that may be engaged in by persons unsuitable to be licensed to provide labour hire services and in achieving this it will improve the integrity of the labour hire industry.

It is critical that we crack down on dodgy operators exploiting workers and driving honest employers to the wall.

Rogue operators are underpaying workers, failing to ensure proper safety standards and abuse worker visas. These actions undermine minimum standards of employment for workers and undercut those businesses doing the right thing.

Every inquiry in this area has highlighted the issue of 'phoenixing'. This is where people avoid legal obligations such as wages, superannuation, tax, workers' compensation and the most basic of working conditions by winding up dodgy companies and re-incorporating them under a new name.

There is a need for increased cooperation between State and Federal Governments. We will continue to push for a national licensing scheme.

However, in the meantime, and in the absence of any meaningful action by the Federal Government, South Australia along with other States will introduce a complementary licensing scheme.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

Division 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause provides the short title.

2—Commencement

This clause provides for commencement to be fixed by proclamation.

Division 2—Objects and application of Act

3—Objects of Act

This clause provides for the objects of the measure which will be achieved primarily by establishing a licensing scheme to regulate the provision of labour hire services. The objects of the measure are to—

- (a) protect workers from exploitation by providers of labour hire services; and
- (b) protect licensed labour hire businesses from predatory business practices that may be engaged in by persons unsuitable to be licensed to provide labour hire services; and
- (c) promote the integrity of the labour hire industry.

4—Extraterritorial application

This clause indicates that the measure is intended to have extraterritorial application to the extent that the legislative powers of the State permit.

Part 2—Interpretation

5—Interpretation

This clause provides defined terms for the purposes of the measure.

6—Meaning of labour hire services

This clause provides for a definition of *labour hire services*, whereby a person provides *labour hire services* if, in the course of carrying on a business, the person supplies, to another person, a worker to do work. Worker is defined in clause 7.

7—Meaning of worker

This clause provides for a definition of *worker*, whereby an individual is a *worker* for a person if the individual enters into an arrangement with the person under which—

- (a) the person may supply, to another person, the individual to do work; and
- (b) the person is obliged to pay the individual, in whole or part, for the work.

8—When a worker is supplied

For purposes of the measure, the supply of a worker to do work for a person commences when the worker first starts to do work for the person in relation to the supply.

9—Fit and proper person

This clause makes provision in relation to determining whether a person is a fit and proper person for the purposes of the measure.

Subclause (1) lists a number of matters that may be relevant in determining whether a person is a fit and proper person to be the holder of a licence or a fit and proper person to be the director of a body corporate that is the

holder of a licence, such as the reputation, honesty and integrity of the person or demonstrated compliance by the person with relevant laws.

Subclauses (2) and (3) list the circumstances in which a person will be taken to not be a fit and proper person to be the holder of a licence or a fit and proper person to be the director of a body corporate that is the holder of a licence. Examples include if a person has been found guilty or convicted of an offence prescribed by the regulations or if a person is a member of, or a participant in, a prescribed organisation.

Part 3—Prohibited conduct

10—Licence required to provide labour hire services

This clause provides that a person must not provide labour hire services except as authorised by a licence.

This clause also provides that a person must not advertise, or in any way hold out, that the person provides, is entitled to provide or is willing to provide labour hire services unless authorised to provide labour hire services by a licence.

11—Person must not enter into arrangements with unlicensed providers

This clause provides that a person must not, without a reasonable excuse, enter into an arrangement with another person for the provision of labour hire services to the person unless the other person is authorised to provide labour hire services by a licence.

12—Person must not enter into avoidance arrangements

This clause provides that a person must not enter into an arrangement designed to circumvent or avoid an obligation imposed by the measure (an *avoidance arrangement*).

13—Persons must report avoidance arrangements

This clause provides that if a person to whom another person has supplied, or intends to supply, a worker becomes aware, or ought reasonably to have become aware, that the arrangement for the supply of the worker is an avoidance arrangement, the person must notify the Commissioner in writing of the name of the non-complying person along with a brief description of the avoidance arrangement.

Part 4—Licences

Division 1—Application and grant

14—Application for licence

This clause provides for applications to the Commissioner for a licence authorising the provision of labour hire services which must—

- (a) be in a form approved by the Commissioner; and
- (b) specify the names of the person or persons nominated to be responsible persons for the purposes of the licence; and
- (c) include the information required by the Commissioner to determine the application; and
- (d) be accompanied by the prescribed fee.

Notice of each application for a licence under the clause must be published by the Commissioner on a website determined by the Commissioner.

The clause further provides that—

- (a) a person who has applied for and been refused a licence may not apply for a period of 3 months from the date of notice of the refusal or the date on which an appeal against the refusal was finally determined; and
- (b) a person who has previously held a licence that has been cancelled may not apply for a period of 2 years from the date of the cancellation,

unless the person is a body corporate and, since the time of the refusal of the licence or the cancellation, no person who held shares, a beneficial interest or was in a position to control or influence the affairs of the body corporate at that time holds shares or a beneficial interest or is in a position to control or influence the affairs of the body corporate at the time of a new application for a licence.

15—Objection to application

This clause provides that a designated entity may, by notice in writing, lodge with the Commissioner an objection to an application for a licence on the grounds that the applicant is not a fit and proper person to be the holder of a licence or, in the case of a body corporate, that 1 or more directors of the body corporate are not fit and proper persons to be directors of a body corporate that is the holder of a licence. The Commissioner is required to notify the

applicant of a notice of objection and must, before granting a licence, consider both the objection and any response of the applicant.

In this clause—

designated entity means any of the following entities:

- (a) an industrial association (within the meaning of the Return to Work Act 2014);
- (b) an agency or instrumentality of this State or of the Commonwealth, another State or a Territory of the Commonwealth;
- (c) a council (within the meaning of the Local Government Act 1999).

16—Grant of licence

This clause provides that the Commissioner may grant a licence to an applicant if satisfied that—

- (a) in the case of an applicant who is a natural person, the applicant—
 - (i) is a fit and proper person to be the holder of the licence; and
 - (ii) has sufficient financial resources for the purpose of properly carrying on business under the licence; or
- (b) in the case of an applicant that is a body corporate—
 - (i) the body corporate is a fit and proper person to be the holder of the licence; and
 - (ii) each director of the body corporate is a fit and proper person to be the director of a body corporate that is the holder of a licence; and
 - (iii) the body corporate has sufficient financial resources for the purpose of properly carrying on business under the licence; and
- (c) each person to be specified as a responsible person is a fit and proper person to be a responsible person.

17—Conditions of licence

This clause provides that a licence may be subject to such conditions as the Commissioner thinks fit and that such conditions may be imposed, varied or revoked by the Commissioner at any time after the grant of a licence.

Division 2—Duration of licences and reporting

18—Duration of licence, periodic fee and return

This clause provides that a licence remains in force until the licence is surrendered or cancelled or the licence holder dies or, in the case of a licensed body corporate, is dissolved.

The clause also provides that the holder of a licence must, after each reporting period for the licence (every 12 months)—

- (a) pay to the Commissioner the fee prescribed by regulation; and
- (b) lodge with the Commissioner a report in the form approved by the Commissioner containing the prescribed information as defined in the clause.

If the fee or the information return are not provided to the Commissioner, the Commissioner may require the person to make good the default. If, after 28 days of the notice to make good the default, the person has still not complied, the licence is automatically cancelled.

19—Notification of certain changes in circumstances

This clause provides that the holder of a licence must give the Commissioner notice of a change in respect of a prescribed matter relating to the licence within 14 days after the change. There is a proposed penalty of \$4,000.

For the purposes of the clause, a prescribed matter, relating to a licence, is defined to mean a matter prescribed by regulation relating to—

- (a) whether a person is a fit and proper person to be the holder of a licence; or
- (b) whether a person is a fit and proper person to be a director of a body corporate that is the holder of a licence; or
- (c) details about the licence shown on the register; or
- (d) activities undertaken under or relating to the licence (such as, without limitation, accommodation provided by the holder of the licence for workers supplied to another person).

20—Provision of information

This clause provides that the Commissioner may require the holder of a licence to provide information to the Commissioner as the Commissioner requires relating to—

- (a) the provision of labour hire services by the licence holder; and
- (b) whether the holder of the licence is a fit and proper person to be the holder of a licence; and
- (c) whether the licensee's business has sufficient financial resources for the purpose of properly carrying on business under the licence; and
- (d) any other matters relating to the objects of this Act.

If the required information is not provided to the Commissioner, the Commissioner may require the person to make good the default. If, after 28 days of the notice to make good the default, the person has still not complied, the licence is automatically cancelled.

Division 3—Suspension, cancellation and surrender

21—Suspension and cancellation

This clause provides that the Commissioner may suspend or cancel a licence by notice in writing to the holder of the licence if the Commissioner is satisfied that—

- (a) the licence was obtained because of materially incorrect or misleading information; or
- (b) the holder of the licence has given materially incorrect or misleading information in a report under clause 18, 19 or 20; or
- (c) the holder of the licence, or an employee or representative of the holder of the licence, has contravened a condition of the licence; or
- (d) the holder of the licence, or an employee or representative of the holder of the licence, has failed to comply with, or has contravened or is contravening, a provision of the measure or the regulations; or
- (e) the holder of the licence, or an employee or representative of the holder of the licence, has contravened or is contravening a relevant law; or
- (f) the holder of the licence is no longer a fit and proper person to be the holder of a licence; or
- (g) if the holder of the licence is a body corporate—
 - (i) 1 or more directors of the body corporate are no longer fit and proper persons to be directors of a body corporate that is the holder of a licence; or
 - (ii) the holder of the licence has been wound up or deregistered under the *Corporations Act 2001* of the Commonwealth; or
- (h) the business to which the licence relates no longer has sufficient financial resources for the purpose of properly carrying on business under the licence; or
- (i) for any other reason, the licence should be suspended or cancelled.

22—Return of evidence of suspended or cancelled licence

This clause provides that, on the suspension or cancellation of a licence, the Commissioner may require the holder of the licence to return any evidence of the licence issued to the person within 14 days after receiving notice of the suspension or cancellation.

23—Surrender

This clause provides that the holder of a licence may surrender the licence by notice in writing to the Commissioner. The Commissioner may then require a person giving notice of surrender to return any evidence of the licence issued to the person within 14 days.

Division 4—Responsible persons

24—Requirements for responsible persons

This clause provides that a business conducted under a licence must, at all times during business hours, be personally supervised and managed by a natural person (a *responsible person*) who is responsible for the day-to-day management and operation of the business to which the licence relates.

A responsible person, for a licence, must—

- (a) be a fit and proper person to be a responsible person; and

- (b) satisfy any other requirements prescribed by regulation.

25—Responsible person must be reasonably available

This clause provides that the holder of a licence must ensure that each responsible person for the licence is reasonably available to be contacted by the Commissioner, an authorised officer or a member of the public during business hours. A maximum penalty of \$4,000 applies in the case of non-compliance with this requirement.

26—Application to change responsible person

This clause provides for the responsible person under a licence to be changed on application to the Commissioner who may approve the change if satisfied that the proposed responsible person is a fit and proper person for that role.

27—Substitution of responsible person for limited period

This clause provides for the temporary appointment of a person to be a responsible officer in the absence of the designated responsible officer. Notice of such an appointment must be given to the Commissioner who may cancel the appointment if satisfied that the person is not a fit and proper person to be a responsible person.

Part 5—Monitoring and enforcement

Division 1—Referral to Commissioner of Police

28—Commissioner may refer matters to Commissioner of Police

This clause provides that the Commissioner may refer certain matters to the Commissioner of Police who must provide information of criminal convictions relevant to a matter and may provide other information relevant to the referred matter (such as whether an application should be granted or a person is a fit and proper person).

29—Criminal intelligence

This clause provides for the protection and confidentiality of information provided to the Commissioner by the Commissioner of Police that is classified by the Commissioner of Police as criminal intelligence.

Division 2—Authorised officers

30—Authorised officers

This clause provides for the appointment of authorised officers by the Commissioner.

31—Obtaining information

This clause provides that an authorised officer may require a person—

- (a) to answer any questions, orally or in writing; or
(b) to produce books or documents.

For such purposes, an authorised officer may require a person to attend at a specified time and place.

32—Entry and inspection

This clause provides for authorised officers to have certain powers of entry and inspection.

33—Use and inspection of books or documents produced or seized

This clause provides that a book or document seized by an authorised officer may be retained for the purpose of enabling the book or document to be inspected and enabling copies of, or extracts or notes from, the book or document to be made or taken by or on behalf of the Commissioner.

34—Hindering an authorised officer

This clause provides that a person who hinders an authorised officer acting in the exercise of powers conferred by or under the measure is guilty of an offence for which a maximum penalty of \$10,000 applies.

35—Offence relating to intimidation

This clause provides that a person must not persuade or attempt to persuade by threat or intimidation another person to fail to comply with certain requirements of an authorised officer. A maximum penalty of \$10,000 applies.

36—Impersonating an authorised officer

This clause provides that a person who falsely represents, by words or conduct, that the person is an authorised officer is guilty of an offence for which a maximum penalty of \$10,000 applies.

Part 6—Proceedings, review and appeal

37—Evidentiary provisions

This clause provides certain evidentiary provisions for the purposes of proceedings under the measure.

38—Appeal to District Court

This clause provides for appeals to the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court against certain decisions made under the measure.

Part 7—Miscellaneous

39—The register

This clause provides that the Commissioner must maintain a register of licences granted under the measure. The clause specifies the matters that must be included on the register.

40—Delegations

This clause provides for the Commissioner to be able to delegate any of the Commissioner's functions or powers under the measure to—

- (a) a person employed in the Public Service; or
- (b) the person for the time being holding a specified position in the Public Service.

41—Commissioner may rely on licence, approval etc under prescribed law

This clause provides that the Commissioner may, if satisfied that a person is the holder of a licence, or is otherwise accredited or approved (however described), under a prescribed law, dispense with a requirement to provide certain information to the Commissioner under the measure and may act on the basis of that other licence, approval or accreditation to determine, without any further consideration, that the person is a fit and proper person or has sufficient financial resources for the purpose of properly carrying on business under a licence.

42—Exemptions

This clause provides for the Commissioner to grant exemptions to a specified person or person of a specified class.

43—False or misleading information

This clause provides an offence of making a statement that is false or misleading in a material particular (whether by reason of the inclusion or omission of any particular) in any information provided, or record kept, under the measure.

44—Vicarious liability

This clause provides for vicarious liability for the principal of a business, or the directors of a body corporate, where an offence is committed by an employee or agent of the business or by the body corporate. This vicarious liability also extends, where an offence is committed against the measure in relation to the formation of a contract, to a person who has derived or would, if the contract were carried out, expect to derive a direct or indirect pecuniary benefit from the contract.

45—Defences

This clause provides defences of reasonable mistake and reasonable reliance on information supplied by another person. A further defence is where a contravention is due to the act or default of another person, to an accident or to some other cause beyond the defendant's control and the defendant took reasonable precautions and exercised due diligence to avoid the contravention.

46—Confidentiality of information

This clause provides for the confidentiality of information obtained in exercising a power or function under the measure.

47—Service

This clause provides for service of a notice or document required or authorised to be given to a person for the purposes of the measure, which may—

- (a) be given to the person personally; or
- (b) be posted in an envelope addressed to the person at the person's last known residential, business or (in the case of a corporation) registered address; or
- (c) be left for the person at the person's last known residential, business or (in the case of a corporation) registered address with someone apparently over the age of 16 years; or
- (d) be transmitted by fax or email to a fax number or email address provided by the person (in which case the notice or document will be taken to have been given or served at the time of transmission).

Also, this clause provides that a notice or other document required or authorised to be given or sent to, or served on, a person for the purposes of the measure may, if the person is a company or registered body within the meaning of the *Corporations Act 2001* of the Commonwealth, be served on the person in accordance with that Act.

48—Regulations

This clause provides that the Governor may make such regulations as are contemplated by the measure or as are necessary or expedient for the purposes of the measure.

Schedule 1—Repeal and transitional provisions

1—Transitional provision

This clause provides a transitional period of 6 months for persons providing labour hire services at the commencement of the Act.

2—Transitional regulations

This clause provides that the Governor may, by regulation, make additional provisions of a saving or transitional nature consequent on the enactment of the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

BAIL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendment indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 6, page 3, after line 14—Insert:

(2) Section 10A(2), definition of *prescribed applicant*—after paragraph (e) insert:

or

(f) an applicant taken into custody in relation to both—

- (i) a serious drug offence (within the meaning of section 34 of the *Controlled Substances Act 1984*); and
- (ii) a serious offence against the person (within the meaning of section 74EA of the *Summary Offences Act 1953*).

Consideration in committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Never let it be said that the House of Assembly does not seek the utmost level of cooperation with the other place. In yet another display of the ecumenical approach—

The CHAIR: Bonhomie.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —the bonhomie—we accept the thoughts of the other place.

Mr GARDNER: The opposition was under the impression that the government wanted to pass the Budget Measures Bill before the end of this week—

The CHAIR: That has nothing to do with this amendment, but we will—

Mr GARDNER: —so I therefore direct members to the lead speaker of the opposition in the upper house for his or her comments on this matter.

Motion carried.

SUMMARY PROCEDURE (SERVICE) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

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

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

BUDGET MEASURES BILL 2017*Committee Stage*

In committee.

(Continued from 9 August 2017.)

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

Mr MARSHALL: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Marshall-1]—

Page 4, lines 4 to 22 [clause 2(2) to (6) inclusive]—Delete subclauses (2) to (6) inclusive and substitute:

- (2) Schedule 1 Part 3 clause 14 will be taken to have come into operation on 1 July 2016.
- (3) The following provisions will be taken to have come into operation on 22 June 2017:
 - (a) Schedule 1 Part 1 (other than clause 11 which comes into operation in accordance with subsection (1));
 - (b) Schedule 1 Part 2;
 - (c) Schedule 1 Part 5.
- (4) The following provisions will be taken to have come into operation on 1 July 2017:
 - (a) Schedule 1 Part 3 (other than clause 14 which comes into operation in accordance with subsection (2));
 - (b) Schedule 1 Part 6.
- (5) The following provisions will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation:
 - (a) Schedule 1 Part 4;
 - (b) Schedule 1 Part 8.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr MARSHALL: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Marshall-1]—

Page 4, line 24—Delete 'a Schedule' and substitute 'Schedule 1'

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 4.

The CHAIR: Your amendment on this clause, leader, is actually to oppose the clause, which means we have to put the clause so that you can actually physically oppose it.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! It is technical enough for all of us to be listening very, very carefully. The table is advising everyone impartially. It is not our role to put words in your mouth. We need to make sure that you all understand where we are. My advice is that we put clause 4 as printed because your amendment is to oppose it anyway.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7.

The committee divided on the clause:

Ayes 22
 Noes 16
 Majority 6

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Brock, G.G.	Redmond, I.M.	Hildyard, K.
Williams, M.R.	Hughes, E.J.	Pederick, A.S.
Vlahos, L.A.	Chapman, V.A.	

Clause thus passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 14) passed.

Schedule 1 passed.

Schedule 2.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I move en bloc:

Amendment No 1 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 24, lines 15 to 16 [Schedule 2, clause 26, inserted section 72(7)(b)(ii)]—Delete 'the person or trust has paid, or is liable to pay, the foreign ownership surcharge' and substitute:

a foreign ownership surcharge has been paid, or is liable to be paid,

Amendment No 2 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 25, after line 29 [Schedule 2, clause 27, inserted section 102AB]—After subsection (2) Insert:

(2a) If a foreign entity is a member of a group that notionally acquires an interest in residential land as a result of a transaction to which this section applies, the entity is liable to pay a surcharge (a *foreign ownership surcharge*) to the Commissioner in addition to the duty payable on the transaction by the group.

Amendment No 3 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 25, line 30 [Schedule 2, clause 27, inserted section 102AB(3)]—After 'surcharge' insert:

under subsection (2)

Amendment No 4 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 25, after line 32 [Schedule 2, clause 27, inserted section 102AB]—After subsection (3) insert:

- (3a) The amount of the foreign ownership surcharge under subsection (2a) is 4% of the value of the foreign entity's interest in the interest notionally acquired by the group in the residential land (as determined under section 99).

Amendment No 5 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 25, lines 41 and 42 [Schedule 2, clause 27, inserted section 102AB(5)(b)]—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute:

- (b) at the time the entity ceases to be a foreign entity—
- (i) the entity retains the interest notionally acquired; or
- (ii) in the case of an entity that paid the surcharge by virtue of being a member of a group that notionally acquired the interest—the group retains the interest notionally acquired, and the entity retains its interest in the interest notionally acquired by the group,

Amendment No 6 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 26, line 6 [Schedule 2, clause 27, inserted section 102AB(6)]—After 'foreign entity,' insert:

or, if the interest was notionally acquired by a group, an entity that is a member of the group (and was a member of the group at the time of the acquisition) becomes a foreign entity,

Amendment No 7 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 26, after line 24 [Schedule 2, clause 27, inserted section 102AB(6)(b)]—After subparagraph (i) insert:

- (ia) in the case of an entity that is (but for this subparagraph) liable to pay the surcharge by virtue of being a member of a group that notionally acquired the interest—the group ceased to have a notional interest in the residential land, or the entity ceased to have an interest in the interest notionally acquired by the group, before the entity became a foreign entity; or

Amendment No 8 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 26, lines 25 to 26 [Schedule 2, clause 27, inserted section 102AB(6)(b)(ii)]—Delete 'the entity has paid, or is liable to pay, a foreign ownership surcharge' and substitute:

a foreign ownership surcharge has been paid, or is liable to be paid,

Amendment No 9 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 26, lines 28 to 41 [Schedule 2, clause 27, inserted section 102AB(6)(c)]—Delete paragraph (c) and substitute:

- (c) however, if an entity referred to in paragraph (b)(ii) is a corporation or trust that is not a wholly foreign owned corporation or trust, then—
- (i) the entity is liable to pay a foreign ownership surcharge on the transaction; but
- (ii) the amount of the foreign ownership surcharge is to be reduced by the amount of the foreign ownership surcharge (if any) paid in respect of the transaction by virtue of which the entity became a foreign entity.

Amendment No 10 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 27, lines 29 and 30 [Schedule 2, clause 27, inserted section 102AB(9), definition of *foreign entity*]—Delete ', a foreign trust or a group of which 1 or more members is a foreign person or a foreign trust' and substitute:

or a foreign trust

Mr GARDNER: I appreciate that some discussion may have taken place, but can the Treasurer briefly explain the amendments that he has moved?

The CHAIR: Yes, I am sure he can.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have had a brief discussion with the shadow treasurer, whom we briefed between the houses. We received advice from several independent accounting agencies about some unintended consequences of some of the amendments. These amendments are in place—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not think I would say that about parliamentary counsel. I do not think that is fair. Parliamentary counsel do an exceptional job for us and for the opposition. I do not think they deserve the criticism. Amendment No. 1 standing in my name relates to the clawback of an unpaid foreign ownership surcharge, where a resident person or trust acquires an interest in land only to later become a foreign person or trust within three years of that land acquisition. In these circumstances, a foreign ownership surcharge becomes payable on the original land acquisition.

If a foreign ownership surcharge is paid as a result of the transaction by which that person or trust became a foreign person or trust, the amount of the surcharge paid is rebated against the amount of a foreign ownership surcharge, payable under the clawback provision, to avoid double taxation. This amendment is required to ensure that no clawback is required at all where a person or a trust becomes a wholly-owned foreign person or trust within the three-year time frame. This is because the surcharge will be payable on 100 per cent of the value of the underlying interest in residential land, such that no clawback is required until the initial acquisition of the land.

Amendment No. 2 applies in relation to the operation of a foreign person surcharge, where a stamp duty assessment is issued under the landholder provisions to a group of associates. In certain circumstances, individual persons are determined to be associates and their interest in companies or trusts aggregated for stamp duty assessment purposes. The relationship between individual persons that can give rise to persons being treated as associates is drafted broadly to capture acquisitions by different persons acting for a common commercial purpose.

The grouping ensures, amongst other things, that contrived ownership splitting is not employed to avoid the payment of stamp duty. The government is proposing this amendment to ensure that a foreign ownership surcharge is only applied to the interest held by the foreign members of a group or associates and is not charged on the interest held by other group members. This amendment will ensure that direct and indirect acquisitions of interest in residential land by foreign persons and trusts receive equal treatment under the foreign ownership surcharge provision.

Amendment No. 3 to schedule 2 is complementary to amendment No. 2, which the government proposes for the same reason as I previously stated. Amendment No. 4 is complementary to amendment No. 2, which the government proposed for the same reason I stated previously. Amendment No. 5 is complementary to amendment No. 2, which the government proposed for the same reason as previously stated. Amendment Nos 6 and 7, again, are complementary to amendment No. 2. Amendment No. 8 has been made for the same reason as stated in amendment No. 1.

Amendment No. 9 is complementary to amendment No. 2, which the government proposed for the same reason as previously stated. Amendment No. 10 is complementary to amendment No. 2, which the government proposes for the same reason as previously stated.

The CHAIR: Is that sufficient explanation for you, on my left? Do you need anything extra?

Mr GARDNER: Thank you for the explanation.

Amendments carried; schedule as amended passed.

Schedule 3 and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (17:22): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Again, I refer members to my remarks in the second reading closure of debate. I am disappointed that it has come to this—that the government's budget is not being given free passage through the house. It is an unfortunate new precedent being set by the opposition. Hopefully, common sense will prevail in the other place.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (17:22): I am not really sure what the Treasurer is getting at. It is quite clear that this Budget Measures Bill will pass this house because the government is supporting it. The government has a choice. They had a choice today whether to support the opposition's amendments to remove the state bank levy. We have made it very clear to the government and the people of South Australia that this is something in this Budget Measures Bill that we find abhorrent.

Of course, the Budget Measures Bill will be passing this house today, and it will go to the Legislative Council. The government will have an opportunity again, at that point, to be either practical or pig-headed. They have an opportunity for the Budget Measures Bill, if they remove the state bank levy, to pass in the other place, or they have an opportunity to be pig-headed and for that bill to stall. I think the people of South Australia have made it very clear. I think there is very little doubt the people of South Australia reject this government's state bank levy. It is a differential levy; there is no basis for this levy. It is only going to further diminish our capacity as a state to attract investment capital into South Australia.

We have the highest unemployment rate in the nation. We have had that position for the last 31 consecutive months. The last thing we need to be doing is creating a further burden on people who would like to invest or employ people in our state. So we implore the government, if they do not agree to the removal of the state bank levy in this house, to consider it between the houses and do the right thing by the people of South Australia: provide certainty, reduce risk and remove this state bank levy.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (17:24): In closing the debate, I have heard what the Leader of the Opposition has said. Quite frankly, I do not accept his argument. I accept his right to oppose measures because I think oppositions should always break out on their own and have their own policies and offer an alternative to the people of South Australia.

I do not accept that that means we should trash a convention that we have had in this parliament since we settled and had representative government in this state. I do not accept the argument the opposition is making that they are prepared—because they know that constitutionally they cannot amend the budget bill in the other house—to put at risk payroll tax cuts and other concessions for small businesses because the opposition are now a completely wholly owned subsidiary of the Australian banking association and the banks.

That is an unfortunate situation for them. I do not believe that they have thought this through. I do not believe that they understand the consequences of what they are doing. As I said yesterday in my remarks, the opposition leader has led his party to a cliff on this issue, and pride and ego do not allow him to take a backward step. All we are doing is what every other government has done since representative government began in this state.

We proposed a budget to the parliament, and the constitution has provisions in the passage of those bills to ensure that government bills are passed, and thus far the Legislative Council, throughout its entire history, has never blocked a budget bill. Yet we are being pushed to that very point, and he is pushing us to that point because he cannot take a backward step because of his own stubbornness. He is pushing this state. Going forward, if he is successful, the precedent he has set is that every budget, every appropriation bill, is up for grabs.

The example that they used on the transport development levy is not accurate because the government agreed to remove that measure. We decided in our cabinet to remove that and the cabinet decided to remove it through the parliament using the House of Assembly. That is how it has worked in this parliament forever. What the opposition are attempting to do is to stymie an entire budget for one measure—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and that will be the consequence. You just heard the interjection. The Leader of the Opposition interjects that it is the right thing to do. Well, tell that to all those small businesses that are currently paying 4.95 per cent payroll tax—that the opposition are prepared to use their numbers in the Legislative Council to block a tax cut to them. What have they done?

Mr Marshall: You don't need legislation.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not need legislation to cut a prescribed payroll tax rate? Yes, I do. Yes, I do, and that is why it is here and that is why it is in the bill. I also need these measures to offer stamp duty concessions for off-the-plan apartments to try to stimulate growth. But the opposition, following a man off the cliff, does not know the precedent it is setting. Dean Brown never did this. John Olsen never did this. Tom Playford never did this. Don Dunstan never did this. Steele Hall never did this.

Mr Marshall: It's a new Liberal Party.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's right: it is a new Liberal Party—one that is unrecognisable to any other around the country, one that is unrecognisable to people who have supported it their entire life.

Since when does the Liberal Party ban gas exploration? Since when does the Liberal Party vote against tax cuts to small business, which is what they are going to do in the other house? The shadow treasurer has to block tax cuts to small business to save five businesses headquartered elsewhere—five businesses. He is prepared to save five businesses from paying \$20 million a year. Following this folly, if successful, the Leader of the Opposition is consigning this place to chaos. How will they govern? How will they introduce new measures? How will they implement their agenda? But, again, this is called thinking ahead, planning ahead.

Mr Picton: Actions have consequences.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Actions have consequences. It is one of the oldest laws of physics: for every reaction, there is an equal and opposite reaction. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Everyone please have a careful few weeks away.

At 17:30 the house adjourned until Tuesday 26 September 2017 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***TAFE SA**

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (3 November 2016).

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): The Minister for Higher Education and Skills has provided the following advice:

The independent valuation has been completed. The independent valuation provided a market value of \$594.940 million for the land and buildings comprising 23 TAFE SA sites that transferred to Renewal SA on 1 March 2017.