

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 2 November 2017

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:32 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*

#### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (INTENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT) BILL**

##### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (10:33):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Development Act 1993 and the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. Read a first time.

##### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (10:33):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am introducing this relatively simple bill because of matters that have arisen in my electorate as a result of some proposed developments. Gordon Avenue, a street in my electorate in St Agnes, is a cul-de-sac. There are 27 dwellings on that street and on the same street there are two substantially large blocks. Most of the blocks of course are 800 square metres or 1,000 square metres. One block is 6,500 square metres and a second block is of a similar, if not slightly smaller, size. A proponent has purchased the 6,500 square-metre block and is proposing to build 24 dwellings on that block.

Those quick at maths will see that it is almost a 100 per cent increase in the number of houses on that street. They will also realise that there is still another very large, similarly sized block with scope for approximately the same number of dwellings to be built on top. Assuming everyone else does a two-for-one development on their blocks, as they might ordinarily be entitled to, you are starting to get to a point where you might have 100 dwellings on that small cul-de-sac in St Agnes, which was never intended to carry that many houses.

Currently, councils do not have the ability to look at a development, look at a street and assess the total number of dwellings in the event that all blocks were developed to the potential of the zoning in that area. This bill seeks to give councils the power to have a forward look, to essentially determine the carrying capacity of a street to see how that might be evenly and fairly spread across all landholders in a street, and then to make a decision on a proposed development on that basis. The first provisions of the bill seek to do that.

The second part seeks to clarify powers that already exist under the act. The act already gives councils the power to enforce decisions of the Development Assessment Commission, and that is not explicitly stated in the bill. My bill seeks to clarify this to ensure councils know they have the power to enforce conditions of the Development Assessment Commission decisions, and that they have their suite of powers, being able to do everything they would do to enforce the conditions of a decision they made. They also apply to Development Assessment Commission decisions. It is a relatively simple bill and I commend it to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

#### **CRIMINAL LAW (FORENSIC PROCEDURES) (EMERGENCY SERVICES PROVIDERS) AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 October 2017.)

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (10:38):** I move:

That Order of the Day No. 1 be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 22  
Noes ..... 15  
Majority ..... 7

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.A.	Hughes, E.J.
Kenyon, T.R. (teller)	Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Rankine, J.M.	Vlahos, L.A.
Wortley, D.		

NOES

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

PAIRS

Rau, J.R.	Whetstone, T.J.	Snelling, J.J.
Tarzia, V.A.	Weatherill, J.W.	Pengilly, M.R.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta queried me about the difference between postponement and adjournment. My informal answer to him was not quite correct. The correct answer is that there was no debate on it today.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (DECRIMINALISATION OF SEX WORK) BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 October 2017.)

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (10:46):** It should come as no surprise to people in this chamber that I would support a bill that reforms the sex industry. It is not very often that I am heartened by anything I read in *The Advertiser*, but I think it was yesterday's editorial that detailed the need for reform in the sex industry. I believe that had come as a result of brothels that have been established that are being occupied by international students. The point is that *The Advertiser* had come to the fore. In fact, in my reading of it, it was urging this place to take the steps that are necessary to make sure that we do reform this industry.

My friend the member for Ashford will correct me if I am wrong, but I think our state lags behind the rest of Australia with respect to the reform that has been undertaken in those particular states. It seems quite simple to me. The sex industry, including people who engage in the sex

industry, is not going away. It has been here for as long as humans have been on the planet. We should recognise that that is the case.

The simple fact is that measures that have been put in place previously to outlaw that industry and to criminalise that industry have not worked, so why do we not look at ways by which we can ensure that, through progressive, obvious and needed legislation, firstly, we recognise that it is an industry that exists and, secondly, we make sure that we create a regulatory framework that makes that industry safer than it currently is? The bill before you today aims to do that.

I will also alert the chamber to the fact that I have lodged a couple of amendments. I intend, depending on how this progresses, to lodge another amendment, which will in fact strengthen those amendments that I have lodged in the first instance. Quite frankly, I would like to see this matter resolved before we rise. I will not be here this time next year; in fact, I will not even be here in February.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Yes, that's right. It would be nice to be part of a chamber that has recognised this industry and recognised it in such a way that we are doing something that is positive for the industry and, indeed, positive for our community, by making sure that it is a safer industry than it currently is.

I want to refer to some correspondence that was sent to us by the Australian Sex Workers Association—that includes Scarlet Alliance and SIN—that refers to the passage of the bill in the upper house, the bill that is before us today. The organisations that are represented within the Australian Sex Workers Association, which includes, as I have mentioned, those two groups and others, have told us that a majority of 13-8 of those people in the upper house that we are aware of voted in favour of the bill. I was very pleased with that result. I do commend those people who have been working on it, in particular the Hon. Michelle Lensink in the upper house, who I think has done a very good job in ensuring that the bill found its way to this chamber.

From my most recent meeting with representatives from the SIN organisation, they themselves were in favour of reform of the industry. That message came through very clearly to me. It might be a different matter if you want to talk about their support or otherwise for the amendments that might come up subsequently, but those amendments will be a matter for the chamber. I am not being disrespectful to anyone in the industry or the industry as a whole, but I think it is incumbent upon us to do what we can to recognise that the industry exists and, in doing so, put in the necessary measures that will make that industry safer for those people who work in it and safer for those people who use it. As I said, sex work is not going to go away and, in fact, neither are the people who are customers or clients of those who work within the sex industry.

I do not want to keep the house very long. You know my position and my speaking is not going to change anyone's view as to what their view is.

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

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** No, it's not, Michael, and you know it, just as your contribution most likely will not change the way I might think, but I am looking forward to your contribution when you get up and speak. I respect people's rights to have their own views, providing that we treat each other in a respectful way. This legislation essentially is about treating those people who work in the sex industry in the way we treat each other—respectfully—and acknowledging that the industry exists, that they are in it, and that we as legislators can do something to make sure that industry is far more safe and effective than it is at this point in time.

As I said, I do not want to hold the chamber up for any great length of time or, indeed, any more time. What I want to do, though, is make sure that we in this chamber do the very best we can to make sure that this debate is concluded during the time that we have left and that it does not go off into the netherworld for a future parliament to have to deal with it. I think it is incumbent upon us and responsible of us to actually deal with it and do what we can. If it goes down, it goes down, but for goodness sake let's have a crack at making sure that we actually deal with it and not shunt it off to the netherworld.

I commend the bill to the house, and I know there will be some amendments, but I am very pleased to be standing here today supporting attempts by this parliament—long overdue—to do something about the sex industry in the positive way that is being proposed.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (10:53):** Much of conservative opinion and Christian opinion in our state is attached to the current 110-year-old law about prostitution because it thinks it bans prostitution. Well, it does not really. Our law has never punished the sale of sexual gratification simpliciter. If some conservative opinion has no illusions about that, it still thinks the law is a totem worth preserving.

For the member for Ashford, the Hon. J.M. Lensink, the Hon. T.A. Franks and the association of people who have an interest in brothels, the Sex Industry Network, changing the law is principally totemic. They want sex work treated as a normal vocation, one that has no stigma, and they look forward to a world in which prostitution is a commodity that becomes a form of entertainment and advertised like any other. They were comfortable with or quoted testimony that denied sex workers use drugs more than the rest of the population or have backgrounds more troubled than the rest of the population or that sex workers ever regret the work they do or even that they had pimps.

This is why any attempt by my constituents who attended street corner meetings about the bill to use the word 'prostitute' or 'prostitution' were howled down by Sex Industry Network activists who came to the meetings. For these activists, the English language should be legally restricted to prevent the expression of the thought—indeed, the formulation of the thought—that a woman selling her body to any man for sexual gratification could be morally wrong in any circumstances.

None of these activists lived in the area principally affected by street prostitution and, when asked by me as the co-chair of the meetings which suburb or street they lived in, lied to me by nominating streets that did not exist. One in particular, Zrebar Karimi, who gave a second false address at a fourth meeting for local people, told me lying was necessary to prevail in political struggles like these.

The law we have against prostitution is this patchwork of offences, mostly dating from 1907: being on premises frequented by prostitutes, living off the earnings of prostitution, keep and manage a brothel, receiving money in a brothel, procuring a person to be a prostitute, keeping a common bawdy house. The effectiveness of some of these laws has been undermined by credit cards, mobile phones, the internet and the mobility afforded by motor vehicles.

I served on a two-year parliamentary inquiry into prostitution in the 1990s and, together with the then member for Hartley, I wrote a dissenting report and moved a private member's bill to give effect to it. I think both stand the test of time well. I would be pleased to leave the parliament having repealed most of the old laws and replaced them with new and effective ones that make brothels legal, subject to a range of precautionary conditions, and that recognise that merely decriminalising sex work does not sanitise it, as the proponents of this bill think. I filed amendments to this bill to give effect to that aim.

It has been impossible for any reform bill to succeed in the past 28 years I have been in parliament because debates about prostitution lead to a clash of values and cultures, and the devil is always in the detail. We cannot agree on anything. I threw myself into this debate after its proponents passed it through the other place in unseemly haste, in terrible ignorance of the history and the detail and in a form they must have known would fail in this house—namely, the decriminalisation of street prostitution without restrictions of any kind. Not even the New South Wales parliament has done that.

The way to get progressive legislation through the parliament is not to consult diehard supporters repeatedly and frame your bill in doctrinaire terms that appeal to them, but to analyse carefully who may oppose your bill and why, and negotiate with them with a view to getting a majority. Nick Xenophon worked out legislating soon after he was elected, but MPs, such as Sandra Kanck, never could.

As it happens, the state district of Croydon covers Hanson Road and its surrounding conurbation: Athol Park, Mansfield Park, Woodville Gardens and Woodville North. These are the main street beats in Adelaide, and I would have failed my constituents and neighbours (I live in Woodville Park) if I had not told them about the Lensink bill and the debate in parliament about it.

I am open to the decriminalisation of brothels but not street prostitution, which I think is the most dangerous kind of sex work: harmful to sex workers and offensive to the communities that are forced to host it. But I do not want to give the house the impression that the maximum \$750 fine for soliciting in a public place is much of a deterrent to street work. The women who do this work used to work in escort agencies and brothels, but this was no longer an option for them owing to advancing age, poor health (such as loss of teeth) and an obvious drug habit, or all three. Having the most sanitised legal trade possible will not stop women who drop out of the legal trade going on the game in public places.

From time to time, a kerb crawler (a client) picks up one of these women in his vehicle, receives the services and then bashes or murders her. This is not sufficient to deter them from being on the game in the street, so a fine is not going to deter them either. When the magistrate at Port Adelaide has imposed the fine—probably about \$100—the defendant is back on Hanson Road or the streets nearby earning money to pay the fine. As you can imagine, the average copper at the Parks Police Station does not relish being ordered to go down to The Avenue at Athol Park to arrest a sex worker who is high on drugs.

My hope lies not in the full Nordic model but in tweaking the soliciting in a public place offence, making it plain that it applies to kerb crawlers and encouraging police to go after the kerb crawlers, with policewomen disguised as sex workers wired for sound and with micro body cameras and backup to photograph the vehicle registration plate and the face of the kerb crawler. If we can deter kerb crawlers from coming into our neighbourhood, there will not be much point in street prostitutes patrolling Hanson Road and the streets around it.

I accept that there are people who need sex workers: people who are disabled, people who do not have the emotional skills to form a relationship, men who have a repellent appearance. The Nordic model would criminalise their hiring of prostitutes in all circumstances. That seems cruel to me. When I sat on the social development inquiry, Helen Viqua gave evidence of attending the Julia Farr Centre, the former Home for Incurables, to provide sexual services to patients there in a house on the grounds of the institution. In my opinion, the services she provided were probably not unlawful under the current law but, if they were, I would not be a vote to make them unlawful.

Other than street prostitution, the other big vice of the trade is the big brothels, some of them licensed in other states and one I know of listed on the Stock Exchange. I attended one of these brothels, Top of the Town, near Southern Cross Station in Melbourne, with the committee. A young woman who worked in the Public Service talked to us about how she was working to pay off her credit card debt.

Sandra Kanck noticed that there was a menu on the wall, but she could not read it in the gloom of the brothel even when she put on her glasses. She asked if the brothel served food or drink. The manager laughed and explained that it was a list of sexual services. The menu was long. You see, customers do not come to a brothel for company or kissing or missionary position sex: customers come to the brothels for the kinds of things they have seen in pornography videos, the kinds of things their wives and girlfriends do not do.

The big brothels force the sex workers to work the entire menu. This is modern, market-governed slavery. The only places sex workers govern themselves in Victoria is in the illegal, unlicensed brothels where the workers themselves abbreviate the menu and work only the menu they are comfortable with. More power to them.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

## **LIMITATION OF ACTIONS (INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 September 2017.)

**Mr SNELLING (Playford) (11:04):** I move:

That Order of the Day No. 4 be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 22  
 Noes ..... 15  
 Majority ..... 7

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Caica, P.	Tarzia, V.A.	Kenyon, T.R.
Whetstone, T.J.	Weatherill, J.W.	Pengilly, M.R.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

**ROAD TRAFFIC (HELMETS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 September 2017.)

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:10):** In concluding the debate on this bill, I urge the government to support what we think is an extremely commonsense amendment—

**The SPEAKER:** If the honourable member speaks, he closes the debate.

**Mr SNELLING:** I will move that the debate be adjourned.

**Mr KNOLL:** I am on my feet.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not think we can entertain that now that I have let the member for Schubert start. If the member for Playford wished to contribute to the debate, that would be another matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr KNOLL:** That's what happens when you are given the call.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford has a point of order.

**Mr SNELLING:** Mr Speaker, if you are giving me the call, whether I am adjourning the debate or giving a speech should not make any difference.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the member for Playford is, of course, intellectually correct, but this is more a fairness principle. I have given the member for Schubert the call, he is closing the debate, away we go.

**Mr KNOLL:** In closing the debate on this, this is an extremely simple amendment. It seeks to remove a grey area that currently exists in that people who ride motorcycles, bikes, trikes and any other manner of vehicle that requires a helmet currently have a grey area where the affixing of a camera or a bluetooth device to the external shell of the helmet can be considered illegal. It depends on what we are referencing, and whether or not the attaching of a camera to the helmet actually renders the Australian standard certification of the helmet invalid.

Certainly we have had a case where a South Australian who was wearing a camera was fined, or at least formally cautioned and told that next time there would be a fine. We think that, for a whole host of reasons, from improved safety, improved compliance on the road to improved ability to prosecute road traffic violations, this is a sensible amendment. We have ensured that what we are seeking to do matches what already happens in ACT, so it already exists in an Australian jurisdiction, so there is nothing here that we are doing that has not otherwise been tried and tested in an Australian environment.

The amendment itself refers to a frangible mounting, which essentially means that the affixing of the camera cannot break the outer layer of the helmet, therefore ensuring that the integrity of the helmet is maintained. We know that minister Malinauskas had carriage of this and was in favour of doing something. In fact, this bill has been in parliament now for four months, so the government has had ample opportunity to get together and look at what they think they should do.

Minister Malinauskas did say that he wanted to see reform in this area. We have done the hard work, and it is on the table. This is sensible, it is common sense and, if the government chooses not to support this today, it will be simply because they do not want to support a very sensible amendment by the opposition. It will be a sad day and it will frustrate the tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, of riders in South Australia who are looking to keep themselves safer and feel more comfortable on our roads.

We know that they are at greater risk when they are on our roads; they are much more likely to crash. Especially this year, when we have seen a massive increase in the number of motorcycle deaths on our roads, anything we can do to help improve safety and improve compliance on our roads can only have a positive effect. The government spruiks Towards Zero Together at every opportunity. This is an example of us moving potentially one inch closer to zero together. This is something that should be bipartisan, it should be above party politics, and I look forward to the government supporting this amendment.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

**Mr SNELLING:** I move:

That progress be reported.

The committee divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 22  
Noes ..... 17  
Majority ..... 5

**AYES**

Atkinson, M.J.

Brock, G.G.

Cook, N.F.

Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.

Key, S.W.

Bettison, Z.L.

Caica, P.

Digance, A.F.C.

Hildyard, K.A.

Mullighan, S.C.

Bignell, L.W.K.

Close, S.E.

Gee, J.P.

Hughes, E.J.

Odenwalder, L.K.

## AYES

Piccolo, A.  
Rau, J.R.  
Wortley, D.

Picton, C.J.  
Snelling, J.J. (teller)

Rankine, J.M.  
Vlahos, L.A.

## NOES

Bell, T.S.  
Gardner, J.A.W.  
Knoll, S.K. (teller)  
Pederick, A.S.  
Speirs, D.  
Williams, M.R.

Chapman, V.A.  
Goldsworthy, R.M.  
Marshall, S.S.  
Pisoni, D.G.  
Treloar, P.A.  
Wingard, C.

Duluk, S.  
Griffiths, S.P.  
McFetridge, D.  
Sanderson, R.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

## PAIRS

Kenyon, T.R.  
Tarzia, V.A.

Whetstone, T.J.  
Weatherill, J.W.

Koutsantonis, A.  
Pengilly, M.R.

Progress thus reported; committee to sit again.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 August 2017.)

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:23):** I support the bill and hope that we are coming to a vote on it at any moment now.

**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) (11:23):** If I am not mistaken—I do not have a copy of the bill in front me, but I think it will be here in a second—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It would be nice to finish a sentence. This is a bill—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot hear the member.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** This bill seeks to establish that a citizen has the right to take issue with a redistribution, if they choose to do so. If I could just see a copy of the bill, please.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I did not say I am opposing it, either. I am trying to clarify what the bill is. That is my point.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Sit down.

*Members interjecting:*



**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I am on my feet. The Deputy Speaker wants to serve the house as best she can. It is Thursday and I understand that we have had a long week. We only have a few minutes left on this. Members are entitled to be heard in silence. I know the Attorney has gathered his thoughts, and he will now enlighten us.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** The question that I was raising was whether or not this bill was the one that dealt with, in effect, the standing people might have to deal with an order of the commission. My understanding is that that is what the bill is about. If that is what the bill is about—and it does appear that that is what the bill is about—then we agree with it.

I was seeking to make absolutely certain that we were talking about the same thing, which, of course, is prudent. This is one of those examples, where, when the opposition brings forward useful proposals in private members' time, we are happy to agree with those. We are quite pleased, actually, to agree. I look behind me and there is a sea of smiling faces, and they are interested and keen. So with those few words of support—and it gives me great pleasure to be supportive on a matter brought forward by the member for Bragg—I rest my case.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:27):** In concluding the debate on this matter—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I know you are going to find this really hard to believe, but I cannot even hear the deputy leader. Can somebody enlighten me whether cacophony is a word I can use in here? Because I think it is on my left this morning. Deputy leader.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hold everything. If you speak, you close the debate.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Correct.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Correct. I just want everybody else to understand that.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** My ears are ringing with delight to hear the Attorney-General's support of this bill, and I thank him for indicating the same. I ask that the motion now be put.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:29):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Motions*

## MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:29):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) condemns the Weatherill Labor government's decision to cut services at Modbury Hospital and in particular, the removal of emergency surgery, the downgrading of the hospital's emergency department and the closure of its high dependency unit;
- (b) notes that as a consequence of these changes, life-threatening emergencies are now diverted to the Lyell McEwin Hospital and other hospitals and, accordingly, that some north-eastern Adelaide residents now have to travel further and wait longer to access emergency department services; and

- (c) recognises that Labor government's Transforming Health plan is changing the focus of Modbury Hospital from a general community hospital for the people of the north-eastern suburbs to an elective surgery and rehabilitation centre for the whole of northern Adelaide.

This is a very important motion for the people of my electorate, particularly those living in Highbury (north of the river) and some of the Hills communities for which Modbury Hospital is often the first hospital of call. It is also important for residents of Rostrevor, Athelstone and all the other suburbs in Morialta because there are flow-on effects of the changes to Modbury, as there are across the whole of the north-eastern suburbs.

This is a tremendously important motion for the people of the north-east, and the lack of interest from the government in dealing with the challenges that Modbury Hospital is now facing is notable. I fear that the lack of interest from the government would come as an absolute shock to residents of the north-east, who turned up at their polling booths at the last election in seats like Newland, Florey and probably Wright—I was not on the polling booth so I did not see—to see signs put out by the Labor Party which said 'Save Modbury Hospital, Vote Labor'.

Of course, what does the Labor Party do when they attain government? They betray the people of the north-east. They cut services to Modbury Hospital. They portrayed themselves before the election as the saviours and champions of Modbury Hospital and then displayed their true character after the election when, just as they did at the Repat and at Noarlunga, they were willing to betray those communities, and instead of supporting those services, they withdrew them.

Labor's downgrade of key services at Modbury Hospital is part of its discredited Transforming Health experiment. Under Transforming Health, Modbury Hospital will no longer be a general community hospital; it is becoming a centre for rehabilitation, day surgery and outpatients. Before Transforming Health, life-threatening emergencies were treated on-site. After Transforming Health, life-threatening emergencies are diverted away from Modbury, or are stabilised and then transferred.

Before Transforming Health, there was a high dependency unit on site. After Transforming Health, there is no ICU or HDU backup on site. Before Transforming Health, there was a 24-hour emergency surgery at Modbury. After Transforming Health, there is no emergency surgery, no 24-hour on-site anaesthetic service or theatre team. Before Transforming Health, there were acute surgical wards. After Transforming Health, there are no acute surgical wards. Before Transforming Health, there was access to a range of medical wards, but after Transforming Health they have lost two-thirds of their medical beds and now only short-stay, low-acuity beds are available.

Before Transforming Health, there were acute cardiology beds. Now there are no cardiology admissions. At the 2014 election, Labor promised a \$46 million upgrade of Modbury Hospital. That budget was subsequently cut by \$14 million. Before the 2014 election, a redeveloped Modbury emergency department opened with 40 treatment and assessment bays. Now, there are only 29 bays operating. Downgrade after downgrade, cut after cut: that is what this government has done to Modbury Hospital. That is what this Labor Party has done to the people of the north-east—not with them, but to them.

The emergency department has been downgraded. Modbury's emergency department no longer deals with life-threatening cases which would involve hospital admission. Lyell McEwin is so overcrowded that it was subject to a safety notice in late 2016, and it frequently diverts patients to Modbury. The dedicated ambulance shuttle from Modbury to Lyell McEwin stopped operating on 31 March. The number of patients who attend the Modbury ED has not changed significantly and the cases seen by the ED are more complex, not less. As Dr Davidson, head of the Modbury emergency department said in October last year:

...we now have no acute services beyond the ED, other than general medicine, so the loss of intensive care and anaesthetics, particularly out-of-hours, makes a difference to the care that the ED specialists can provide.

SA Health's own data has confirmed that, under Transforming Health, the performance of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network has deteriorated. Modbury's surgery focuses on day surgery involving up to 23-hour hospitalisation, only about one-third of Modbury's previous load. Without critical backup for both treatment and diagnosis, emergency cases have to be diverted to other hospitals. Older patients and other complex cases are more likely to have care scheduled at another hospital. Again, quoting Dr Davidson last year:

...basic hospital admissions can no longer be admitted at Modbury Hospital...

Many country hospitals have access to general surgeons, and not to be able to offer this basic service, to me, is a failure of adequate care.

We also understand that the ED is having trouble recruiting staff and covering overnight shifts. There has been a loss of ability to train and teach medical students, specialist trainees and nurses. Again from Dr Davidson:

...there is still the daily battle for staff, managing problems, and morale is at an all-time low.

When Transforming Health was announced, Modbury Hospital was going to host an eye hospital for the whole of Adelaide. The government has cancelled those plans and now has no plans for an eye hospital. SA Health has recently tried to withdraw the inpatient medical emergency team and have the emergency department staff take on the hospital emergency call-out role. It is dangerous to plan for senior ED staff to leave their patients in an emergency department and be busy for hours in a separate building.

Under Transforming Health, under this government, the cardiac inpatient unit at Modbury Hospital was closed. The member for Playford promised that cardiac outpatient clinics would continue. In a news release dated 7 October 2015, he stated:

...all current specialty outpatient services accessed at Modbury Hospital will remain...

Initially, the outpatient department still performed echocardiograms, stress tests and urgent clinics for chest pain. Until around a month ago, the hospital offered urgent clinics for chest pain each week. The chest pain quick access clinic has been terminated: now, a cardiologist visits Modbury once a fortnight.

In the 2017 budget, Labor promised \$250 million for The Queen Elizabeth Hospital as they scrapped Transforming Health, but only \$9 million for Modbury Hospital. Labor plans to build a \$9 million eight-bed emergency extended care unit at Modbury by 2020. The unit may act as a holding bay for patients awaiting transfer. It will not undo the significant negative impact that Labor's chaotic Transforming Health agenda has had on Modbury Hospital.

I was very pleased several weeks ago when the Liberal Party announced a series of policies to improve services at Modbury Hospital if we are successful in the election in March next year. After the Liberal Party policy was released, the government announced a review of Modbury services in September 2017. The government said that it would take two weeks: it has still not settled. At Modbury Hospital, the main impact has been in the area of surgical services. Complex surgery has been transferred to Lyell McEwin and other hospitals, emergency surgery has been withdrawn and the HDU has been closed. The lack of an HDU means that often less complex surgery cannot be provided at Modbury because the person has other high-risk factors, particularly a person with asthma or an elderly person.

A Marshall Liberal government will invest \$20 million in Modbury Hospital to begin undoing the damage of Transforming Health and reassert Modbury's role as a community hospital. If we are elected, we will establish a four-bed high dependency unit at Modbury Hospital. It would reduce risk to patients with more than one condition, making more procedures possible at the hospital. It would provide a base for a medical emergency team within the hospital. It would reduce the need for ambulance transfers to other hospitals. It would ease the pressure on the Modbury emergency department, and it would ease the pressure on Lyell McEwin.

A Marshall Liberal government will also support surgical teams on site to undertake emergency surgery for both emergency department presentations and patients within the hospital who need critical care. We would redistribute its surgical services across the northern hospitals, with Modbury taking a larger volume of the lower complexity surgery. The redistribution will be driven by the new health board, allowing people to get care closer to home and easing overcrowding at the Lyell McEwin. We will increase the length of stay allowed for surgical inpatients at Modbury from 23 hours to 72 hours. If the hospital admission criteria were made more flexible, a larger range of cases could be undertaken at Modbury because the risk of a longer stay can be managed at Modbury.

Modbury Hospital is an important hospital for the people of the north-eastern suburbs. It is a hospital that anyone living in the north-east is likely to have had contact with. I had contact there for the first time in 1989, in I think year 6 or thereabouts, when I broke my arm at a child's birthday party that the Minister for Transport and I were both at, I was taken to Modbury Hospital and given excellent care. It has certainly always been a positive connection in my life and my family's life.

So many people in the north-east use these services. When I speak to the Liberal candidate for Newland, Dr Richard Harvey, he often tells me about the impact and importance of Modbury Hospital for his family and the important role it has played in the life of his three children. Modbury Hospital is tremendously important, but what state has this government brought it to? Let me tell you: this morning, at 8am, every inpatient bed at both Modbury and the Lyell McEwin Hospital was occupied. Modbury Hospital had 123 inpatients, three more than the hospital's all-beds capacity of 120. Lyell McEwin had 421 inpatients and one patient waiting for a bed, 45 more than the hospital's all-beds capacity of 377.

When every treatment bay is being used in an emergency department, a Code White is declared. On Monday afternoon, 30 October this year, the Lyell McEwin ED was Code White for 16 hours straight. During that period, the Modbury Hospital ED was also Code White for seven hours straight. Yesterday, Wednesday 1 November 2017, the Lyell McEwin ED was Code White for 12 hours straight. During that period, the Modbury Hospital emergency department was also over capacity for six hours straight. These are the consequences of what has been wrought by this government upon the people of South Australia, the people of the north-east and Modbury Hospital.

This is a government supported by marginal seat members of parliament who campaigned on defending Modbury Hospital. The only person on that side of the house who seems to be coming even close to taking an interest in defending the needs of their constituents and the residents of Modbury Hospital is the member for Florey, who has had to leave the Labor Party in order to do so. The fact that the Labor Party is so desperate to get her back, I think we have seen, has led to them now having a review—a review that was promised with results to be delivered in two weeks and improvements to come, fixing the errors wrought through the Transforming Health process. It was promised weeks ago that it would be within two weeks and it has not come up yet. The government obviously is still deciding how much they want to put towards reclaiming the member for Florey.

While it would be a worthy outcome if all these political machinations did indeed result in better services for my constituents and constituents across the north-east, is it not telling about this sort of government that we have in South Australia that this Labor government's only reason that it is being dragged kicking and screaming to returning these services to the people of the north-east is that they want the member for Florey to be the Labor candidate for that seat? What an appalling indictment of the government. They should have known that they went to the last election with their posters, with their A-frames, with their corflutes saying, 'Vote Labor in Newland. Vote Labor in Wright to save Modbury Hospital,' and then they, of course, are the architects of its destruction by cutting and withdrawing services.

This motion is important. It calls attention to the failure of those members to stand up for their community and the failure of this government to deliver the services needed by people in the north-east. If the government does not want to vote for or against this today, if the government wants to move it off, or if the government wants to move against it, then this is the standard to which they will be held to account. I hope that the review the government is putting in place to try to satisfy the member for Florey will indeed see good outcomes for our constituents and our residents, but what an indictment that it has taken this long. I note that they still have not promised to do anything as a result of it. They still have not even delivered this review. I commend the motion to the house and I hope all members will support it.

**Mr SNELLING (Playford) (11:43):** I will just say at the outset that the government understands that the member for Florey will be moving an amendment. The Labor Party party room will have to have an opportunity to consider that amendment and so, after the member for Florey has moved that amendment, we will be seeking to adjourn this debate, but I will say that we certainly do oppose the motion as it is currently drafted. I think the impoverishment of this debate and the impoverishment with regard to health policy when it comes to the South Australian Liberal Party is very sad.

I could speak at length about the long history of the Liberal Party and Modbury Hospital, their decision in the 1990s to privatise the operations of Modbury Hospital and the complete disaster that that proved to be, in that the government, when it was elected, as quickly as possible made the decision to bring the operations of Modbury Hospital back into government hands. There are other speakers who can speak to that point and highlight the utter hypocrisy of the opposition when it comes to Modbury Hospital.

I do want to address specifically the motion. The member for Morialta talks about rehabilitation, outpatients and day surgery as if these are dirty words. He talks about downgrading Modbury Hospital because the government has made a specific decision for Modbury Hospital to have a particular focus on those areas, and he sees those things as being somehow pejorative.

If the Liberal Party in this state took any trouble to have a good look at the health demands of the South Australian population and where this state is not doing as well as it should it is in precisely those areas. It is in having more surgery as day surgery so that people have the opportunity not to have to stay overnight in hospital, so that they can go home, and in fact so that we can reduce the waiting list for elective surgery. The more day surgery we can do, the more surgery we can do and the shorter the waiting lists, the shorter periods people have to wait to get the surgery they need.

With regard to rehabilitation, I am just amazed that the member for Morialta should see rehabilitation as being somehow second best in our health system. It just goes to show the complete lack of understanding or even really interest in health policy in this state from the Liberal Party, because anyone who understood health policy and took an interest in health policy would know how critical rehabilitation is. It is the engine room of our health system. It deals with people and it makes sure that people who have been injured or been unwell, who have suffered a stroke or an amputation, can get back to leading normal lives.

That might not be important to the member for Morialta. He loves to focus on the sexy side of health care, the life-saving interventions. He thinks that that is the be-all and end-all. I have a message for the member for Morialta and for the Liberal Party in this state: it is not. Our health system is so much more than just the high-end, critically ill people. It is increasingly the people with chronic illnesses, whose life circumstances are severely compromised because they cannot get access as quickly as they should to day surgery, because they cannot get access to an outpatient appointment as quickly as they should, because they cannot get the rehabilitation that they need in an appropriate environment, so instead of being in a tertiary hospital they can get quickly out of a tertiary hospital and start getting the treatment they need so that they can get back to living as normal a life as is possible.

I absolutely stand by the decisions this government made with regard to Modbury Hospital because it was about making sure that Modbury Hospital was delivering the health services that the people of the north and the north-east need. It is no good having an intensive care unit and emergency surgery at Modbury Hospital if patients cannot get access to an outpatient appointment, if they cannot get access quickly to the elective surgery that they need, if they cannot get access to the rehabilitation they need after a severe illness, such as a stroke or an amputation, or if they have been in a terrible car accident and they need to spend months in rehabilitation so that they get home as quickly as possible.

The member for Morialta pours scorn on the local members of parliament in that area because they have stood by what is right. As difficult as it is, as difficult as health policy and changes and health reform can be, those local members have taken difficult and courageous decisions to stand by the reform project that the government has undertaken to drag our health system into the 21<sup>st</sup> century and to make sure that people are getting the sort of health care that they absolutely need and the changes that we need to make to our health system so that they can get those services that they need.

The opposition in this state carry on as if they really have no expectation of ever having to sit on this side of the house and take responsibility for difficult decisions. They are happy to play political games and try to win a few cheap brownie points by making political mischief, but what it really shows is that the opposition Liberal Party in South Australia actually have no considered

position and no considered policy when it comes to health policy in this state. We saw that in their '2036' document, which had a few platitudes but actually nothing of any substance.

At the last election, they were called out by Liz Dabars, the Secretary/Chief Executive Officer of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation, for having effectively no health policy. What have we seen over the last four years? A pretty disgusting attempt by the opposition, including dragging public servants and doctors and nurses before parliamentary committees, to intimidate and bully people who are prepared to stand up and back these important reforms.

It may well be that one day, and I am not sure it will necessarily be in my lifetime, this Liberal Party in South Australia will have an opportunity to sit on this side of the house and someone from their side will have to sit in the seat of health minister. It will be very interesting to see how that person deals with the complexities of a modern health system because up to now the only thing that the Liberal Party have offered is basically to preserve everything in our health system in aspic so that nothing ever changes: 'We want to just keep everything as it is. We don't want anything to change.'

The problem with that policy is health care changes, the nature of health care changes and is incredibly dynamic, and the health needs of our population are constantly changing as well. If you make no changes, if you just leave the configuration of your health system essentially the same or similar to what it has been since the 1950s, then you will be letting down the people of South Australia, because unless the health system and the configuration of the services in our hospitals change then they cannot keep up with technology change and treatment change in our hospitals, and they certainly cannot keep up with the fast-paced change of the health needs of our population.

Our population is getting older. There is a massive increase in chronic illness, and to deal with those challenges the health system needs to change to be able to meet those challenges. You cannot meet those challenges with a hospital system that was basically configured in the 1950s. I completely oppose this motion and I look forward to hearing the amendment of the member for Florey.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:54):** I am pleased to speak in support of the motion that the member for Morialta has brought to the house because it is accurate. It is an accurate summation of what is taking place at Modbury Hospital. Whenever there is an opportunity to speak about Modbury Hospital, I usually avail myself of that opportunity because, as I have highlighted in the house before, if the towns to the north of my electorate—Lobethal, Mount Torrens, Birdwood and Gumeracha—do not avail themselves of the services of the Gumeracha hospital, patients normally look to Modbury Hospital for healthcare services.

Those towns in the northern area of Kavel, due to the redistribution of electoral boundaries, are coming out of Kavel and going into the seat of Morialta, so upon the re-election of the member for Morialta in March next year he will have the pleasure of representing those tremendous northern Adelaide Hills towns.

I listened to the member for Playford's contribution. He talked about the impoverishment of health care and health policy. Well, if ever there was an architect of the impoverishment of healthcare services at Modbury Hospital, it is the member for Playford because he was the minister for health for quite a number of years. I find it quite interesting that the member for Playford himself would highlight those issues.

We have seen what an absolute debacle Transforming Health has been over a number of years, so much so that some months ago, when I spoke on issues relating to health, I recounted that, if my memory serves me correctly, the current president of the Labor Party, federal member Mark Butler, wrote a letter highlighting his concerns about what was taking place in relation to Transforming Health. If I am incorrect, I am happy to come back and correct the record. However, I think it is the case that the president of the Labor Party highlighted his concerns about what was taking place with health services, particularly at The QEH, from memory, and the impact that Transforming Health was having in cutting services right across a whole swathe of the western suburban area.

The member for Morialta raised some very important issues in highlighting the motion that he has brought to the house. I do not necessarily need to traverse all those issues, but we have seen some hypocrisy in how the government in more recent times has been dealing with health services. That goes to some issues that the Hon. Stephen Wade, shadow minister for health and wellbeing in

the other place, highlighted just on the weekend. The Hon. Stephen Wade put out a press release on this issue. It is headed, 'Weatherill cutting the heart out of Modbury'. I will quote:

Last month Jay Weatherill promised community consultation into a review of services at Modbury Hospital—now we learn that at the same time the Government was silently cutting cardiac outpatient services.

This latest cut to services at Modbury Hospital highlights that the Weatherill Government is pushing on with Transforming Health in all but name.

We all remember the press conference that was held by the Premier and the then health minister when they said that Transforming Health is all finished and that they had carried out everything they wanted to do under Transforming Health. However, we know it has not stopped; it continues. As the Hon. Stephen Wade in the other place highlights, the government is pushing on with that policy initiative in all but name—Transforming Health in all but name.

The other interesting thing that I think needs to be raised in the house is that we had a set up with the ambus, the ambulance bus, that was meant to transfer patients from Modbury to Lyell McEwin. If ever there was an example of a shambles, the ambus certainly was that. If my memory serves me correctly, when it was first rolled out I do not think anybody was licensed or qualified within the health service to drive the thing, so there was a problem from the outset that they did not have an experienced person who could drive the ambus.

I understand that the services of the ambus were cancelled some months ago. The ambus does not operate from Modbury Hospital to Lyell McEwin Hospital anymore, and that is probably because patients realised it was no good going to Modbury because the government has pulled the guts out of the services at Modbury and they may as well just keep travelling in the car up to the Lyell McEwin. As the member for Morialta accurately pointed out, there has been a Code White at both Modbury and the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

On a couple of final points, the member for Newland and the member for Florey, when she was a member of the Labor Party, put out material into their electorates. I guess the member for Florey's position has changed considerably as she is no longer a member of the Labor Party and now an Independent member.

**Mr Gardner:** She's free.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** She's got some newfound freedom. That's right, John. But the member for Newland is still locked in to the Labor Party position on Modbury. He has put out some material into his electorate that, as time has gone on, is not accurate. I think it is the responsibility of the member for Newland to accurately communicate to his electorate what is taking place at Modbury Hospital.

In contrast to all that, the Liberal Party has made some outstanding policy announcements in relation to Modbury Hospital. The Marshall Liberal government will establish a four-bed high dependency unit at the hospital to enable the return of more complex surgical cases to the downgraded hospital. The return of a high dependency unit will reduce the risk to patients undergoing treatment at Modbury and enable a wider range of surgical procedures to be performed at the hospital. The high dependency unit will help restore the local community's confidence in the Modbury Hospital and reduce the number of people needing to travel to Lyell McEwin Hospital in an emergency.

We have seen just this week, as the member for Morialta highlighted, a Code White in the ED at Lyell McEwin, so they are at capacity, if not over capacity, in dealing with emergency presentations. For the members of the government to try to lecture us on health policy, I think, is a bit rich. It is not a bit rich, it is enormously rich, if I can use that phrase. Transforming Health has been a complete failure. We know it, the community knows it, the medical profession knows it, and the only way to restore good health policy back into our health services is to elect a Marshall Liberal government in March next year.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:03):** I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete (a), (b) and (c) after 'That this house' and substitute the following words:

- (a) recognises Transforming Health has changed the focus of Modbury Hospital and as a consequence some north-eastern residents now have to travel farther and wait longer to access services; and
- (b) welcomes the consultation to evaluate current services as part of a review to reinstate services at Modbury Hospital.

Health is, of course, the largest expenditure this state faces, and there can be no greater trust for us on behalf of our constituents than to look after their health care. I think a lot of truths have been spoken here this morning, and I believe that people in Transforming Health originally thought that the changes they were making would streamline and enable services to be delivered with the best service the first time, every time.

Unfortunately, it has not seemed that way, and there are many reasons for that. I think the member for Playford has mentioned a lot of them. Health care has changed over the years. People are living longer, with greater demands, and no-one can anticipate what is going to happen in health care. This is why I very much welcome the review that is taking place. The member for Kavel may think that this is a revelation to me in my newfound circumstances, but I can assure him I have been watching Modbury Hospital and actively representing its best interests since 1994, and he may not even have been alive in that year; I do not know.

The year 1994 saw me become active on the hospital. My own family were using it. In the year 2002, when the government changed hands we eventually got the outsourced management back into government hands. It would be fair to say a lot of things did not quite work out at Modbury Hospital the way those people thought in good faith they would have.

I think the important focus we should have now is on the consultation process that is going on. The difficulty with that, of course, is that not everyone is going to agree on the exact details of the best way forward, but I do feel that there is a general consensus in the community that Modbury Hospital needs to be able to see not only sick people but those who are slightly sicker, with the very sick always going to have to go to a larger hospital where the amalgamation of some services means that there will always be someone on call or there all the time to assist them.

We are never going to be able to get every single thing right with health. That is a great tragedy for some people, but the important thing is that we have our population knowing where they can go to access services when they need them. It is also important that we recognise that the staff of Modbury Hospital have worked diligently and without question over the years to provide the service they have to the community. There was a time in this place when I had to keep saying, 'You would think no-one who went to Modbury Hospital survived,' when we know that hundreds and hundreds of people have received the best care and the care that puts them back on their feet as quickly as possible.

What we want to avoid, though, is having people in ambulances moving between sites if we can possibly do that. I am very hopeful that the doctors will come to some sort a consensus position on how best to look after the residents of our area and to support the staff at both Modbury Hospital and the Lyell McEwin health service—because they are also stretched—to make sure they are delivering the best care first time, every time, and that these consultations and evaluations will take place in good faith.

I do not like the fact that meetings are being called at very short notice. I understand that the review was to be given a short time frame, and I understand the reason for that, but it is going to be almost impossible to have the sorts of meetings that people are asking us to have with two or three days' notice. As you know, doctors are very busy people, and it is not always going to be possible to accommodate that.

I am very much looking forward to seeing the community activity on Sunday 5 November, followed by meetings with the health minister at Modbury Hospital on the evening of 6 November and, not long after that, being able to see the sort of outcome I want to see—and that I know the members on both sides of the houses want to see—which is that people receive the care that they need closer to home as a matter of course rather than as some sort of accident of timing or planning.

The fact that brickwork is falling off the hospital is not helping, of course. That means there might have to be some sort of major infrastructure work undertaken out there, and that is going to take away money that would be so sorely needed for front-line services. It is also important that we



realise that the sorts of services we are asking for reinstatement would underpin current services at the hospital, such as the GEM ward and the day surgery. If multiday surgery is something that comes back to the hospital, then of course that sort of unit that we are talking about would be able to help look after those patients as well.

With regard to flow-through in hospitals, I do not know how medicos do all that. It is beyond me, but if teachers can organise timetables, I am sure people on the front line of hospitals can organise flow of services. They do, and we are so grateful for their service. We are also very grateful for the extra money that has been spent on paramedics in the Ambulance Service, which is the front-line part of Transforming Health.

Again, I bring to the house's attention my call for an examination of the provision of universal emergency ambulance services to underpin Transforming Health, such as other states are able to do. We have seen large expenditures of money in education, which of course are very welcome. It would be nice to see some way of organising the expenditure needed for a universal emergency ambulance cover as well.

But, of course, health is not just a state issue. It is a much larger issue than that. The changes that we have seen here in Australia since the Medibank days—the reintroduction of taxation exemptions for private health insurance, the way that private health insurance premiums have skyrocketed, the nexus between private health provision and public patients, and the importance of GPs in the role of primary health care—all need to be examined, with the very important issue of aged-care services not far behind what we are looking at today as our population ages and lives longer.

I know that in our area of Modbury we have a large number of retirement villages and nursing homes in the catchment area that are very close to the hospital for that very reason, and the services we are talking about reinstating at Modbury Hospital underpin all those cohorts of patients and make their journey through the health system a lot less stressful.

The idea of having acute services at the Lyell McEwin health service, with rehab and so forth at Modbury, is a terrific idea. We need to make it work, and that is the difficulty. We do not want to be transferring people backwards and forwards between places or hospital sites if we can possibly avoid it, and I think this is the important part of the process that is underway now. It is going to be very difficult to get something like that in place very quickly, but the government has given me an undertaking that they are looking to do something sooner rather than later.

**Mr Gardner:** Don't trust them.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I think it is up to all of us to make sure that the community gets the right outcome. I can only take their voicing this as a way forward in goodwill and in good faith. If I find out that that is not the case, it would be very disappointing, not only for me but for everybody in this house and the wider community altogether. It is really important that we do not lose out in the cut and thrust of what has gone on here today.

There has been truth on both sides of the debate this morning and there has been a little bit of a stretch of both as well, but we all want to land in the spot where the residents in our community are getting the services that they need, and we are only going to do that by using the truth and the absolute truth. As unfortunate as it may be for some people, it is the way that we will get to the position that will see the services that we need in the right place at the right time.

I am pleased to see that the minister has been able to resolve the SASMOA position this morning. I am looking forward to working with the people involved with SASMOA and the medicos who are in the hospitals delivering the services that we need. I will also be speaking to the ANMF to see how I can best support them. The nurses, of course, are the backbone of the system of health that we have at Modbury Hospital. They have been so loyal to the hospital over so many years.

I am going to do all that I possibly can to make sure that the delivery of whatever the outcome is, even if it is not the best possible outcome I can get at this very moment, will not be the last word that is ever said about health in this place by me or anybody else. Just as we have had to try the Transforming Health changes and see how they have gone in the community, we are going to have

to look at what the consultation brings for us in the north-east as we underpin services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital as part of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network.

**The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Disabilities, Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport) (12:13):** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 22  
Noes ..... 16  
Majority ..... 6

#### AYES

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

#### NOES

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

#### PAIRS

Digance, A.F.C.	Pengilly, M.R.	Weatherill, J.W.
Whetstone, T.J.	Wortley, D.	Redmond, I.M.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

### WOMEN IN AGRICULTURE AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (12:19):** I move:

That this house—

1. Congratulates the Women in Agriculture and Business of South Australia Inc., which was founded in Riverton, on its centenary held in Riverton on 28 and 29 October 2017.
2. Recognises the organisation's achievements and services; and in particular for:
  - (a) encouraging interest and participation in activities of rural people and organisations, especially in primary industries;
  - (b) promoting goodwill, friendship and understanding among members;
  - (c) providing effective leadership to link Women in Agriculture and Business and Agricultural Bureau activities through the membership network;
  - (d) generating opportunities for educational, cultural and technical advancement to members, combining with other rural organisations where appropriate;

- (e) encouraging and fostering the ability of women to take a shared responsibility for the community in which we live, from local to world level; pressing for recognition of the needs and worth of rural people at all levels of government; and
- (f) promoting and supporting the preservation of our environment and ecology and care for the land.

Today, women are working in every occupation and every industry. Most women love the sense of achievement that working in male-dominated occupations brings, not to mention the better pay and also the recognition. It makes sense for young women to break out of traditional, narrow occupational choices and find out more about other options. Unfortunately traditional 'men's work', where women make up less than a quarter of the workforce, is often regarded by men as more important, and in some cases allows more independence, than comparable 'women's work', where women make up the majority.

Today, we not only see recognition of women who have historically been actively involved in agriculture but, more importantly, we see their roles increasing into what were once male-dominated industries. This is not only in the corporate world of private industry but also in transportation, especially in the ever-increasing activities in the resource sector. We also see an ever-increasing number of women taking an active role in politics at state, local and federal levels; just recently we have seen many female state premiers and, only recently, our first female prime minister.

However, the above has not always been the case with regard to women being accepted and acknowledged in the workforce. Women have always worked the land and helped provide the food to nourish Australians. Aboriginal women gathered their food as it ripened with the seasons in the annual cycle of migration. When the Europeans arrived in 1788, women worked with their husbands or farmed in their own right to develop primary production in Australia, but their roles went unacknowledged. Even now, as then, many of these women remain unacknowledged.

The lack of recognition for rural women in Australia actually has a historical basis. In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Australian government felt there was a sense of shame for a developing nation such as Australia to admit the extent of women's involvement in agriculture. There was a deliberate avoidance of recognising women's agricultural pursuits for fear of creating the impression that women were in the habit of working in the fields, as they were in some of the older countries around the world. It was not something a new and prospering country like Australia wanted to publicise. As a result, the census at the time no longer recorded women's farm work and, until 1994, the legal status for farm women was 'sleeping partner, non-productive'.

Australian agriculture can post a whole range of primary production and food processing industries, and women have always played a part in their development in the rural communities in which they are based. During World War II many women in Australia joined the Land Army and kept the economy afloat at home. Responding to need, often because of hardship and isolation, women have brought innovation to country Australia in the areas of both agriculture and the corporate world.

Australia went through a period of change when the contribution of farming women began to be publicly recognised. We saw some of the tall and brave 'poppies' being unjustly branded with lines like, 'Well, who does she think she is? You'd think her husband didn't work on the farm when you read or hear about what this woman is doing.' Thankfully, those reactions are disappearing. It is now commonplace to see or read about farming couples and families with women and men commanding equal recognition for their hard work and expert skills in their own right.

In an effort to address some of these cultural and social problems, government-sponsored rural women's networks, similar to Women in Agriculture and Business, have established themselves at national, state and local levels since the early 1980s. These networks encourage rural women to look beyond their individual context and to identify themselves as part of a much larger group of women. As the proverb goes, 'Women hold up half the sky.' I can vouch for that because my partner, Lyn, keeps telling me all the time.

While women's empowerment has traditionally been the prerogative of development organisations and equality advocates, corporate executives increasingly recognise that the issue belongs in the boardroom also, on the action agenda for business growth and competitiveness. Notwithstanding the real and substantial barriers that women face in policy, legal and cultural terms,

several gaps offer quick wins for business engagement, especially in closing financing and input access disparities by understanding and serving women as suppliers, clients and customers. Capturing those opportunities will require a mindset shift for business.

As with new geographies, women entrepreneurs—arguably the world's largest neglected market—are best reached via a tailored approach. This will mean questioning lingering assumptions, such as the perceived riskiness of investing in women-owned SMEs and drawing from evidence-based approaches for grassroots engagement. Real progress depends on corporate leadership, and there is still ample space for early movers to step up. Businesses that do not find themselves in this situation or do not try this will be left behind. There are many different pathways students can take to study a non-traditional occupation. Your career pathway is the journey you take to reach your goals. You decide what pathway is right for you. In my role as the local member, that is something I encourage in young people and women.

WAB was formed in Riverton in 1917 to meet the needs of women who were isolated and who were working with their families to establish farms and homes in the rural districts. From those early days, the Women in Agriculture and Business (WAB) has had close links with the Agricultural Bureau and various government agricultural agencies. Women in Agriculture and Business of SA is a peak rural organisation assisting to create confident, skilled women recognised for their leadership and their contributions to vibrant and sustainable communities. WAB facilitates a range of activities through a statewide network that supports, encourages and develops women with rural, agricultural and business interests in their role as key decision-makers and facilitators in rural communities and in many primary industries.

Today, the Women in Agriculture and Business (WAB) has a formal affiliation with the Agricultural Bureau and is represented on the Advisory Board of Agriculture. WAB is also associated with the Associated Country Women of the World, which has links with the United Nations. It is also affiliated with the National Council of Women. Organisations such as WAB have encouraged females to look towards better achievement and recognition, and we are all the better for their dedication.

I congratulate Liz Calvert who has been state president for the last 12 months. The celebrations took place at Riverton, a small rural community of just over 800 or 1,000 people. This organisation has received world recognition, and 70,000 young women have benefited from this over many years. Liz Calvert is an unassuming person and she has done a wonderful job. The weekend was an absolute fantastic success. I congratulate the organisation and women in general, and I say to them, 'You can do anything you want. Just take the opportunity, believe in it and go for it.' As I previously said, the tall poppy syndrome that we have seen over the past few years is rapidly disappearing.

The celebration of a century of this great association was mentioned at the conference on Saturday, which I attended. There was a full house, and I must congratulate Rob Kerin who spoke on behalf of regional people. He did a fantastic job. Members of the state and federal government also gave recognition to these people. It was highlighted that the glass ceiling has now been smashed. Again, I congratulate the organisation, and I encourage young women—wherever they may be—to seize the opportunity and achieve their dreams.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:29):** I rise to support this very good motion from the member for Frome. Women in Agriculture and Business is an absolutely outstanding organisation in South Australia and have been for 100 years now, as we know from the centenary celebrations that were held in late October in Riverton. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend those celebrations due to other electorate commitments. I know that Kendall Jackson, the Liberal candidate for Frome, was able to attend. She said it was an outstanding event supporting a truly wonderful organisation.

I have been fortunate, though, to attend other Women in Agriculture functions—a tremendous one once in Booleroo. Quite a few years ago, they asked me to come and speak with them. They have a very strong presence in that part of the world. Not too many months ago, I was able to attend a very special event for Women in Agriculture and Business here in Adelaide in the park in North Adelaide just off O'Connell Street, where they actually had the ceremonial planting of the rose that was bred to celebrate women in South Australia and the contribution they have made over many years.

As we know, Women in Agriculture have been around for 100 years. Interestingly, they started in Riverton. They were actually created there in Riverton. It is a bit unfortunate that they do not have a branch in Riverton anymore, but they are very strong in many other parts of Australia and South Australia. The working and social interaction between men and women in country and outback South Australia could not be more important.

I know it is important in the city. I am not comparing in any way, but my experience with the way families and businesses and communities operate in country and outback areas is that they could not and would not be what they are without organised, capable, hardworking, nurturing women who contribute everything you could possibly imagine, from raising families all the way through to leading large businesses in rural South Australia.

An interesting thing is that rural country areas, outback areas are sometimes considered to be more conservative, a bit more old-fashioned and maybe more chauvinistic, but let me tell you that men in country and outback areas value the women they live and work with enormously. There are features of country and outback life that perhaps to city dwellers might seem to be a bit more conservative, but let me tell you that it does not flow through in any way to respect for women or the understanding by men that women in country and outback areas can contribute to leadership roles of all sorts of descriptions.

There are women leading school governing councils, there are women who are principals, there are women who lead hospitals, there are women who lead transport organisations and there are women leading in senior police roles. There are women in every level of society in country areas, and men are glad to have them there. Men do not want to drag them back down. Men do not feel uncomfortable in that role at all. Let me say that that flows through across different ethnic and racial backgrounds as well. In Aboriginal communities, women play an incredibly strong leadership role in many ways.

In migrant communities in country and outback South Australia, women play a very important leadership role. Throughout country and outback South Australia, women are recognised as the people who will sometimes be supportive, sometimes be working side by side and sometimes be leading to make sure that the right things happen in their families, in their homes, in their communities and in their workplaces. In country and outback South Australia, we celebrate that fact, so I support the member for Frome's motion wholeheartedly.

Women in Agriculture and Business is a very significant organisation that contributes in the most grassroots of ways and also to some of the most senior leadership roles that exist in the nation. Their advice is valued everywhere they go. They are an outstanding organisation and I am very pleased to have many friends and acquaintances who are members of Women in Agriculture and Business.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:35):** I strongly support this motion and would just like to say a few words. I will not repeat what the two previous speakers have already said; they have already covered a lot of ground, and they covered it very well. One thing I would like to talk about is the work of women in agriculture, horticulture and primary production. There is often a belief, particularly in metropolitan and inner-city areas, that women in the workforce is a recent thing. Women have been in the workforce since the year dot in country and regional areas.

Women have worked on farms for many centuries in Australia, as they have done in other countries, and that has not changed. I am very fortunate to meet with women in my electorate who have turned 100 years old. Invariably, a lot of the women in my electorate have actually retired from nearby farming communities. When you sit down with these women and talk about their stories, you realise they have often lived quite harsh and difficult lives. Having said that, they have never complain and think themselves quite fortunate.

What becomes apparent is that from the time they could walk, women, like men, have worked in agriculture. They worked while raising families. They rode horses and carts in the early days, and they worked in the paddocks, etc. Often that is not well understood in city areas, but as I said, these women have worked along side men since the year dot. As has already been mentioned, Aboriginal women also worked in their own communities. Migrant women, particularly in the Riverland and other communities, have worked alongside their partners and families, often in the blocks. They have

driven tractors and done a lot of the hard work, so I think it is very important that we understand that when we talk about women in society we actually pay a special tribute to women in rural areas. Often, they have actually done a lot of the hard work.

I would also briefly like to mention a sister organisation: the Country Women's Association. I am very fortunate to have Mrs Linda Bertram in my electorate. Until recently, Mrs Bertram was state president of the Country Women's Association of South Australia. Through that organisation, Linda and other women have supported their communities in leadership roles. They have raised funds, supported young people who are struggling in their communities, and they have supported other women. Linda tells me she became involved in the Country Women's Association because she wanted to support the women in her community.

A lot of the women in rural communities often work in an environment where they suffer from isolation and loneliness due to the lack of services and support that we often take for granted in urban South Australia. There are a lot of good things about the Country Women's Association, but one of them is that they are one of the few service clubs which is actually growing in this state. They have opened new branches in Gawler and other areas—in fact, I recently received a list from Linda about all the new branches they have opened across South Australia.

Another good thing about the Country Women's Association is that they have been able to renew the organisation and work out how to stay relevant, how to involve younger women and how to involve women who now work differently. They have done a very successful job and, I must add, they have been far more successful than some of the service clubs which have traditionally been run by men. The women have actually listened to their communities; they have renewed their organisation. Linda was part of this push to renew and rebuild the organisation, and they are doing a wonderful job. With those few comments, I would like to first support the motion and, secondly, acknowledge the important role women have played in rural South Australia. Often, that is not fully understood or acknowledged in urban South Australia.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:39):** I rise to support the motion congratulating Women in Agriculture and Business in South Australia on its centenary and acknowledge that I have been and remain a member for a very long time. In fact, my membership of this organisation predated my membership to the Country Women's Association, which I note the member for Light has addressed in his commentary.

It is an organisation that has not only predated the Country Women's Association in South Australia but has survived. I acknowledge in the leadership of WAB, as we know it, that, to ensure they remain contemporary, they have in recent years established an online service for communication between members. This has been an important addition to enabling our representatives who live in more remote areas of South Australia to remain connected and, of course, to be able to participate in the exchange of information and ideas, even if they are, for whatever reason, unable to attend local meetings.

Its recognition as providing a network to its members in South Australia is one thing, but of course it also very significant at an international level with other rural organisations. So, well done to the Woman in Agriculture and Business and to the leadership, who have ensured that its achievements have been recorded and also celebrated and, secondly, ensured that it has an online life to provide practical access to the next generation of women. Congratulations!

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:42):** I rise to support this motion moved by the member for Frome, which states:

That this house—

1. Congratulates the Women in Agriculture and Business of South Australia Inc., which was founded in Riverton, on its Centenary held in Riverton on the 28 and 29 October 2017.
2. Recognises the organisation's achievements and services; and in particular for—
  - (a) encouraging interest and participation in activities of rural people and organisations, especially in primary industries;
  - (b) promoting goodwill, friendship and understanding among members;

- (c) providing effective leadership to link Women in Agriculture and Business and Agricultural Bureau activities through the membership network;
- (d) generating opportunities for educational, cultural and technical advancement to members, combining with other rural organisations where appropriate;
- (e) encouraging and fostering the ability of women to take a shared responsibility for the community in which we live, from local to world level; pressing for recognition of the needs and worth of rural people at all levels of government; and
- (f) promoting and supporting the preservation of our environment and ecology and care for the land.

I note that the mission statement from Women in Agriculture and Business is:

To facilitate a range of activities through a statewide network which supports, encourages and develops women with rural, agricultural and business interests, in their role as key decision makers and facilitators in rural communities and in primary industries.

Women in Agriculture and Business was first established in 1917, and I note that it was first established at Riverton, where they celebrated the centenary the other day, and it was to meet the needs of women who were isolated and who were working with their families to establish farms and homes in rural districts. Women in Agriculture and Business now has some 300 members.

To show that there is no gender bias in Women in Agriculture and Business, I note that I was an associate member for a while. I said, 'Is that appropriate?' and they said, 'Yep, that's fine,' so that was good. I would like to acknowledge the centenary celebrations at Riverton; I was not able to get there as I had other commitments. I note that the member for Frome was a sponsor and I was a sponsor and got some good coverage out of it.

I am very pleased to get on board and sponsor the centenary celebrations. Women take not just the supporting role but the leading role in rural life in many instances, whether or not it is actively being out there on the land. I can certainly talk about issues at sheep yards, which bring out either the best or the worst in men and women. It is a real teller of character to see how people get on. Before my wife and I were married, I remember that we were drafting some prime lambs on a block where we were share farming. We were leasing it for running these lambs. I was yelling at the dog, yelling at dad to shut the gate, as you do, and I must have yelled at my future wife. Next thing, she is walking off.

**The Hon. G.G. Brock:** You're game.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Well, it was probably a very light yell. I said, 'Where are you going?' She said, 'I'm not going to be spoken to like that.' I said, 'Look, we are handling sheep. That's how it is.' She did come back because it was about a 20-kilometre walk home.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** She probably regrets it now.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Exactly. I did not think it was too harsh, but when the action is on handling animals—and they can be a bit frustrating—you have to work with the situation. I would like to salute all women in agriculture who, as I said, have been in the lead role and also have been actively either running the properties or playing a true partnership role with their husband or partner in managing the properties. There are stories about women having to take over running a property who come from an urban background. Sharon Oldfield is one person who comes to mind from up north. Her husband died tragically in a plane accident many years ago. She took over Cowarie Station and is doing a great job. I have visited that station several times and seen how she runs the property.

I think that where women are truly the unsung heroes of agriculture and business is in doing the book work. I do not think that I was Robinson Crusoe as a farmer before I came in here, but paperwork was not my first choice when I came in from the paddock off the tractor or from handling livestock. I believe that, apart from the assistance or the main role women take in the outside jobs, in a very high percentage of cases they are the ones doing the GST returns. They are doing the book work. They are making sure the business just works.

Sadly, for too many of us blokes—and I put up my hand—our first choice is not to deal with the paperwork. Sure, we can handle how to put in a crop, how to take it off and how to raise livestock, but when it comes to going through the paperwork and making sure the business is operating

effectively, thankfully, in the main, women are there doing that work. As I said, for most of us blokes, that is not our first choice, so I salute all the ladies who do that. It is a huge role.

As we know, with GST receipts it is unpaid work. It has to be done to make sure you get the claims right with the tax office. Apart from that, it is running the business, paying the bills on time and, if you are marketing stock or grain, making sure that that is on track and that the money is flowing in as well. The contribution of women in rural life will probably never be measured appropriately because of the amount of contribution they give both out in the field and in the office. I salute them.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:49):** I rise to make a brief contribution on this and not to go over the ground that other speakers have gone over except to say congratulations to the Women in Agriculture and Business on their 100-year anniversary. A woman in my office by the name of Courtney is a local of Saddleworth and Riverton and knows all things that go on over there and has been talking to me quite a bit about the work that these people do in her local community.

I want to specifically thank and acknowledge the work of the branches that exist within the beautiful electorate of Schubert, and in particular the Rosedale, Sandy Creek and Williamstown branch, which was formed in 1953, and the Tanunda branch, which was formed in 1950. We also have the former branches of Freeling, Wasleys and Light Pass.

The Tanunda branch have been a fantastic group of women, in particular Mel Hoffman who has been a stalwart of that branch; in fact, I am fairly certain that Mel has actually been a part of that branch for her its entire life. Whilst now their numbers are not that great and they are looking for new recruits, they have made a huge and valuable contribution to the Schubert electorate and to the Barossa Valley over the last 67 years and they are a welcome part of the fabric that makes up our beautiful community.

To the Women in Agriculture and Business, can I add my support and my thanks for the work that they do in helping to advance the cause of women in agriculture and business. I look forward to their contribution for many years to come.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (12:51):** I want to thank everybody for their contribution. As everybody has indicated, I think society has changed dramatically from where it was many years ago. Again, everybody in this world is equal and, with the acknowledgement that we have all made today regarding the success and the great contributions that women make across all of South Australia and Australian in particular, I think we have learnt and become more appreciative of what we have.

In closing, again I would like to reinforce my commitment, as will others here I am sure, to ensuring that we give every young woman an opportunity to achieve the best they can in their life, no matter where they are or where they live, and in particular the people in the regions out there. Sometimes we may appear to be not recognising that, but you only have to look at some of the young kids coming up today and women in particular. They are the trailblazers for the future. I thank everybody for their contribution today.

Motion carried.

### YAMBA QUARANTINE STATION

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:52):** On behalf of the member for Chaffey, I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Yamba quarantine station and the role it has played in protecting South Australia from biosecurity threats, including fruit fly, phylloxera, exotic invasive weeds and nursery material;
- (b) highlights the ongoing fruit fly threat to the Riverland and South Australia from interstate;
- (c) notes the importance of the Yamba quarantine station operating 24 hours, 7 days a week; and
- (d) ensures everyone is aware of the importance of keeping fruit fly out of South Australia and adhering to the strict restrictions in place for bringing fruit, vegetables, other plants and plant products into the state.



Certainly, I acknowledge that the Riverland is the engine room for horticultural products, fruit and vegetables for this state. The Yamba quarantine station is an absolutely vital part of keeping that fruit fly free status, not just for the Riverland but further on through the state. Obviously, we have areas that are not in the Riverland zone that I represent between Bowhill and Murray Bridge in the main, where there are vineyards, apricots, a bit of citrus and other crops that also need to be protected from all these pests.

Fruit fly is one of those things that, if it ever takes hold, as it has done in other areas, becomes an issue that is managed, instead of fixed before it becomes an issue. That is why people have to pay the utmost respect when travelling into areas like the Riverland. If they are coming across the Victorian border at Yamba, obviously they will be stopped. They will be inspected and they need to fess up. They need to acknowledge that if they have anything in their car, any fruit or vegetables, it needs to be dealt with.

Over the years, this state, as well as the Riverland in my electorate, has contributed many billions of dollars, hundreds of billions of dollars for not just growing local produce but produce that is exported interstate, and that is also vital for our valuable international export trade. If we do not get it right—and I can assure you, this happens, because our international partners check—we can lose out on trade deals worth many hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

It is something that we must be absolutely vigilant on. I note that at Pinnaroo we do not have that 24-hour coverage and we do rely on honesty. When my boys play footy at home, down at Peake, one of the teams we play is Murrayville, at the MCG, the Murrayville cricket ground. We have to cross the border, obviously, so we are well aware of the issue of bringing material back into South Australia. I guess for cost reasons that station is not operated 24 hours a day. I think it is operated business hours during the week. It seems by practice, and by the fact that we have not seen major outbreaks for a while, that people in the main are doing the right thing. As I said, this is absolutely vital.

Several years ago, I went to the launch of the station in Port Augusta that was going to be breeding, and has been breeding, non-fertile fruit fly to upset the breeding program. That seems to be doing its job. Regarding quarantine stations, it is interesting that when you go into Western Australia, the quarantine station for going into the west—and I have gone through it several times over my life—is right on the border, and ours is at Ceduna coming from that way.

I know there was discussion for a while about whether it should be moved to the border. I think it is about 500 kilometres away from Ceduna. I know the West Australians do it, but the issue is about relocating staff and upsetting their families. It still is a very effective quarantine point coming in from Western Australia. I know for a fact that when you go through the roadhouses and rest stops in Western Australia, there are all the signs about coming back to our state: 'put it in a bin', 'don't go over the border', 'get rid of your fruit and produce'.

There are also other threats that we have to be aware of. Phylloxera could decimate the wine industry. The wine industry is only just now pulling itself out of a string of years when there was oversupply; about 25 per cent of our production was oversupplied. With some massive exports being opened up, especially in countries like China, a lot of that excess has been soaked up, so to speak, and has helped the wine industry. Just when the wine industry is having a little lift, we do not need, and we never need, to have a problem in our vineyards.

Exotic invasive weeds are certainly something that we need to be aware of. I note the issue of branched broomrape that was around in the Murraylands. I know the former member for Hammond was dealing with this and, when I came in in 2006, I was dealing with this.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** As you seek to draw another breath, member for Hammond, perhaps you would like to seek leave to continue your remarks.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

*Petitions***MODBURY HOSPITAL**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Presented a petition signed by 200 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to restore vital emergency and surgical services to Modbury Hospital, expanding its role within the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network and in particular, seek to reinstate the High Dependency Unit at Modbury Hospital, and to fast-track the introduction of the Emergency Extended Care Unit.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Auditor-General's Department—Annual Report 2016-17  
Premier and Cabinet, Department of the—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Minister for The Arts (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Annual Report 2016-17  
Adelaide Festival Corporation—Annual Report 2016-17  
Adelaide Film Festival—Annual Report 2016-17  
Art Gallery of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17  
Carclew—Annual Report 2016-17  
Carrick Hill Trust—Annual Report 2016-17  
History Trust of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17  
JamFactory Contemporary Craft and Design Inc—Annual Report 2016-17  
Libraries Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17  
South Australian Museum Board—Annual Report 2016-17  
Windmill Theatre Company, Australian Children's Performing Arts Company—  
Annual Report 2016-17

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

State of the Sector—Annual Report 2016-17

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

Primary Industries and Regions SA—Annual Report 2016-17  
Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Fisheries Management—Fees No. 6  
Industrial Hemp—  
Fees  
General

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

Adelaide Venue Management Corporation—Annual Report 2016-17  
South Australian Tourism Commission—Annual Report 2016-17

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

Forestry SA—Annual Report 2016-17

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

Animal Welfare Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium, Board of the—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Dog and Cat Management Board—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Dog Fence Board—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Environment Protection Authority—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Environment, Water and Natural Resources, Department of—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Heritage Council, South Australian—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park Co-management Board—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Lake Gairdner National Park Co-Management Board—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Maralinga Lands Unnamed Conservation Park (Mamungari) Co-management Board—  
 Annual Report 2016-17  
 Nullarbor Parks and Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Parks and Wilderness Council—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Pastoral Board—Annual Report 2016-17  
 South Australian Water Corporation—Annual Report 2016-17  
 South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Stormwater Management Authority—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park Co-management Board—Annual Report  
 2016-17  
 Witjira National Park Co-management Board—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Yumbarra Co-Management Board—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Zero Waste SA/Office of the Green Industries SA—Annual Report 2016-17

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

National Heavy Vehicle Regulator—Annual Report 2015-16  
 State Development, Department of—Annual Report 2016-17  
 TechInSA—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Minister for Police (Hon. C.J. Picton)—

Health and Ageing, Department of—Annual Report 2016-17  
 Principal Community Visitor—Annual Report 2016-17

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:06):** On behalf of the Presiding Member, I bring up the 583<sup>rd</sup> report of the committee, entitled Operations Control Centre Relocation Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** On behalf of the Presiding Member, I bring up the 585<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Metro Trunk Mains Renewal Silks Gorge Road Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

#### *Question Time*

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is to the Premier. Has disciplinary action been taken against any person in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet following the hiring of Veronica Theriault as Chief Information Officer?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:08):** I will take this on notice because I need to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader and the deputy leader are called to order. The Deputy Premier is offering no provocation; he's attempting to answer the question.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will attempt to find out what has happened in relation to those matters. I do know that there were a number of investigations around this matter. I do not—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Well, if you have asked me on a couple of occasions and you have received an answer—

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier will not respond to interjections.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** No; I thank you, Mr Speaker. I am sorry I got distracted by them. I will continue to speak to Dr Russell. At this stage, my answer is the same as it was on previous occasions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert is called to order and warned, and the deputy leader is warned. Leader.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09):** Supplementary: who is conducting this investigation? Is it Dr Russell? Are there other members of the review and are there any independent members of the review team?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:09):** To the best of my knowledge, the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Dr Russell, is the responsible person, in terms of having overall responsibility for organising what investigations and inquiries need to be made. Exactly who else he has engaged to assist him with those matters, I don't know, but he is the person with the primary responsibility.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09):** Supplementary: is there anybody independent of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet taking part in this review?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:10):** I am not aware of any, but I will check with Dr Russell.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10):** Can the Attorney-General indicate to the house when this review is due, given that it was kicked off in September?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:10):** Again, I will check with Dr Russell.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10):** Will the government table the review when it is complete?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection**

**Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide (14:10):** The word 'review' has crept into this series of questions in the last one or two. I indicated that the chief executive was looking into the circumstances surrounding these matters. I will ask the chief executive to provide me with all the information that is sought. Whether or not that information is in the form of a review, in so many words, I don't know. As I have said, he is reviewing the matter; that is true. I am just trying to be very clear here. I am not saying that there is going to be some particularly formatted report of some description, but what I am saying is that there will be answers to the questions.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11):** Supplementary: given that this review was kicked off in September of this year, has the review of public sector recruitment practices following the DPC's hiring of Veronica Theriault identified any other appointments in which Commissioner for Public Sector Employment guidelines were not followed?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:11):** Again, it's a good question and I will seek the answer.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11):** I have a further question to the Attorney-General. Has the Chief Information Security Officer conducted an audit as to whether there was any breach of departmental security by Ms Veronica Theriault, which the Attorney-General undertook on 27 September to check with Dr Don Russell?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:12):** I undertook then to check with Dr Russell. When I give an undertaking of that sort in the parliament, these things are referred to the relevant public servants to look at and to provide an answer. I don't presently have an answer to those things, but, as a result of these questions, I will again draw the attention—

**Mr Gardner:** When you take it on notice, you're supposed to bring an answer back.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I'm finding Morialta distracting, Mr Speaker. The point is that when I find the answers to those questions, obviously I will let those opposite know. As a result of today's questions, I will take a photocopy of today's questions and send them to Dr Russell and say, 'These further questions have been offered.'

**Ms Chapman:** That's what you said last time.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I do it every time. I don't ignore questions that are put to me, but I will pursue the answers, as I have indicated, with Dr Russell.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the leader for his interjections. I also call to order, warn a first time and a second time the member for Morialta. I warn for the second and final time the deputy leader.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Given that it has been over a month since the Attorney-General said he would get an answer to the house, can the Attorney now advise whether Ms Veronica Theriault had access to cabinet documents?

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

**for the City of Adelaide) (14:14):** At the risk of nudging on the repetitive, I have asked all of the questions—

**Mr Marshall:** You didn't even ask that question. That's not part of an overall review.

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

**Mr Wingard:** Yes or no? Come on.

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

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I have referred all of the questions that have been asked of me in this place to Dr Russell. I will do it again and emphasise that my feeling about it is that there is a sense of urgency about the answers. I will refer that to Dr Russell and ask him to assist as quickly as he can. In relation to the particular matter that has just been raised, I will certainly include that in the questions that I ask Dr Russell.

If I could make a suggestion which might be of assistance: if the Leader of the Opposition has a series of quite particular questions about matters of some detail (such as this matter), I would be perfectly happy for him, if he wished to do so, to either have a chat with me or write me a letter, or whatever, and I can action that independently of being in here. It is perfectly reasonable for him to ask me for that sort of information and I'm very happy to do my best.

However, to ask the question in here and then—I have said that I would try to get the answers, which I have done. We have now had I think five or six questions on this topic, which is fine, and I have attempted to answer each one of them as best I can, but there is a certain familiarity about the answers now, so I am not sure that I can help the house much more than to say that I have taken up and will take up all of these matters with Dr Russell.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR RECRUITMENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** Supplementary: can the Attorney-General advise the house whether Dr Don Russell was a member of the panel that recommended the appointment of Ms Veronica Theriault?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:16):** I would only be speculating on the answer to that question—and so I won't—but, again, I will get clarification on that from Dr Russell.

#### **AUSTRALIA DAY**

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:16):** My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Does the minister support ensuring that local government continues to recognise 26 January as Australia Day?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:16):** As I have said to this chamber before, the issue of what councils do is a council decision. Secondly, I think that the Australia Day issue is a commonwealth issue.

#### **AUSTRALIA DAY**

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:16):** Supplementary question: does the minister support ensuring that citizenship candidates continue to have the opportunity to become Australian citizens on Australia Day as part of local government Australia Day celebrations?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:17):** Again, if I can, I reiterate that what councils do are council decisions. Again, the citizenships can be held under federal law and things like that. The member for Unley knows very well that—and I think he's trying to blur the lines here a fair bit—certainly it is a federal issue and what councils do is their own business per body.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the members for Davenport and Unley, and I warn the member for Mitchell.

**SAFEWORK SA**

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:17):** My question is also to the Minister for Local Government. Is the minister content to wait 18 months for SafeWork SA to finalise its report while staff members at the City of Burnside are being subjected to bullying, harassment and stalking by an elected member?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:17):** This is a matter that is relevant, obviously, to the activities of SafeWork SA and so forth. I will make inquiries of them. However, I am a bit concerned, I have to say, as to the form of the question because the form of the question, as it sounded to me, is stating what, as I would understand it, would be no greater than assertions and allegations from an area which I think is well known for having quite an exciting local government life.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader and deputy leader are on a full set of warnings.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I was not invoking a doctrine, the name of which is associated with another person; I was simply saying that I will make inquiries of the relevant agency. But I think we probably need to be mindful of the fact that there have been, as I can recall, almost for as long as I have been in this place, murmurings of discontent from that particular quarter—some of them more reliable than others—so it wouldn't be the first time there has been an allegation or, indeed, a counter allegation from there. However, I will make inquiries of the people who are doing an appropriate investigation.

**SAFEWORK SA**

**Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:19):** A supplementary: can the minister also explain why the SafeWork SA investigation is taking so long, and when will it be completed?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:19):** That is a fair enough question, and I will seek an answer.

**RURAL ROAD SPEED LIMITS**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:19):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Does the Minister for Regional Development support the government's recent decision to reduce speed limits on eight country roads?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mitchell!

**Mr Wingard:** That was funny, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I will be the judge of that. It is not that I don't enjoy humour from the opposition, particularly German humour. The member for Mitchell is warned a second time. Minister.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:20):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I am very happy to answer the question from the member for Flinders. Certainly of interest to his community, I know, are issues of road safety generally. This is something that the government has been looking at for a significant period of time. Road safety is a very important issue across South Australia. Over the past, I think it goes back even three years, the government has been looking at it in terms of speed limits across South Australia. There was a consideration of all the roads where there was a limit of 110 across South Australia.

There was a discussion held; there were a number of forums held across South Australia over the past few years in terms of looking at whether those should revert to the default speed limit of 100 km/h. What was decided by the previous minister was in regard to a very small number of roads, where the numbers of people driving on those roads were very low generally. I think there was one where it was higher, but also they weren't the key tourist or freight routes and also we had seen significant numbers of casualty crashes on those roads.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** We had seen some significant numbers of casualty crashes on the roads that were identified. In total across—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** In total, across the eight roads that were identified, I am advised that there have been 59 casualty crashes over the past five years, resulting in 84 casualties across those roads, so this is something that the government obviously takes very seriously. That is why a decision was made in regard to those eight roads, that I am told represent only 5.5 per cent of the 110 km/h roads in our regional road network, that it would be appropriate—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

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

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

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

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON:** —for those roads to revert to the default speed limit of 100 km/h, based on both an analysis of those roads and the casualty crashes that occurred. Obviously, changing any speed limit is not necessarily a popular thing to do, but sometimes these things need to be done based on the evidence before the Minister for Road Safety in terms of doing the best that we can to protect the public.

I know that the opposition have said that they would increase all these speed limits. That is obviously a matter for them to take to the election in terms of what they would be proposing, but I think it is very important that we have a department and a Minister for Road Safety that look very seriously at the number of casualty crashes that we have had and take the proper evidence and looks at those criteria, based on the national criteria that we have in place, to ensure that the safety of the public is kept to the highest level possible.

Of course speed limits are only one factor that we consider in terms of the number of measures that we have in terms of improving our road network but also taking other measures to improve road safety and get the message out about road safety in our community, but it is one of those important measures we need to keep in mind and keep abreast of. Certainly the advice I have from the department and also the independent experts is that this was the appropriate decision to make, and hence it is not something that I will be looking to overturn—the decision that was made in regard to these eight roads.

### RURAL ROAD SPEED LIMITS

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:24):** Supplementary: my question is to the Minister for Regional Development. What feedback has the minister had from constituents with respect to this decision, and what impact does the minister expect this decision to have on regional communities?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:24):** As the previous speaker has indicated, this is under the responsibility of the Minister for Road Safety, etc. However, I will say that what I have done as the local member of my



constituency of the electorate of Frome—and everybody on the other side is aware of this—is that I did not agree with the decision. I have made that quite clear.

I have had numerous calls from other electorates—the member for Schubert's is one of them—and I asked the question, 'Have you spoken to your local member?' The comment to me from these people—that's just one of the electorates out there—and the answer I get from these people is: 'My member has told me to ring you.' That is me, the Independent member for Frome.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** In actual fact, they have not gone through the obvious channels. In regard to that, my comment is that the local members apparently do not want to take that head on and they are asking me, as an Independent member for another electorate, to act on their behalf.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The members for Adelaide and Hartley are called to order, and the member for Chaffey is warned. The member for Napier.

### BUILDING BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

**Mr GEE (Napier) (14:26):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How will the Department for Education and Child Development manage the Building Better Schools project?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:26):** I am very pleased to answer this question about this extraordinary level of public infrastructure spending that will be occurring over the next four years. Yesterday, I attended a meeting alongside the Premier and the Treasurer with a number of senior members of the Department for Education, and also the Small Business Commissioner, the Industry Participation Advocate and leaders from the Local Government Association, UDIA, the Master Builders Association and the Australian Institute of Architects, to talk about this very question about how to best manage such a complex and large project.

One of the complexities is that, unlike with the STEM facilities project, which is in fact for more schools—that was 139 schools—at least with that project it was very clear there was a particular kind of learning area that needed to be created, although there would be a lot of variation as it was fitted into individual schools. But for this project, there will be a vast variety, from a completely new build through to internal refurbishments of learning areas as diverse as performing arts spaces, language centres and hospitality.

Of course, previously, the very large project that occurred in South Australia was Building the Education Revolution (BER) funding, which was much more of a cookie-cutter approach, for want of a better term, of a certain range of buildings, essentially, with some variations in some schools that were ready for such variations. So it was much more an approach of, 'Which one do you want? You've chosen this one. This is how it will work.'

With the \$692 million project, we are really looking at a very big geographic spread and a very big variety of the nature and kind of work. Therefore, we need to make sure that we are preparing a process that will be very efficient in the use of public funds that will maximise the use of local content, local labourers and local subcontractors and that it is designed well from the beginning. It was a very productive discussion—obviously, just at the beginning—between the architects and the builders and also those representing engineers about how to best design from the beginning to maximise efficiency of trades coming in and out, also making sure that any additional costs or the complete costs of refurbishment are known beforehand. So it was extremely useful.

What was very clear from the meeting is how pleased and eager all of these organisations are to get involved in such a big public infrastructure spend. Everyone wants this to work best for the purposes of education but also to have this have such a good impact on employment; particularly employment across the regions is something that we want to make sure we do as well as we possibly can. So the discussion yesterday was of course just the first stage.

The Department for Education and Child Development will be working closely with these organisations and also working with their interstate colleagues on how to best set up a project management office to minimise project expenses and maximise the impact for the schools.

#### VICTIM SUPPORT SERVICE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Why was the employment of Julian Roffe, as chief executive of the Victim Support Service, terminated on 24 April this year?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:30):** I thank the honourable member for her question. Perhaps if I can just help the house with a bit of background. As I understand it, that organisation is an organisation which, along with many others, seeks some financial support from government funding sources—in particular, I think, the Victims of Crime Fund. That is the nature and extent of the relationship between that organisation and the state government. It is otherwise—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It is otherwise a completely separate, autonomous, self-directing entity and it manages itself according to its own lights and its own rules. Whether or not they have had issues with any of their staff, whether they be a director or otherwise, is a matter that is particularly known to them and not to me.

They are, as I said, separate from government. They are not controlled by government. They are not appointed by government, and I would have thought if there are issues relating to the behaviour of members of that organisation, then I would expect there would be some sort of process in train, probably initiated by those people who have a grievance. Some of those might conceivably be on the public record, but that is a matter for those individuals and it's not a matter over which I have any control.

#### VICTIM SUPPORT SERVICE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:31):** Supplementary: given the Attorney-General's answer, is he concerned that the \$4 million a year in public money that goes to this organisation from his area of responsibility doesn't have a current chair identified, even on the website, of that board?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I think we've got the question. Attorney-General.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:32):** I am not aware of what's on their website, although after question time I will have a look at it. Somebody in my office will be able to find it for me, I'm sure. Whether or not that represents their current situation, again, I don't know.

I will make inquiries of the Attorney-General's Department to find out what we know about the current state of the management in that organisation. If there is an issue about the current state of the knowledge that the Attorney-General's Department has about their competence to manage themselves, obviously we will take those matters further.

#### NATIONAL AUSTRALIA BANK

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:33):** My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, do you expect any impact on South Australia from the announcement today by the National Australia Bank?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:33):** I thank the member for her interest in this matter. Yes, indeed, I do expect there to be impacts in South Australia from

the National Australia Bank's announcement today. The NAB today announced cash earnings of \$6.642 billion for the 2017 financial year, up 2½ per cent on the year before. In a staggering move, the NAB went on to say it intended to sack 6,000 workers. The more money they make, the more people they sack.

The bank has not detailed exactly where the job cut axe will fall, but it is highly likely that a significant number of employees in South Australia will be among the casualties. My thoughts and the government's thoughts go out to the workers in the financial institutions today—in the NAB—who heard the news, after seeing their company make a record profit, that 6,000 of them are going to lose their jobs. Understandably, where profits rather than people are the driving force, the bank is proud of their results.

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It paid \$582 million in performance-based compensation to its staff in the financial year 2017. Payments to individual executives and directors will be published later in the bank's annual report, but I remind the house that the NAB senior executives were paid just over \$35 million in their 2016 financial year, including \$6.7 million to their chief executive, Mr Andrew Thorburn, alone. A further \$3.7 million was paid to non-executive directors that year.

We support success, we welcome profitability and we endorse increased economic activity and job creation, but this government also champions fairness. We do not agree with businesses paying executives extraordinary salaries at the same time they make record profits, cut jobs and place extreme pressure on their customers and families just before Christmas. Our support goes particularly to the small businesses, which are the engine room of job creation as shown, for example, by our Job Accelerator Grants, where 4,915 employees have registered the creation of 14,210 new jobs. We want to help small business by cutting payroll tax and giving them a little bit of extra—

**Mr KNOLL:** Point of order: the minister is now straying into discussing a bill that is currently before the house. He is just about to talk about payroll tax.

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer should not be discussing the merits of the payroll tax alteration. It would be good if he could skirt around it.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, sir.

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the member for Fisher. This is not a revivalist meeting: she does not need to echo the Treasurer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It is clear that the big banks such as the NAB are in no need of any assistance while they are delivering themselves super profits. If the banks have stopped creating jobs, they should put a small fraction of their super profits towards other businesses that want to create jobs. The Liberal Party should know better and they should be ashamed of themselves for supporting such an organisation.

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Unley, but I also say to the member for Unley that he seemed to take objection to my last warning to him and indicate that that warning should have been applied to the leader. Unfortunately, if it is, the leader will be leaving us.

**Mr PISONI:** I did not say any such thing, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** So it is the member for Unley's choice.

**Mr PISONI:** I did not say any such thing, sir. Do I have the call?

**The SPEAKER:** You have the call.

#### PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Planning. What were the circumstances for the minister's decision to declare specific developments for retirement villages, residential aged care and any associated development as assessable outside of local DPAs?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:37):** I thank the member for Unley for this question. It is an interesting question. First of all, just to clarify a matter about what has and what has not happened, the declaration of a major project does not mean that there has been an approval for anything. What it means is that there has been a particular process engaged for the assessment of a proposal or, in this case, a class of proposal. That's the first thing.

Therefore, any of the commentary or discussion that has occurred recently in the media to the effect that there has been an approval by me, or by the government or somebody else, for certain types of developments is not true. There has been no approval for anything. All that has been done is that there has been an indication that a particular class of development would not be placed in the noncomplying category for development. If I can explain that briefly, under the Development Act as it presently stands you can have zoning that explicitly prohibits or does not permit certain activities.

To pick an extreme example, an abattoir would be a prohibited activity in a residential area, for example. It would not be a merit-assessed activity. It would be a prohibited activity, and I am sure that everyone would agree that that is probably a damn good idea, but there are other things, such as residential care facilities for people who do want to age in the communities in which they live, which is an entirely reasonable aspiration.

Because the development and thinking about the way we accommodate older citizens have changed a lot over recent years, these particular types of development were never really contemplated when the existing zoning criteria, which are now embedded in the zoning of virtually all metropolitan and regional councils, were established. It is not so much that the communities there think that having aged care is a bad idea: it is the fact that, in the form aged care is presently presenting itself as an opportunity both for citizens to find a decent way to be accommodated as they get older and for employment generation, it was not really contemplated in the past and therefore it is absent altogether from the zoning rules, which leads us to the potential problem where there are gaps in the zoning rules.

There is no doubt in my opinion that when the new planning and development legislation comes into effect, there will be zoning criteria that will be sufficiently flexible to contemplate and offer opportunity for this type of development. Unfortunately, short of going back to each individual council zoning and individually changing those zones and going through the whole process—which would not even be completed by the time that whole zoning practice itself became redundant by virtue of the new act coming in—this was the only method by which we could get this conversation happening. Can I just allay the fears of anybody who would be concerned that there has been any approval. There has not. All there has been is permission for a conversation to occur about this type of development.

#### **PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS**

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:41):** Supplementary, sir: in light of the minister's answer, will the minister meet with local residents to hear their concerns before making a decision on the Life Care applications?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:41):** Good question. That is a question I will need to consider carefully, and the reason I say that is that—

**Mr Knoll:** Because you don't want to say no right now.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** This might assist the member for Schubert because he clearly doesn't understand the point, but as the decision-maker in this matter—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —I must be both actually independent and unencumbered by having a bias, but I also must be seen to be independent and unencumbered by a bias—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Hartley and the member for Adelaide.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** If it is consistent with my role—and I will take advice on this—for me to be able to meet in some particular circumstance that is sufficiently settled, then I will consider that matter, but I can assure the member for Unley and those people who might be concerned about some of the proposals—and I emphasise the word 'proposals'—that have been floated by some of the groups that are seeking to take steps as a result of the development application opportunity, I emphasise that those people should be very much aware that I am taking advice from all quarters.

I am listening to the responses that are coming back, and nobody should make any presumption whatsoever that I have made a determination one way or the other. At this stage, I emphasise again that there is nothing more than a process being provided for people who wish to explore that process. There is no approval.

#### **FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT**

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:43):** My question is to the Minister for Urban Development. Will the minister advise the house if the government has had any contact with the Walker Corporation relating to any government tenancy of floor space at the proposed Walker development behind Parliament House?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:44):** I thank the member for Unley for his question. The short answer to that is: I will check. But it is an important question because, of course, a key element of the agreement that was reached between the government and Walker Corporation, which allowed the Festival Plaza redevelopment to commence, was that, in the event that Walker proceeded with its office accommodation building, the government effectively had a right of veto or the first right of refusal over who, in particular, the ground-floor tenant could be to make sure that the government retained a level of control about who that tenant was going to be and that that tenant could be kept to an organisation or a body or a use or a purpose in keeping with what we had envisaged for the plaza precinct.

I give that background because, in that context, it is entirely likely that there has been some contact. I am not particularly familiar with it, so it would be prudent for me to check and bring back an answer to the house.

#### **FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT**

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:45):** Have those discussions included any form of government incentive for potential tenants for the proposed Walker development behind Parliament House?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:45):** Given that my preceding answer said that there may have been some contact at all about discussions about tenancies in that building between government, I am certainly not in a position to comment on, if those discussions had occurred, what was the nature of those discussions. Certainly, to my recollection, I don't believe there has been anything of that sort.

Yesterday, the member for Unley, during another period of questioning, asked me about some of the arrangements about the management of government office accommodation which, of course, is managed in an across-government sense by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure. So we do have a reasonable level of familiarity with the arrangements that are being entered into when it comes to government office accommodation. Having said that, I don't specifically recall anything, but I think it is prudent for me to check with those agencies.

#### **FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT**

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:46):** Has the government had discussions with potential tenants of the proposed Walker development behind Parliament House that may include the option of the government later taking over the floor space leased to that potential tenant?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:47):** I guess following on from my previous answers, if there has been any discussion, I would have to understand what the basis of those discussions was and whether that aligns with the line of questioning that the member for Unley is asking. I guess the only other thing I can advise the house is similar to the first statements I made about part of the arrangements that the government entered into with Walker about the ability to effectively have some say over who was that ground-floor tenant. Beyond that, I am not familiar and I would have to familiarise myself and bring back an answer to the house.

#### HOUSING CONSTRUCTION APPROVALS

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:47):** My question is for the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Can the minister update the house on housing construction approvals in South Australia?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:47):** I thank the member for Fisher for this important question. We are seeing some very, very strong results for building approvals here in South Australia. The latest Australian Bureau of Statistics' statistics show that, in terms of the number of dwelling approvals, they rose by 1.5 per cent in September and they were 19 per cent higher than a year earlier. It is a very strong result, particularly in the context of the national result, where there was a fall of 0.4 per cent in the year to September 2017.

The latest ABS statistics also show the number of private sector house approvals rose by 1.2 per cent in South Australia in September of this year and were 11 per cent higher than a year earlier. Compared to the national figures, that only rose by 0.7 per cent in September and was just 4.4 per cent higher than a year earlier. So, certainly in the context of those figures, they are outperforming the national averages.

I am also advised that there have now been 10 months of consecutive growth in dwelling approvals here in South Australia, while the number of private sector housing approvals has risen now for nine consecutive months. By these measures, there is very strong and growing evidence of an underlying trend towards a welcomed recovery in the local housing sector. This recovery has been supported and helped by this government's decision to provide significant assistance to homebuyers, particularly people wanting to build a new home or buy an off-the-plan apartment. Of course, there is more to do, and that's why the government has recently announced a further investment of approximately \$10 million to stimulate jobs and activity in the building industry.

Under these initiatives, first-home buyers who purchase an off-the-plan apartment could be entitled to more than \$40,000 in assistance. This comprises a \$10,000 preconstruction grant for off-the-plan apartments, stamp duty concessions of up to \$15,500 for purchases of off-the-plan apartments and a five-year land tax exemption for investors purchasing off-the-plan apartments. Combined with eligible applicants' access to the First Home Owner Grant, eligible buyers could receive \$40,500 towards their off-the-plan apartment.

Of course, members would recall that we are also investing nearly \$300 million in a major public housing renewal, a new-build program known as Renewing Our Streets and Suburbs. This program includes the renewal of 4,500 Housing Trust properties within 10 kilometres of the Adelaide CBD and the construction of 1000 Homes in 1000 Days across South Australia, which is supporting hundreds of South Australian jobs in the years that the program is operating. I am advised that nearly 60 different builders are involved in these programs, and many of these builders have not previously done work in public housing, so we are reaching out to a larger proportion of the building industry and keeping them busy during these times.

South Australia's building and construction industry is growing and strengthening. It is continuing to create jobs and help drive our state's economy. We are proud of our achievements to provide affordable homes for South Australians while supporting the housing and construction industry.

**SMALL BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE**

**Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:51):** My question is to the Minister for Small Business. Minister, could you update the house on the Small Business Roundtable initiative?

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Health Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:51):** I thank the member for Elder for her question. There are a lot of small businesses and associations in her electorate. The round table is a joint initiative of the Treasurer and myself. We wanted to make sure that the CEOs of associations right across the small business sector had an open door to government and access to ministers at all times.

The most recent meeting this week saw over 30 business and industry association CEOs come to Parliament House for the latest round table. These businesses employ—and there are around 140,000 of them—thousands and thousands and thousands of South Australians. They are the biggest employers in the state, all of them with between one and 19 people working in their businesses. Small businesses contribute an estimated \$35 billion each year to the state's economy and account for around one third of the state's growing labour force.

We hear a lot about big business. When a big business closes and perhaps puts off 150 people, it seems to be on the front page of the paper every day for a week, but when a cluster of small businesses hire three or four times that number of people it doesn't get quite the same airplay. We are very aware of that, and that's why we are so supportive of small business.

Yesterday, a record number of associations were represented at the 11<sup>th</sup> round table, including representatives from Whyalla. Manufacturing and innovation minister, Mr Kyam Maher, came and briefed the group on a wide range of targeted business and industry assistance programs that he runs within his portfolio, and there was a lot of interest in that. These programs have been key factors in shifting the impact of the Holden closure, where around three-quarters of the 74 automotive component suppliers to the car industry had said they would close in 2017. But the good news is that now only around 25 per cent have closed, saving between 1,000 and 1,500 jobs.

On previous occasions, the Treasurer has been to speak to the round table, as has the Minister for Planning—in fact, an array of ministers, including the Minister for Local Government and Regional Development and the transport minister. In fact, there is a cluster of ministers here who have all been to speak to this group. There is a robust question and answer session at the end of the presentations, and everyone gets a go at having their say.

This week, international students were a focus because the hiring of international students and migrants is an important thing for small businesses. We had a video presented by Wines by Geoff Hardy, who employed a Chinese graduate and built their exports from around 5 per cent being sold to China to nearly 41 per cent being sold as exports. Apprenticeships came up, and I am going to ask the minister for TAFE to come and speak to the next meeting. There was quite a bit of interest in that and a host of other issues.

One of the issues that came up prominently yesterday was the tax cuts for small business proposed by the Treasurer in his budget. I was queried at length about payroll tax exemptions, the grant programs that are being offered—

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** —the stamp duty exemptions and all of those benefits that they are—

**Mr GARDNER:** The minister is now doing exactly as the Treasurer did earlier and referencing a bill that is before the house, and he knows it, which is why he is continuing.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** —hoping will flow to them as—

**The SPEAKER:** I don't think the Treasurer actually did it. I will listen carefully.

**The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH:** —a consequence of the decisions the government has made, because small business feel like the forgotten businesses. They are mum-and-dad teams.

They have often mortgaged the house and they need help. The only thing stopping them from getting that help is their opposition of the bank tax because they want the benefit taken from the big end of town to the little guys and they are the ones that the government is trying to help, who have been abandoned by those opposite.

**The SPEAKER:** I think the member for Morialta is adopting an altogether too strict interpretation of my previous ruling.

#### CONVEYANCERS

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:56):** My question is to the Minister for Consumer and Business Services. What steps are the government taking to ensure the integrity of communications from conveyancers, in light of the recent scam that resulted in South Australian property buyers being defrauded out of nearly \$1 million?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:56):** I thank the member for that question. That is a good question and I will seek information about it, although I'm not sure—

**Mr Marshall:** Your office is going to be busy after question time today.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** They always are. They always are after question time. I'm not sure whether the particular matter that the member for Davenport raises is properly a matter for Business and Consumer Services or whether it fits elsewhere. It doesn't matter. Even if it does fit elsewhere, because that was such a well-intentioned question and asked so courteously, I will try to get an answer, even if I have to speak to others to get it.

#### STATE FORESTS

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister for Forests. How is the state government encouraging South Australians to enjoy our forests?

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, the Speaker is interested in this answer. I would certainly like to be able to mushroom lawfully at Kuitpo Forest next year.

**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) (14:57):** That's fantastic. We have some glow in the dark mushrooms around Glencoe and they glow before you have even eaten them. It is not the hallucinogenic effects that make them glow. That has been a very popular thing around Glencoe and in the South-East. They are called the ghost mushroom. Between about April and June, when you go out in the forests at night, you get to see these ghost mushrooms. We set up a ghost mushroom lane this year to really get a lot of tourists to go through there. We had 18,500 tourists through there.

**The Hon. J.W. Weatherill:** Has anyone else seen these mushrooms or just you?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I have seen them. I have seen these mushrooms and, as I said, they do glow before you eat them. This is one of the great things that we can do in our forests here in South Australia. Of course, there are more standard things that we have been able to do, and that is ride your bike, ride your horse, go for walks on trails, and things like that, through these wonderful forests that we have. We had more than 240,000 people visiting our state's forests in 2016-17. That is twice the number that visited the forests in the preceding year, so I think the more activities we have there and the more we promote our wonderful forests, the more we will be able to attract into our forests.

Almost \$310,000 will be invested into the Cudlee Creek Forest mountain bike trail network this financial year. Those activities continue to increase in popularity. The project will assist the South Australian government strategy to establish the Mount Lofty Ranges as an international mountain biking destination and increase general visitation to the area.

A successful submission by Bicycle SA secured a \$190,000 South Australian government Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program grant, with a further \$120,000 contributed by



ForestrySA through its Community Service Obligation funding program. Located in the Mount Crawford forest near Lenswood, just a 50-minute drive from Adelaide, it caters for mountain bikers of all skill levels—from children and families to advanced and experienced riders—and attracts around 10,000 riders each year.

The network of trails is among 450 hectares of former pine plantation that was burnt in the 1983 Ash Wednesday bushfire and is now being returned to native bushland. Known as Fox Creek by mountain bikers, it has been a popular place to ride for more than 20 years and is acknowledged as one of South Australia's best downhill and cross-country mountain biking destinations.

More than 35 volunteers and participants from employment and training programs and educational organisations, such as Urrbrae TAFE, have contributed thousands of hours to develop conservation and recreational assets at the site over many years. The 15-year partnership between the state government and peak cycling organisation Bicycle SA has been critical in developing this strong community support.

It is terrific to see the state government's investment through ForestrySA in recreational facility upgrades and that the efforts to promote the recreational and tourism potential of our forests have motivated so many people to be active in our state forests. Whether it is up around Williamstown or down around Kuitpo, we absolutely have some of the best forests anywhere in Australia. Down in the South-East, of course, so much of the area is covered in pine plantations and native forests. I encourage all people, if you have not been out to visit a forest recently, then it is high time you did.

Time expired.

#### **BARREN HILL DAM**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:01):** My question is to the Minister for Agriculture. Does the minister support the Barren Hill dam proposal at Aldinga?

**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) (15:02):** It's not actually in my area for approval, so I think you have asked the wrong minister. However, I can tell you that I support getting extra water for the growers of McLaren Vale because the wine industry is so important to that area. In January last year, as we were heading towards the business end of vintage, the company down there to whom SA Water sells recycled water, which is then onsold to growers, had actually sold more water than they had to provide to the growers. It is a serious problem for the people of McLaren Vale. We do need more water.

There is a proposal out there to build a huge dam at Barren Hill. I have been out to the property owned by the Boyds which neighbours this proposed dam, and it is the wrong spot for a dam because, firstly, it is prime agricultural land. We have a site at Plains Road at Aldinga which is really Biscay clay, and that would be a more suitable place to build a dam for recycled water. It is where we built the first recycled dam about six years ago. That should probably be a precinct that we look at for recycled water to be stored in that area.

When Paul Holloway was the minister for planning, I fought hard on behalf of our local area to lock in Barren Hill as land that would be preserved and that could not have gutter to gutter housing on it. That was a really important move. It preceded the work I then did on the character preservation bill for McLaren Vale and, at the same time, the character preservation bill for the Barossa, which the current Deputy Premier and Minister for Planning ushered through both houses of this parliament.

What we have done with that is lock in that land forever, or until both houses of parliament agree that gutter to gutter housing is better than what we have on those lands at the moment. On those lands at that moment we have prime agricultural production and we have fantastic tourist activity, as well. Since we introduced those character preservation rules around McLaren Vale and the Barossa, the price of land for vineyards has gone up significantly.

We are seeing the sort of investment in tourism that we did not see before because there was uncertainty there about whether, if you built a tourism icon, like The Cube will be, which will open at d'Arenberg in December—and currently it is surrounded by vineyards and rolling hills and wonderful vistas—and we had not brought these character preservation protections in, we could

have had gutter to gutter housing between McLaren Vale and McLaren Flat or Willunga and McLaren Vale.

So we as a government I think have done an extraordinary job over many, many years and several planning ministers. I want to thank the Deputy Premier and former minister Holloway as well for the leadership that they showed in getting this through. It was what the local people down in McLaren Vale wanted, and I was only too happy to champion their causes and bring people together as well. We had the environmental groups, we had the business groups, we had the winemakers, we had the grapegrowers. We had everyone working together.

I will continue to do that. I applaud people's ambition to get more recycled water storage down there, but we have to make sure that it is on the right spot. Next door to the Boyds I do not think is the right spot. It is a massive dam with a 15-metre high wall, and the Boyds are down there with their property. They do not need that next door to them, neither do the other people in the vicinity.

### BARREN HILL DAM

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:06):** Supplementary: so given the minister's concern about this being in the wrong place, what action has he taken to ensure that Renewal SA don't accept an unsolicited bid to sell or lease this land for the purpose of that dam?

**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) (15:06):** I have taken several steps—several steps. I think you will see, as things evolve, what will happen with that proposal. As I said, I don't want to come in and just be negative about a proposal and not have a solution. I think we've got a solution.

**Ms Chapman:** If you haven't done anything, just say so.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** This is the deputy leader who came in here four months ago with unfounded allegations off Facebook and asked about this dam.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** You made accusations in here that I owned a vineyard in McLaren Vale.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** You took your information for your questions off Facebook, and you never apologised. Remember Ray Martin on *A Current Affair* when he said, 'How can this woman get it so wrong?' You have been in here for 16 years, and you get it wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong, every time.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** You are an absolute disgrace in the way you used—

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order, sir: the minister is responding to interjections, and I believe that is disorderly.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley fixes me with his rictus smile, as warm as the silver plate on a coffin. Was the member for Unley also taking a point of order about the deputy leader's interjections?

**Mr PISONI:** We didn't have a chance to, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Didn't have the chance. I understand. Minister.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** So to finish the answer, I have been speaking with the planning minister, I have been speaking with the Minister for Water, the two ministers who are responsible for this. I am also talking to the people in my local area, the people I have worked hard for for the past 12 years. I will continue to work hard for them. We have got the runs on the board. We have locked in the agricultural and tourism—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** We have locked up the lands, the agricultural and tourism—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** The deputy leader likes to pounce around on Kangaroo Island like she owns the place. I was talking to a tourism operator on Kangaroo Island at the show at Kingscote on Saturday, and in her normal rude way the deputy leader came up and interrupted it like she was the queen of Kangaroo Island.

**Ms Chapman:** I came to your stall.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** You did come to my stall, and I was talking to a tourism operator. These people opposite, the Liberal Party in this state, have deserted Kangaroo Island. You want to treat it as some little plaything. It is an economic powerhouse down there on Kangaroo Island. Tourism is vital for the island, and I was talking to a tourism operator about the benefits of cruise ships down there. That's what I was talking to him about, and you sort of waltzed up to my stall—

**The SPEAKER:** I didn't come to your stall at all.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Sorry, the deputy leader waltzed up to my stall, Mr Speaker, and interrupted a conversation I was having with a tourism operator—but I was very happy to give you a packet of FruChocs.

#### *Grievance Debate*

### **CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MINING AND ENERGY UNION**

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:10):** The SA Branch of the CFMEU is to be put under the control of the national union heavyweights, including Queensland state secretary, Michael Ravbar, and national secretary, David Noonan. According to recent reports, these two officials will join incoming national president, Dean Hall, on a newly created strategic direction committee. This committee will help the SA branch to achieve its goals.

To achieve those goals, the new committee will set budgets, dues, levies and other charges, approve expenditure and manage the financial and physical assets of the union, as may be required from time to time. The committee will have the power to employ and terminate the employment of members of staff. Talk about a hostile takeover. Premier Jay Weatherill needs to tell these people to buzz off, to leave our state alone. The Premier should publicly state that his Labor government will no longer have any dealings with this militant union, especially these interstate intruders.

The SA branch of the construction union has already spent the last few years being dragged through the court on a long list of illegal activities on SA construction sites. Total fines have stacked up now to over \$1 million, with a large number of officials implicated. A number of times we have questioned the Premier and the Deputy Premier in this place, and in other estimates forums, about actually taking some action against Aaron Cartledge and his band of thugs, and every single time the government just bats it away like there is nothing to see here.

The last thing our state needs is an interstate CFMEU hierarchy that does not think that the SA branch has gone hard enough and wants to come in and make things worse than they already are for the South Australian construction industry. Mr Ravbar and Mr Noonan have faced serious charges over their behaviour on behalf of the union. Mr Ravbar, as Queensland state secretary, allegedly ordered underlings to stop a crane company's machinery from working on projects worth a combined \$1.9 billion because it did not have a union agreement. He and four other officials are facing trial in the Federal Court after the Australian Building and Construction Commissioner alleged they breached the Fair Work Act. The trial continues.

Mr Noonan, the CFMEU and Western Australian officials were fined \$277,000 over unlawful blockades at the state's \$1.2 billion Children's Hospital site in Perth. Do we really want these men to effectively control and run the South Australian branch of the CFMEU? The answer is no. Mr Weatherill, it is time that you admitted just how much money the CFMEU have contributed to the Labor Party in recent years. Come clean. Tell the people of South Australia how big the fix is. Is there an implicit agreement from the CFMEU for more financial backing for Labor in the coming SA state election?

Unions have a role to play in our society, but they are expected to obey the laws of the land just like the rest of us. We know that this type of illegal behaviour increases construction costs on building sites all across Australia. We know that a single project in Victoria had an extra \$10 million worth of costs put on it because of the destructive impact of the CFMEU in that state. In a state that has lacklustre growth, such that we have, the last thing we need is a militant union coming in and making the cost of construction in our state worse than it is. If this happens, things will get worse and it will cost jobs here in South Australia.

Over the past few years, we have had the highest unemployment rate in the country, and a strong, vibrant, growing construction sector is a key way that we can turn South Australia around. Premier Weatherill needs to tell the new controllers of the SA branch of the union that they are not welcome here, to pack their bags and to go back to where they came from; if he does not, all South Australians will pay the price over coming years.

### GILES ELECTORATE

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:13):** I rise today to talk about a number of positive developments in the electorate of Giles. I would have to say that the people of Giles are particularly blessed at the moment with a whole range of positive announcements in terms of economic development, economic diversification and, of course, the recent and very welcome announcements about investment in public education in Giles.

The \$692 million commitment to 91 schools in the state was very welcome news, and it was good to see the electorate of Giles receive some of the benefit of that commitment. The Roxby Downs Area School was one of the beneficiaries, with a \$7 million commitment to improve the school. That of course comes on top of the previous commitment to the STEM facility at the Roxby Downs Area School to the tune of \$3.5 million on top of the \$4 million commitment to early childhood services in Roxby Downs. That commitment is in partnership with BHP, with a \$2 million contribution from the state matched by BHP.

It was also very pleasing to see Fregon in the APY lands get a significant amount of money, and that money is well deserved. Fregon will receive in excess of \$15 million. Of course, the big announcement was the commitment to build a brand-new high school in Whyalla. This has been needed for some time. Whyalla is in the unusual position, given the model of education at the high school level that has operated for many years. In my opinion, this model leaves a lot to be desired: it is two junior high schools feeding a senior high school.

So you effectively put in a transition point, and that does not lead to a good educational outcome, especially for some of the most vulnerable students. It is excellent to see that commitment to a new school. The other thing to bear in mind is that the free public high school sites in Whyalla have a combined student population of just over a thousand children. The new high school will be a fairly regular high school; it is not a super school. The other really good elements about this is that it will be one of the few places in Australia where there will be a total educational precinct. The high school will be built next to the UniSA campus in Whyalla, and next to the TAFE campus. So, we will see a dream that some of us have had for many years come to fruition.

This proposal has the strong backing of the educational leadership in Whyalla. The three principals of the current high schools in Whyalla are all committed to going in this particular direction and, as I understand it, so are the school councils. So they have put the long-term interests of Whyalla students ahead of any parochial or narrow interests, and they are to be congratulated on this. This will be an excellent outcome for our community at a time of growing vibrancy.

I just want to touch on the announcement this week from GFG Alliance: the commitment, or at least partial commitment, to a \$700 million investment in improving energy assets by GFG and SIMEC, which is part of the GFG group, which recently took over ZEN. The commitment to a very significant investment in renewables in this state, and possibly some interstate as well, is warmly welcomed. They are talking about 1 gigawatt of renewable energy generation, which is incredibly significant. When it comes to Whyalla, they are talking about 200 megawatts of solar. They are talking about a 100-megawatt battery in Port Augusta, 100 megawatts of demand response at the steelworks and other sites, and 120 megawatts of pumped hydro at the Middleback Ranges. This is

a fantastic potential development. I hope they are in a position to commit to that and roll it out in the coming years because it is transformational.

Time expired.

### **BUSHFIRE PREPAREDNESS**

**Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:19):** Today, I rise to speak on a very important issue in my community, and that is about being bushfire ready. In 2016, South Australia experienced its wettest winter. In 2017, many parts of the state have experienced below average rainfall. As we head into the 2017-18 bushfire season, the combination of an abundant growth of fine fuel caused by last year's rain and reduced moisture this year has resulted in many areas of above normal fire potential.

The Southern Australia Seasonal Bushfire Outlook 2017 is an incredibly important document used by fire authorities to make strategic decisions on resource planning and prescribed fire management for the upcoming season. I encourage all members to be familiar with this hand guide for the reported outlook in their respective areas. Fortunately, the outlook for the Mitcham Hills community, which I represent, is for normal fire potential. This is despite it being unlikely that spring and early summer will provide any substantial rainfall.

Normal fire potential means we should still expect to experience dangerous bushfire conditions as there is no place for complacency in the Australian summer. One of the many attractions of the Mitcham Hills is the abundance of natural vegetation, but the leafy surrounds and the wide expanse of bushland do come at a risk to residents each year. Of course, that is the leafy surrounds from Belair National Park to all our reserves. They provide a rich source of fuel for an out of control fire.

Local residents must be reminded of the importance of preparing their family, their home or business and the community for the bushfire season. We must also understand how quickly a fire threat could be upon us and what we need to do in the event of an emergency. That is why last week I was pleased to host, together with the Sturt CFS, a community forum on how to be bushfire ready. It was well supported by the community, illustrating the strong interest in the topic, and I would like to thank all those who attended and participated in an enthusiastic Q&A session.

We were very fortunate to have the Sturt CFS, led by Dale Thompson, present an excellent information presentation on the realities of fighting fires, including a confronting video taken from a fire truck during the 2015 Pinery bushfire. I think that everyone in the room was shocked at the ferocity of that fire at Pinery, the speed at which it moved and how quickly the road in front of the truck disappeared in a cloud of thick grey and black smoke. If the message from the CFS that night was not clear, the video certainly was. It was a motivating reminder that, if the worst does happen and your home is threatened by a bushfire, leave—and leave early.

It also highlighted the value of completing a bushfire survival plan. Everyone in my community should have a bushfire survival plan about preparing your home, your street and your community ahead of the summer by cleaning out gutters, mowing lawns, removing flammable materials from around your home and also knowing where to go in the event of a forced evacuation. There was widespread recognition amongst the audience at the community forum that they had plenty of work to do in order to be prepared for the bushfire season, which formally starts on 1 December in my community.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank our dedicated volunteers at the Sturt CFS for their outstanding work. They comprise the brigades of Belair, Blackwood, Coromandel Valley, Cherry Gardens and Eden Hills. The men and women of these brigades stop what they are doing, they stop their work and they stop their family life in order to serve our community by fighting local fires and helping others. They commit many hours to training to ensure that they are prepared when called upon to help those in their moment of crisis. No doubt they will be hard at work again this summer to protect our lives and property.

The community, as it does so often every year, supports our local CFS. There are always many fundraising opportunities for the CFS in my community but, in particular, on 25 November I will be co-hosting a fundraising barbecue at Coles Blackwood together with the federal member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint, and the Mitcham mayor, Glenn Spear. I encourage everyone to pop in on that

Saturday morning to buy a snag after they finish their shopping to support the very worthy cause that is supporting our local CFS. Whilst you are in the area, it is of course always important to support our local Blackwood traders as well. On 25 November, I encourage my community and everyone around to support our local CFS.

### PLAYFORD ALIVE COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:24):** Today, I would like to talk about the southern parts of my electorate in the Playford council and also those areas that will be in the new Light post the election next year. Last week, I had the pleasure of representing the Premier at the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Playford Alive Community Reference Group. This is a group of local people who collect information, organise events and also advise both the council and the government on issues impacting people in the Playford Alive area. Since the group was established, it has been an important conduit between residents and the different spheres of government to ensure that the way the Playford Alive project is rolled out is consistent with the vision that the residents have for that area.

I acknowledge the current members of the CRG and also make particular mention of some of the original members who have been on that group for the past 10 years. The current chair is Ron Jones; the deputy chair is Darryl Bothe; Coral Gooley is the secretary; and Betty Alberton is a member, as are Geoff Pope and Shirley Harris. Betty was actually the original chair of the group 10 years ago and Shirley was the original deputy chair. If my memory serves me correctly, Geoff Pope was also one of the original members.

Other current members include Brenda Larnio, Matthew Retallick and Shaun Barby. Shaun has been a very active member not only in that group but also in the community previously in the Peachey Belt Residents Association. Pauline Frost, a former councillor who is very active in the environment area is a member, as is Robert Battye. Council representatives are Councillor Gay Smallwood-Smith, whom I have known since the early eighties because we sat on the old district council of Munno Para together, and Councillor Jane Onuzans. They are the people who actually work amongst the community and also advise government on important issues. I would like to congratulate that group and thank them for their service.

This weekend is the village fair, which is held every year on the first Saturday of November in Pioneer Park in Gawler. All the community organisations get together under the auspices of the Gawler Rotary Club and this is a major fundraising activity for the community. A whole range of things happen at the village fair, as you can imagine, and valuable funds are raised by those communities. There are Scouts, Girl Guides, service clubs and various other organisations including schools and churches. It is a great community event and a great event to bring the community together. Once again, I will have a stall there.

On the same day, in the southern end of my electorate is the Playford Alive Community Fun Day, where I will have a presence as well. This is arranged by Renewal SA and it is a major contribution by Renewal SA in terms of community building in that part of my electorate. They have a huge program. In terms of entertainment, Isaiah Firebrace, our Eurovision finalist and also an *X Factor (Australia)* contestant, will be performing live. There will be a range of other local musicians and performers. Andrew 'Cosi' Costello, who was originally a South Australian award winner, will be the MC. There will be a whole range of activities, food and drink and stalls. That is the Playford Alive Community Fun Day.

I am sure one of the things I will be asked at the community fun day—because I will have a stall there—is the current status of Curtis Road at Munno Para. Curtis Road is actually a council-owned road and it certainly carries a lot of traffic. The one issue I get a lot of correspondence about is when the road is going to be upgraded. In some ways, the road is suffering from success, from both the success of Playford Alive—in other words, because there are a lot of people living there—and also the success of the Northern Expressway.

People use Curtis Road as a way of linking the east and the west and they use Curtis Road to access the expressway. Even people from the southern parts of Gawler who go along Main North Road use Curtis Road. People from Blake's Crossing and the Blakeview area use Curtis Road. It is a local road so it is the responsibility of council, but I would say that any upgrade would have to be a

shared responsibility because of the impact of Renewal SA developments, traffic from Main North Road and also local commercial developments, which actually require access. It is one of the issues I will be tackling on an ongoing basis.

### SCHOOLS, LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:29):** Today, I would like to talk about the importance of language education in our schools, and the government's announcement last week of their language strategy was welcome. It was playing catch-up, of course, given that in August the opposition announced a series of language policies which the government seems to have read in detail because a number of their announcements virtually copy things the Liberal Party had committed to in August, but we welcome them.

We welcome them doing that, just as we welcome the government in their announcements of their truancy policy. More than a year after the Liberal announcement of our truancy policy, the government has finally caught up with some of the key things—even to the point of the Liberal Party's proposed increase in truancy and attendance officers from 22 to 33, which the Liberal Party identified as a need in the department. The government has now come to us a year later and said, 'Yes, we do need to increase the number of truancy officers,' and they have come up with the same number—33. If they had accepted the Liberal Party's policy a year ago, those truancy and attendance officers could have been already working in schools, but we are glad they got to the party late.

Of course, our literacy guarantee, a significant policy announced by the Leader of the Opposition, Steven Marshall, in May this year, included a particular focus on literacy, making sure that students with dyslexia and other learning difficulties are supported with extra support and literacy coaches. In their announcement of the public education plan last week, the government also picked up on many of these. I note that the academy they are proposing will work in very well with many of our proposals in the literacy guarantee, and we look forward to taking the work they are starting now, finally after 15 years in government, and applying our policy to it in due course.

It is actually excellent news for the children of South Australia that the Labor Party has started taking note of all these Liberal policies and I look forward to them doing so further. In terms of languages, this is very important because the government's document, which they released last week, Languages Strategy for Public Education, notes:

While many students have access to quality languages education, this is not the case for all students. There are still a number of schools that struggle to offer a language program across all year levels and some have difficulty sustaining a quality program in the long term.

When students do have access to classes, often the way these are delivered means that there are insufficient time allocations for effective learning. Having sufficient time on task and continuity is essential for student achievement in learning another language.

A little further on the document states:

Languages participation rates declined considerably in the senior secondary years, with approximately 5% of students continuing to study an additional language up to year 12. This decline is not limited to South Australian government schools. In many schools, particularly those in low socioeconomic areas, declining participation affects the viability of classes.

But it goes on to say:

In 2016, just 20 South Australian government schools offered language subjects in year 12.

That is a disgrace. That is a disgraceful outcome. After 15½ years of this Labor government it is a disgrace that just 20 South Australian government schools offered language programs in year 12 this year, but the good news is that some steps are being taken to address that. I will quote from the Liberal Party's document that we released several months ago:

For 15 years the State Labor Government has overseen a decline in second language instruction in South Australia, as highlighted by the low number of students now taking language subjects at a year 12 level.

When Labor came to power in 2002, 11.8% of Year 12 students undertook language studies.

One in eight year 12 students undertook language studies; now it is less than one in 20. That is the outcome of this Labor government's appreciation of and failure to support languages in schools. The

Liberal Party put money forward to ensure that there were going to be great opportunities for language outcomes in schools. It is worth noting that more than 1,000 fewer students are doing languages to year 12 in real numbers—more than 1,000 fewer—than in 2002 when the Labor Party came to power.

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

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I need to remind the member for Wright of the standing orders.

**Mr GARDNER:** There are a number of strategies in the Labor Party's languages document that are lifted directly from the Liberal Party's policy, and I congratulate the government on this: support for ethnic schools; support for student school of languages holiday programs; scholarships for teachers to improve language schools; improving professional development; working with the university to ensure that there is a flow of language teachers going in the areas that we need; innovative program grants for language teachers; scholarships to attract more language teachers into specialities, including master's scholarships for 40 teachers; and additional support for ethnic schools to deliver SACE language subjects. These are all from the Liberal policy—well done the government. Now there is a whole range of other policies we are just waiting for you to take on so that you can deliver a better government during your last four months.

Time expired.

### FISHER ELECTORATE SCHOOLS

**Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:34):** Today, I would like to speak about the excellent schools in and around my electorate and thank them for the fantastic role they play in our broader community. I recently hosted principals, educators and members of school governing councils to a morning tea to celebrate World Teachers Day when we reflected on and thanked the motivated passionate teachers in our area and shared our ideas about how the education of our children can be improved and enhanced. I would like to thank those who made it on the day. I am always inspired by your tireless advocacy for the young people of our community.

I recently also attended the Nova and Bendigo Bank Teacher of the Year Awards, which recognise teachers from around the state in a number of categories. Again, it is hard to come away uninspired, as these teachers put their heart and soul into their work. Congratulations to all the winners and the nominees on the night. Last week, it was a pleasure to attend the Woodcroft College valedictory day. I was more than impressed by the speeches of the two school captains, Lachlan and Samantha, which gave great insight into the journey that year 12s have been through to get themselves to that point.

The music on the day was outstanding, as always, and under the direction of Ms Renee McCarthy, or Ms Mac, who has been nominated as a finalist for the inaugural ARIA Music Teacher of the Year Award, it was very special. On hearing about Ms Mac's nomination, I revisited the school to give my congratulations, and I was completely overwhelmed but not surprised by the respect and the appreciation shown to Ms Mac. She is the only South Australian teacher nominated. Please hit up [ariamusicteacheraward.com.au](http://ariamusicteacheraward.com.au) to vote for her.

I would like to take this opportunity also to congratulate Woodcroft principal of 25 years, Mr Mark Porter. He is retiring at the end of this year. He has been a dedicated member of the community and shown fantastic leadership since the school was established. Whether it is the Nova and Bendigo Bank Teacher of the Year Awards, the ARIA Music Teacher Awards or just the heartfelt speeches of students, teachers really do an amazing job in our community.

The opportunity for our young people to excel academically runs parallel with the quality of the education they are provided. Developments in technology and the ever-increasing globalisation of industry mean that our children will have to be creative problem solvers as well as knowledgeable in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics, otherwise known as STEM. I am proud to be part of a state government that recognises this and is investing in our teachers and our schools.

The investment that this government has made in the area of STEM has been groundbreaking. Schools across the state, including some very lucky schools in my electorate, have benefited from the \$250 million investment providing 139 schools with modern STEM facilities to



boost the learning potential of our students in these areas. I know that it is not just the actual schools receiving these grants that are going to benefit; it is also schools located adjacent to these other schools that will invite students from around the area to participate in programs within the newly updated schools.

The government acknowledgement of what our kids will face in the future does not stop there. We understand that our students need strategies to become globally competitive in a world where we do not even know what the careers of the future will be. That is why we are investing in opportunities for our public school students to access language learning across all school levels and increase the number of qualified language teachers in our public schools. Language encourages creativity. Our public schools will also benefit from a \$3.8 million internationalisation strategy, which helps teachers develop their curriculum and prepare students for an intercultural and international-aware future.

Teachers also need to be looked after. Teachers work extremely hard, and sometimes they are the last people to take time out, a little like some of my friends, the nurses, I think. Last week, the government committed nearly \$20 million to teach development and wellbeing programs. I look forward to seeing the results of this. Of course, the government's ongoing commitment to continuously improve the capacity for our kids to flourish has been shown in the groundbreaking Building Better Schools program, which sees \$690 million being spent improving and refurbishing 91 public schools around the state.

This brings the total infrastructure investment that the state government has made in education over the past four years to more than \$1 billion, and it is because of these investments I am really excited for the future of our students. The other afternoon, I think I high-fived about 200 families about these grants; they are very excited. On that note, good luck all year 12s. Use your swot vac wisely. All the best for your exams and the final weeks of high school. Thank you to the teachers and school communities for the support throughout their education.

### *Bills*

#### **MOTOR VEHICLES (SUITABILITY TO HOLD LICENCE) AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:40):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. Read a first time.

##### *Second Reading*

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Government introduces the Motor Vehicles (Suitability to Hold Licence) Amendment Bill 2017 with the aim of making changes to section 82 of the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* to better promote road safety interests for our community.

This long-standing provision provides the Registrar of Motor Vehicles (Registrar) with discretionary powers to refuse to issue or renew a driver's licence or learner's permit, cancel or suspend a driver's licence or learner's permit, or to place provisional or probationary conditions upon a driver's licence, in order to minimise the risk, as much as possible, of accident, injury or repetition of offences by the driver. The section can apply regardless of the driver concerned having previously undergone a period of licence disqualification in relation to those offences.

These powers of the Registrar are normally used in exceptional circumstances in order to promote road safety for all in our community by ensuring, so far as possible, that dangerous drivers are kept off our roads.

The changes in this Bill will enhance and optimise the Registrar's powers to take action against such drivers, in order to make our roads and communities safer.

At present the Registrar may only use these powers in relation to individuals who have previously been convicted of or expiated an offence, or a series of offences, involving the use of a motor vehicle. The Bill changes broaden these criteria to include, more generally, individuals whose past behaviour indicates, in the opinion of the Registrar, that action should be taken. This is intended to encompass a wide variety of driving conduct including, but not limited to, drivers who have been responsible for causing injury through the use of a motor vehicle but who have not necessarily faced Court penalty nor expiated offences in relation to those incidents. The changes also include that, in exercising the powers, the Registrar is entitled to take action to *minimise* the risk of accident, injury and/ or the commission of offences occurring, rather than being required to consider whether taking the action would *prevent* the risk eventuating.

The Bill changes clarify that when the Registrar is determining to take action under the provision, the *paramount*, that is, the overriding, dominant and pre-eminent consideration should be the protection of the public. This is logical and reasonable; this section exists so that the Registrar may exercise a discretionary power, outside of the ordinary driver's licensing regime set out by the Act, to prevent or restrict certain drivers, who by their past offending and/or behaviour are identified as posing a risk to others on our roads, from holding licences or permits, or to impose conditions upon their licences. New clause (1a) is a clarification rather than a change in operation. It is implicit in the scheme of the Act that when making decisions about licencing outside the ordinary licensing regime, the Registrar should place great weight on the protection of the public. The goal is to minimise the risk of accident, injury, and/or the commission of offences by such drivers.

The Bill also amends the provision to make clear that, at time of exercising his or her discretion, the Registrar need not take into account any hardship that may be caused to the person concerned by the Registrar taking action in relation to their holding of a driver's licence or learner's permit.

Individuals affected by the Registrar's use of these powers continue to have rights of internal and external appeal as provided for under the Act.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal. The measure would commence on assent.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*

###### 3—Amendment of section 82—Vehicle offences and unsuitability to be granted or hold licence or permit

This clause amends section 82 to broaden the grounds on which the Registrar may take action under the section in relation to a person and to ensure that, in determining whether to take any such action, the protection of the public will be the paramount consideration and the Registrar need not take into account hardship that may be caused to the person by taking the action.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

### **CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 October 2017.)

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:41):** Where we left off at 11.30 on Tuesday night was looking at the OARS submission. Leigh Garrett, who has been the Chief Executive of OARS for a long period—I think it could be coming up to 30 years—is seen by all as one of the most respected commentators in this area. I was very keen to get his input in relation to this bill. Where we left off was a discussion by him in relation to drugs. Interestingly, on Wednesday morning in the paper, there were some interesting statistics around the use of illicit drugs within prisons that I will get to in a minute. Mr Garrett says:

Stop the Hurt: SA's Ice Action Plan, specifically labels one of its new measures as 'amending the Correctional Services Act 1982 to increase controls on drug use in prison, and to prevent the automatic release on parole for certain prisoners sentenced for dealing or trafficking drugs.'

That is what we are doing. He continues:

Action towards 'stopping the hurt' must include reducing the supply of methamphetamines (and all drugs) in the community and prisons—as is suggested in the action plan. It is known that drug use occurs in, and is brought into prisons, and this must be addressed. This however must not just be addressed with punitive measures, but also educational and rehabilitative measures (as is outlined in the Bill for insertion of a new Section 3) relating to the objectives and guiding principles of correctional services.

On that matter, Mr Scarborough is the Director of Nursing at the SA Prison Health Service and he appeared before the Select Committee on Administration of South Australian Prisons about three or four weeks ago. This is a public servant who is, in my interpretation, a man of some skill and some repute in this area, who was putting on the table some pretty damning admissions I think in the hope that he is able to get notice for these issues. He says:

Unfortunately, present resources only permit specialised mental health services to be offered to those with severe mental health issues, especially those being managed by the high risk assessment team. There is no current way to provide psychological and counselling support to those with low acuity issues such as chronic pain, substance abuse issues and high prevalence of mental health disorders such as anxiety disorders and moderate severity depression. Separate to health, psychologists are employed by the Department for Correctional Services to provide targeted treatment for at-risk prisoners and criminogenic needs.

This is where things get a little interesting. He continued:

In relation to substance misuse, illicit drug use, needle-sharing and risky alcohol consumption, they remain significant issues for offender populations. On admission, 67 per cent of prisoners reported illicit drug use, with main drugs being methamphetamine and cannabis; 45 per cent of prisoners reported a history of injecting drugs in the past, with nearly half of those reporting that they have shared injecting equipment; 6 per cent of prisoners report continuing to inject drugs while in prison. We think that is probably a lower reporting number than what is actually happening.

At this point, the Chair of the committee, the Hon. Terry Stephens, said, 'Mr Scarborough, could you repeat that number for me please?' He replied that there will be 6 per cent of prisoners reporting continuing to inject. He continued:

That is a self-report, so we think it is actually higher than what is being reported. Approximately 50 per cent of prisoners report a high risk of alcohol-related harm in the past 12 months. The use of alcohol is higher amongst the Indigenous entrants. Health services within prisons are largely confined to support during the withdrawal phase. The addition of a psychological and program support should be made available to match services that are available within the community.

Six per cent of prisoners continue to inject drugs whilst in prison. For me, that raises a number of concerns. First, when people come into custody and they are remanded and incarcerated, one would expect that access to drugs stops or, at the very least, slows down to the most minor of trickles, but 6 per cent of prisoners continue to inject drugs whilst in prison. That requires them to have the drug, it requires them to have a needle and it requires them to have—and this is where it gets a bit sketchy for me—some way to heat up the drug to put into the needle to inject into themselves. That is a lot of paraphernalia and a lot of equipment that is getting into our prisons—6 per cent.

We heard yesterday from the minister that there are 3,080 prisoners within our system. That means that we have close to 200 prisoners across our network who are injecting drugs into themselves. That is scary, downright scary. Not only does that pose a problem for those who are injecting the drugs and the fact that they are not able to clean themselves up, and are not cleaning themselves up—and they need to, first and foremost, bear responsibility for that—but it raises questions around the aggression and the activity of those injecting drug users towards other prisoners, towards the prison officers, and also it means that they have paraphernalia.

A needle that is used to inject illicit drugs is a dangerous weapon within prisons. This puts everybody in our prison community at risk. Putting aside the potentially violent situations that arise as a result of this drug use, if we cannot clean up the drug users in prison what hope do we have when these people get back out into the community? I think the community would rightly expect that prison is a place where you go to clean yourself up, that because you are in custody and because your every movement is scheduled and essentially dictated to you this is an opportunity for you to get clean. That simply is not happening.

Questions need to be raised about how these drugs are getting in, in the first place, and I will have a bit more to say in relation to how I think we need to fix that absolutely diabolical issue. I certainly respect Mr Scarborough for putting that information on the record. That is something on which I think both sides of politics need to get our heads together to work out how to fix it. OARS

goes on in the submission—and this is obviously one idea in the bill that has been put forward by the government—in relation to buffer zones. OARS, in its submission, says:

The inclusion of the 'buffer zone' seems reasonable, however we raise concern with regard to the 'possession of a prohibited item of a kind prescribed by the regulations', and whether or not this could impact on visitors to correctional facilities, who, for example, would carry a mobile phone which they may leave locked in their car or locked in the gatehouse—which would be assumed to be within the buffer zone.

So are we accidentally going to be creating criminals simply because somebody happens to wander past a correctional institution with a very common, everyday item? I do not think there would be a South Australian left—well, 99 per cent of South Australians would carry their mobile phone in their pocket or in their purse with them as they go around. OARS goes on to raise concerns around conditions of release on parole, saying:

With regard to the CEO accepting parole conditions on behalf of a prisoner if they are 'unreasonably refusing' it would be reasonable to assume that this would impact on the likelihood of the prisoners reoffending or breaching such parole conditions relatively soon after their release from prison. With regard to a prisoner who is unable to accept due to 'physical or cognitive impairment' the same may be suggested if cognitively the prisoner is unable to understand the implications of accepting/not accepting. This would be better placed with a guardian or trustee having the responsibility to accept.

I think in here Leigh Garrett raises a very common-sense issue and probably again an unintended consequence. I understand from the briefing what the government was trying to get at in relation to this amendment—that, where you have an uncooperative prisoner, you essentially want to impose these bail conditions. If these people are going to get out of gaol, those conditions need to be imposed. Certainly it is preferable if people accept these conditions but, regardless, they need to be served upon the person. When speaking with Frances Nelson QC, she said the same thing, that she accepted that in certain circumstances the CE can accept those parole conditions.

However, it rightly raises the question that if somebody is cognitively not able to accept the conditions of parole because they cannot understand them and they cannot read them—they have some sort of impairment that stops them from being able to accept them on their own—how are they going to comply with them? And is the CE the most appropriate person to accept them on their behalf?

I agree with Leigh Garrett here, and this is something I think potentially that we need to look at amending between the houses: whether or not to extend this to a guardian or trustee or essentially break it down so that, if we have unruly prisoners who can understand what is being imposed upon them but for whatever reason do not want to accept them, we give the CE that ability, but where somebody is unable, through cognitive impairment or some other disability, we should potentially look at another way.

If somebody with a severe mental illness is released from prison and then goes into the community, they should have some sort of care support mechanism, and perhaps it would be more appropriate that a guardian or some sort of caregiver or trustee accepts those parole conditions. We would potentially also need to look at what liability lies either with the chief executive or with the guardian or trustee. I think this is very worthy of consideration and something that we will be teasing out throughout the committee stage.

More feedback does continue to flow through, especially given that it has been only a couple of weeks between the time the bill was tabled and what we are doing here today, and this is quite a long and complex piece of legislation. Especially in relation to drug use in prisons, I think there are another couple of ideas that the government need to look at. The first of those is around using technology to stop mobile phone use in prison.

Contraband mobile phones in prisons allow inmates to facilitate the flow of drugs and other contraband items into prisons and enable inmates to continue a life of crime from behind bars. Using phones, inmates around the world have arranged murder and planned escapes, the import of firearms and drug imports. Mobile phones in prisons can enable inmates to provide orders and direction to gang members; communicate with and intimidate prosecution witnesses; communicate with family, friends and associates, which is a privilege that is rightfully restricted when people are incarcerated; and photograph staff and prison premises and potentially misuse this information.

Despite the current security precautions designed to prevent mobile phones from entering prisons, they are still making their way in, as phones become smaller and easier to conceal. Recent statistics released by the government show that the number of phones making their way into South Australian prisons tripled in one year, from 2014-15 to 2015-16. This poses a serious threat to the security of correctional centres and the community more broadly, who are trusting that, at the very least, prisoners are being prevented from engaging in further crime.

There are ways to help fix this. There are solutions that have been tried internationally that we need to look at as part of any reform process to stop illicit drugs and other criminal behaviour happening behind bars. We have announced a policy that will fund a pilot program at a regional prison to block the use of contraband mobile phones with a view to rolling this out across the prison network.

Mobile phone-jamming technology has been successfully trialled in New South Wales. A couple of months ago, I visited the Silverwater facility in New South Wales. I was able to spend time with some of their senior people to discuss the use of mobile phone jamming out at Lithgow prison. They basically said that it works. There are some set-up issues with the jamming technology and you have to try to calibrate the range, but the technology works. For them, they were going through a procurement process for a second stage into a second prison with that technology. They essentially said, 'It is going to be a case-by-case basis. Every prison is different and the technology set-up is going to be different, but this thing works.'

The technology has also been instituted in New Zealand. New Zealand had a more difficult experience because they instituted this technology 10 years ago, and I think we have come a long way in 10 years in mobile phone-jamming technology. They had to spend a lot of money after the fact to make improvements to the mobile phone-jamming system within their prisons, but they have been able to do it more successfully than in the United States and in Israel, with current technology proving it is possible to contain the jamming signals coming from within the correctional centre's boundaries and not interfere with other signals.

A variety of technologies to facilitate blocking mobile phone use is readily available, including jammers and also managed access systems. Managed access systems is quite an interesting technology. It has been trialled in the US in Mississippi state prisons, in this one group of seven prisons, and they instituted this managed access system. Essentially, it is a phone tower that attracts the signal from all the mobile phones that are used. What happens is that, if you use your mobile phone, it pings to the nearest tower.

From there, through this managed access system, the tower can identify whether it is a white-listed mobile phone; that is, a mobile phone that a corrections officer or someone working within the prison environment has listed inside the managed access system. If a phone is listed, they are allowed to make their phone call, but any unidentified mobile phone number is blocked. This is where this is superior to jamming, because jamming technology just essentially scrambles the frequency and the mobile phone cannot get reception.

The managed access system pings the signal to the tower, stops it from going any further and actually allows you to capture the mobile phone. You cannot capture what is actually in the information, but you can capture who the mobile phone was trying to contact, the number on the other side. This can be quite helpful in understanding who the prisoners were trying to contact and can be used as further evidence, potentially, of illegal activity. It would certainly give police and law enforcement bodies more opportunities to understand the links between different people.

The difficulty is that the managed access system allows you to identify the number of phones within the system. That is certainly a positive because with jammers, essentially, you do not know how many there are. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Auditor-General's Report*

## **AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT**

In committee.

(Continued from 1 November 2017.)

**The CHAIR:** We have the Treasurer, followed by the Minister for Finance, followed by State Development, followed by Mineral Resources, unless the opposition has another plan. Are you happy to start with Treasury?

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Sorry, when you say 'Treasury'—

**The CHAIR:** Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development and Minister for Mineral Resources.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Energy and Mining to start with.

**The CHAIR:** Energy first? Well that is a different group of people and a different order. Just tell us what page you are on and we can find it to start.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Volume 1, pages 5 and 6—Mining royalties. In 2015, Treasurer, you said that a percentage of mining royalties would go into a future fund when the budget is in surplus. There have been two surplus budgets since then, but the future fund has not been established. When will that happen?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Soon.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** When, Treasurer? Can you be more specific? It is a two-year-old promise.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Soon.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** How soon?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Very soon.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** That is what you said two weeks ago when I asked you in question time.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I stand by my answer two weeks ago in question time: soon.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Not possible to improve the answer, or refuse to improve the answer?

**The CHAIR:** You do need to stand, and it is probably best not to try to be too argumentative about it all if we could, and just concentrate on the Auditor-General's Report. Off you go, standing for your question and standing for your answer.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Not possible to improve on the answer, or refuse to improve on the answer?

**The CHAIR:** That is argumentative again.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It is argumentative, Madam Chair. I thank the member for his interest in government policy. I think it is impressive that the member has such an interest in our policies. We are committed to delivering a future fund. We think a future fund is the right thing to do. It is appropriate that we put royalties aside for future generations. I believe in mining. I think mining is an excellent way for us to ensure that we create jobs into the future.

Of course, there are many sovereign wealth funds around the world. Norway comes to mind as a great example that we should attempt to emulate, where oil and gas royalties are going into a future fund. The thing about Norway, which is putting oil and gas royalties into a future fund, is that the Norwegians, like the South Australians, understand the importance of exploiting their natural resources for the benefit of their citizens and not listening to faux science like members opposite, who wish to ban unconventional gas in the South-East for 10 years.

The amount we could put into a future fund would be greater if we could allow science-based regulation rather than emotionally or politically based regulation. Politically based regulation is very dangerous. Politically based regulation is when politicians come in over the top of scientists, independent regulators and people who know the industry, people who understand the industry,

people who know what is safe and unsafe, and people who are able to risk-assess applications for exploration and production. The way to build a sovereign wealth fund, if you are going to use extractives and oil and gas to fill that fund, is to have an independent, science-based regulatory approach. I am very proud of our science-based regulatory approach—

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Excuse me, Chair.

**The CHAIR:** Just a moment, Treasurer, the member for Stuart has a point of order or a query of some kind.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** This is all good information, but it has nothing to do with the answer of the question, so I ask you to bring the minister back to the question.

**The CHAIR:** Well, I am listening carefully. Your question was, 'Could you improve on what you said?' or whatever it was—

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** No, on why he cannot tell us when he will bring the future fund into place.

**The CHAIR:** Okay. I am listening.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I have: soon. 'Soon' is not me trying to be difficult; it is just saying that it is going to be very soon. It is imminent—soon. I am not going to be disparaging about the opposition keeping its policies secret so close to an election, but I believe passionately that the extractive industries can do a lot to create a sovereign wealth fund. That is why we have allocated royalties into a sovereign wealth fund. We are working diligently at its creation. We are working at it assiduously. I know that my agencies are very keen to establish the sovereign wealth fund. Members on this side of the house are itching to get on with it, and we will.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I refer to Part B: Agency audit reports, pages 330 and 331 and the final bullet point on page 330 with regard to contractors. What was the total spend on contractors in relation to the design and review of the government's energy plan, the Energy Plan Implementation Taskforce and related expenditure?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** In March 2017, the South Australian government unveiled a comprehensive plan to take charge of the state's energy future and deliver reliable, affordable and clean power for South Australians. The total cost of the energy plan is expected to be approximately \$550 million, covering the following deliverables: a 250-megawatt gas-fired power plant to provide backup power and system stability services—a very important piece of kit that I am very proud of—and an emergency generation operation renewable technology fund, including battery storage, and a plan to accelerate the exploration gas grant program.

In the six months since the energy plan was initiated, the implementation task force has successfully completed the scoping, planning and contract awards for several of the projects. These processes necessitated the procurement of specialised consultant, contractor and legal resources with the skills to deliver the outcomes required within a tight time frame. In 2016-17, \$1.4 million was spent on contractor resources to deliver the energy plan outcomes; in 2026-17, \$2.7 million was spent on consultancy resources to deliver the energy plan outcomes; and in 2016-17, \$1.1 million was spent on legal resources, including both the Crown Solicitor and external legal resources, to deliver the energy plan outcomes. All payments were approved within the budget of 2016-17.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** On contractors again, can you confirm whether the \$1.4 million spent on the energy plan implementation is different from or includes the \$1.08 million spent for Frontier Economics?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I will get some advice for you very quickly.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** What was the total spend on contractors in relation to the programs or plans associated with the energy plan?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The advice I just gave you is the most up-to-date advice I have. If there is anything in excess of that, I will get that to you.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The first bullet point on the top of page 331 states:

Consultants increased by \$3.5 million mainly due to consultants engaged for advice on [the energy plan]...

Which consultants were contracted to work on these two projects and how much was each paid?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I will get that list of contractors for you. I think you are entitled to have that list, so I will get it for you.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** And how much each one was paid?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sure.

**Mr KNOLL:** I refer to Volume 1, page 5, Statement A, fees and charges. Land Services regulatory fees 2016-17 had a budget of \$210.4 million and an actual of \$187.6 million. What would the state receive from these regulatory fees following privatisation of the Land Services Group?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We expect no change in the forward estimates.

**Mr KNOLL:** When you say over the forward estimates, you expect that to continue ongoing?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The advice I have is yes.

**Mr KNOLL:** What are the budgeted revenues in terms of licence fees, royalties and the likes in each year of the forward estimates relative to the \$187.6 million in fees received before?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Which part of the Auditor-General's Report are you referring to?

**Mr KNOLL:** Volume 1, page 5, Land Services regulatory fees. What I am essentially trying to establish is—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I know what you are trying to do. I want to know where you get your references.

**Mr KNOLL:** What are we looking at in terms of year on year for that figure?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The information you are asking for is set out in the budget papers.

**Mr KNOLL:** In the budget papers? Would you like to give us a page number? Okay, I will find it. I refer to Volume 5, page 297, which talks about revenues from the SA government. There are contingencies paid, Treasurer, for a number of different things including \$2.4 million for the Tax Reform project. Given that the State Tax Review response was tabled in the 2015-16 state budget, what was the \$2.4 million spent on?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Can you give us the reference again?

**The CHAIR:** Page 297, Volume 5.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We will need to update the system obviously for the new tax changes in terms of updating our IT systems, and that money was being spent there, I am advised.

**Mr KNOLL:** Did that involve the purchase of any new IT software?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No.

**Mr KNOLL:** There is \$1.1 million spent on the Homestart Loan Portfolio project. Can you confirm that that was money spent on looking at the HomeStart privatisation?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, there has been a lot of interest from the private sector about whether or not we wanted to commercialise the loan book. Indeed, Nick Reade from BankSA contacted me personally hoping that we would privatise HomeStart, and we did a body of work and found that there was no benefit whatsoever to the taxpayer to do so. We put out a statement after having done the body of work to satisfy ourselves and the private sector that, indeed, it was in the best interests of South Australia to keep HomeStart in public hands, much to the disappointment of people like Nick Reade.



**Mr KNOLL:** I think that was a yes. In relation to the same A-G reference, are you able to confirm the progress of the Medvet privatisation?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am advised that there is no further work being conducted in that area.

**Mr KNOLL:** It says here that \$330,000 was spent for Medvet divestment. Are you suggesting now that that work is concluded?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, I am suggesting exactly what I said: that no more work is being conducted in that area.

**Mr KNOLL:** Referring to Part B, page 507, the third bullet point states:

- a...single source procurement for a contract estimated to cost \$187,000 was undertaken for a consultant to conduct a cost management review. The consultant was later contracted for a second stage of work, bringing the total contract price to \$954,000.

What did the cost management review cover? What the report says is:

...no formal analysis of potential alternative service providers was performed either at inception...or on its expansion for a second stage.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I understand that this is a group that was contracted to the Treasury to do some work in relation to the move from the old RAH to the NRAH. They had expertise in the area. It was easier for DTF to contract them directly to assist in the move. Promentor is the consultancy.

**Mr KNOLL:** Promentor provided advice in relation to the actual move, so moving people from there to there and any associated equipment?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Efficiencies operations that were conducted in the old RAH would be conducted in the new RAH.

**Mr KNOLL:** So it was an efficiency audit into the change of operations between the two hospitals?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We wanted to make sure that the new hospital operates efficiently at its lowest possible cost.

**Mr KNOLL:** What was the second stage of the work?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The first public work had uncovered some parts that Treasury were interested in, about efficiencies of care. The first body of work recommended a second body of work, and the Treasury felt it appropriate and proceeded with it.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Still on Treasury, referring to Part B, page 399, the third to last paragraph states:

...SAFA sought to fix the interest rate for the NRAH project debt. It executed a series of forward starting hedges using interest rate swaps from 2018 to 2033.

What rates have been fixed and for what terms?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We do not have that with us here, but I can get that for you.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Were those hedges fixed before or after the major bank tax levy was announced?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I do not know, but it is fascinating that you ask me this while we are in an examination, when only just earlier you were moving points of order saying that any talk of any measure in a budget bill was out of order.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Treasurer, I was asking about a point in time. Were those hedges fixed before or after the bill was brought to parliament?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** There was also capital raising just recently, where we were oversubscribed. I know that the four banks claimed that we would not be able to raise bonds. At the most recent Budget and Finance Committee, the Hon. Lucas asked the Under Treasurer whether we

had been successful and, indeed, we had been successful in fully subscribing the paper we issued, so I am not concerned about fake threats about bonds not being bought.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Will you come back to the house with an answer about the timing?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Sorry?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I said yes, and I am glad you are sorry.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I refer to page 397. At the bottom of the page, the report states:

The client asset/liability management portfolios do not reside on SAFA's Statement of Financial Position and only impact on SAFA's profit and loss through fee income received. This includes the South Australian Water Corporation...liability management portfolio.

Should Labor's proposed establishment of the energy and water service go ahead, will SA Water's debt portfolio be returned to general government sector balance sheet?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I think any question that starts with 'what would happen if' is hypothetical and not appropriate.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Chair, can you give a ruling on that, please?

**The CHAIR:** It is hypothetical. Just reword it; you will get there.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Does the government plan that the SA Water debt portfolio will be returned to general government sector balance sheet?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, it would remain in the public non-financial corporation balance sheet because ABS standards do not allow it.

*Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order! I did not actually hear it either, I am sorry. Could you just repeat it.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, the debt would remain where it is.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I refer to page 400, school loans scheme. The STEM school loans scheme's first loan was drawn down in February 2017. Can you confirm the state's total exposure under the STEM loans scheme to date as well as the number of loans issued?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I think we have done two rounds; I will check and get back to you. There have been a number of successful schools. I am very keen to publicise the government's good work here in helping the independent sector and the non-government sector get access to these loans. It is a great way of making sure that all our kids get access to public money and improve their educational outcomes. I will get a complete list and get back to you.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I refer to page 504. In the middle of the page, the report states:

Calculating and billing land tax and ESL relies heavily on property and ownership information in the South Australia Integrated Land Information System...database provided by the Land Services Group...of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Below that, it talks about some difficulties with work not being done properly. Given there are existing difficulties, who will perform these functions following the commercialisation of LSG?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The work will be done by RevenueSA.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** What audit process will be undertaken to ensure the accuracy and currency of information being relied upon for land tax and ESL purposes?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** RevenueSA have a fully automated process, and they are completely confident that it will work well.

**Mr KNOLL:** I refer to Volume 1, page 5, Statement A, in relation to recoveries. The report states that TAFE SA properties purchased by Renewal SA from DSD had a budget of \$650 million but an actual of only \$594.6 million. Can you explain the \$55.4 million difference between budget and actual?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am advised that, as the process was undertaken, there may have been some properties that were not transferred and, as the process began, we did an estimation on their value. As the processes occurred, we booked the actual value, so that is why we have the discrepancies.

**Mr KNOLL:** I refer to Volume 1, page 5, again about the recoveries. In relation to the cash alignment policy, can you confirm whether these budgeted for, essentially, a return of cash in 2017-18? Have you received advice about whether a return is likely?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We do not estimate the cash that we expect to be transferred and it has no impact on the budget.

**Mr KNOLL:** So you are saying there is nothing budgeted for 2017-18 in relation to the cash alignment policy?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** On page 33 of the Executive Summary, Part A, under the heading 'Department of Treasury and Finance' there is reference to DTF attending to a number of key strategic projects, including the sale of the State Administration Centre precinct. Where are we at? Has it been sold? Taken off the market? Under contract? What is the situation?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We are making an announcement very soon.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Is it under contract?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We are making an announcement very soon.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I will ask you this: have you received any money at all from the sale of this asset?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Commercial and General were forced to pay us a fee for not being able to settle on the sale process.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** How much?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It was \$5 million.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** So, so far, in the entire project, you have got back \$5 million?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We still have the buildings and, of course, we did sell one property, which was the old multicultural—I cannot recall the number on Flinders Street, but it is directly adjacent—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I know where it is.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —to the old Treasury. Yes, I am glad you know where it is. I cannot recall what we received for that, but I can get that for you because I know how interested you are in the approach that we have taken to these sites. It was a very good sale process with a lot of interest by the South Australian market because the market is very buoyant right now, as witnessed by our lowering unemployment figures and growth in building activity.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Have Funds SA considered and rejected any proposal to purchase the property?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** They considered it and made an offer. We considered it too low and rejected it.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Have they indicated that they are not going to be making any further proposals?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That is a matter for them. They act in the interests, obviously, of people who have money with them and the board acts independently of us. It would have to be a commercial transaction and it was not suitable to both parties, so we did not proceed.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Treasurer, I will just take you back to some energy questions before we run out of time. I refer to Part B, page 330 and 331. At the very bottom of page 330, it talks about \$5.7 million and it gives a break-up. Is the \$2.6 million that the government has told us is being spent on promoting the energy plan in addition to the \$5.2 million that is here in these figures?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It is \$3.7 million; is that right?

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** To give you the specifics, it talks about \$1.4 million on contractors for the Energy Plan Implementation Taskforce, \$2.7 million for advice on energy market transition and \$1.1 million on legal fees. Is the \$2.6 million that we have been told is being spent on advertising part of this or in addition to this?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The figures that you read out are moneys for implementing the program.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** What was the legal advice for, Treasurer?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It was to make sure that we were on firm legal grounds: you operate this plant and equipment within a legal framework within the National Electricity Market.

**The CHAIR:** The time for examination has expired. We thank the Treasurer and his advisers and the members of the opposition for their questions.

*Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.*

**Mr PISONI:** I refer to Part B, page 307, which lists the total number of FTEs at 2,447. Could you advise what the FTEs are for the planning component?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am advised that we need to take that on notice because there are apparently six different programs. I can say that it would be a smaller part of that number because, obviously, the main functions in that department are in other areas, but I am happy to get that information.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I have a question on Part B, Agency audit reports, Public Trustee, commencing on page 46. My first set of questions will be on page 49. The Public Trustee, of course, is an agency under your responsibility, Attorney, and I think it is fair to say that every year there are problems. The most recent, in this last financial year, the subject of this audit, has been the public trial of Ms Alana Bartels and her subsequent conviction in relation to multiple counts of stealing moneys from a deceased estate.

Since we were last here, in November last year, she has pleaded guilty, and you have also, in February this year, provided me with an answer from last year to confirm that your officers in the Public Trustee had discussions with the Auditor-General advising of this alleged theft in May 2016. My question is firstly in respect of this estate: have all the funds that were stolen been recovered from Ms Bartels?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** The answer to that question, I am advised, is as follows. The total amount of money which was misappropriated was in the order of some \$32,000. So far as the estate is concerned, there has been restitution of that money. However, the PT, or the state, has not recovered all that money as yet from the person responsible. I am advised that an amount of some \$5,000 has been collected from her. That, hopefully, is not the end of recovery from her but, from the perspective of the beneficiaries under the estate, their loss has been met by the guarantee, in effect, of the PT over the assets of the estate.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I do not doubt that, Attorney, but if we have only got \$5,000 back to reinstate the resources of the Public Trustee, which is public money, when is the balance expected to be recovered? Or is that the extent that is expected to be recovered?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am advised in respect of that that the matter of the recovery of those funds from her is presently before the courts. The PT is pursuing those matters and is optimistic that the appropriate orders will be made and has some reason for optimism that if those orders are made

the funds will be available, though I have also been advised that there is a policy of insurance, which would ultimately benefit the state and the Public Trustee in terms of its loss, if any, at the end of that process.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Sorry, is somebody other than SAicorp insuring this loss—in other words, the taxpayers of South Australia, if it is SAicorp?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, SAicorp. But you asked the question about the Public Trustee; I am answering it from the perspective of the Public Trustee. That is the position: the beneficiaries under the estate have been restored to the position they should have been in and the PT is pursuing through the courts the recovery of the balance of the funds.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** My point, Attorney, is that when you say there is also an issue of an insurance policy, the only insurance policy that we are talking about here is via SAicorp.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, I accept that, but the state, within itself, pays a premium to SAicorp for the services it provides, but SAicorp is the insurer, yes.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Can you advise the committee if any of those funds are recovered and when?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** In due course?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Yes.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, that is fine.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** At the bottom of page 49, which talks about the estate client file management, documentation not located, notwithstanding that we have had this significant fraud identified over a period of time in this last financial year, we still have problems where documentation in relation to an estate could not even be found. Is there some explanation for that?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I can provide some information. Obviously, a finding of that sort is not desirable from the point of view of the Public Trustee or from my point of view. As I understand it, the Auditor-General could not find supporting documentation for some transactions. I am advised that these documents should have been filed by the estate officers, following a processing of the transactions.

The estate officers have, I am advised, been reminded of these requirements. Reading between the lines, and I stand to be corrected, that does not necessarily mean there is anything necessarily untoward that has happened, but it does mean that the appropriate documentary trail has not been maintained in the way that it should have been. We are also investigating presently the possibility of digitally scanning all payment documentation prior to returning the documentation from the accounts payable section to the estate officers.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am advised that the hope is that that will be implemented in February.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Attorney, it does not help us terribly much, in the sense of the confidence of the committee, when we have an issue like Bartels, we have documentation missing, and, continuing on page 50, the supporting documentation for Lands Titles re-evaluations, for re-evaluations in relation to non-real estate—all are listed as areas of deficiency in respect of documentation. It is of continuing concern that this entity, which is in charge of billions of dollars, has clearly been under attack in relation to someone who has had access to the opportunity to take funds. It is of no comfort to come here to find that that has not been completely addressed.

However, let me put this to you. In September this year, ICAC prepared a report in respect of the Public Trustee. I asked you in the parliament questions in respect of the deficiencies of electronic systems in the Public Trustee which have been reported on. The commissioner stated in that report: 'It was necessary to improve the efficiency of the business and to reduce the risk of corruption and maladministration.' At the time, just to refresh your memory, you took the question on notice as to what was happening in this regard and why there had not been provision, after years of

requesting funding to deal with these electronic systems, for this be remedied. That was on 27 September.

Can you inform the committee with some reassurance, given what we have read here on the Public Trustee's position and in this report from ICAC, what is happening in respect of funding to deal with these electronic systems which have been repeatedly identified by the Auditor-General and then confirmed again by ICAC as being deficient and which are necessary to reduce the risk of corruption and maladministration?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** First of all, we are obviously here responding to the Auditor-General, not to anybody else. The point about record keeping is one that I am not attempting to run away from. I am concerned, as everyone would be, with findings from the Auditor-General to the effect that record keeping could be improved. Of course, poor record keeping is not of itself evidence of somebody being dishonest, but it is obviously the case that poor record keeping is the fertile ground in which that sort of behaviour may flourish, so I entirely understand the point.

The situation in respect of significant investment of resources in the Public Trustee is obviously a matter that I need to deal with through the regular budget process. We have presently an exercise being undertaken to try to assess exactly what costs and what additional resources in particular might be required, and how they may be delivered in order to address some of the issues that have been identified in this report. Ultimately, that will be a matter for deliberation, I guess, in the budget process. That is a matter where obviously there are multiple considerations, but I regard it as being important. I am certainly not in any way attempting to minimise the undesirability of poor record keeping.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** The Auditor-General also made adverse comment on page 28 in respect of the business processes in Consumer and Business Services and SafeWork SA, which he has described as 'in need of improvement', and then more particularised on pages 32 and 33. On page 33, having identified a number of areas of failure, in particular the interface between POS and InfoNET, it states:

AGD also advised that SafeWork SA will adopt an annual review of BPoint user access, a quarterly review of POS users and reviews of InfoNET user access.

Have any of those three happened, and if so, when?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Sorry, but I have just been provided with a further bit of information that I should put on the record. I have just been advised that some of the files which were the subject of the questions from the member for Bragg in respect of page 49 and 50 in her last set of questions were subsequently discovered, but they were in the customer files rather than in the appropriate central accounting files.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** It says they were not located altogether.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am saying that my advice is they subsequently have been. That does not mean that putting them in the wrong file is a good thing—I am not saying that—but it is not a case of files having been destroyed or whatever—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Or completely lost.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Or completely lost, yes. I am sorry, member for Bragg, because whilst I was picking up that additional piece of information I did not get the full context of your question.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** So our next dysfunctional unit under your watch is SafeWork SA. Page 33 states:

AGD also advised that SafeWork SA will adopt an annual review of BPoint user access, a quarterly review of POS users and reviews of InfoNET user access.

Have any of those three happened, and if so, when?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I can give an update on where things are going presently, as I am advised as follows. SafeWork SA will undertake the review of users of the BPoint system during the end of financial year process each year. SafeWork SA has implemented quarterly reviews of the

POS system. Standard operating procedures for the annual review of BPoint user access, and a quarterly review of POS users will be fully implemented by the end of the year.

Regarding the InfoNET user review, it should be noted that there is a current policy and procedure managing InfoNET users which states that a review of the InfoNET users will be undertaken by the Team Coordinator, Business Systems in January and August of each year. Records of the review are retained on the form of audit checklists for managing of InfoNET users and, together with printouts used in each review, are to be signed and countersigned to verify the user status or the removal from the InfoNET application. In addition, user permissions of staff are removed on their departure from SafeWork. This review has been an ongoing practice.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** So in answer to my question, has there been an annual review of the BPoint user access since 30 June 2017 and, if so, when did it happen?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** My advice is that it will be done by the end of the year, which I am advised means calendar year. I am advised that it should be done before the end of this calendar year.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** And the quarterly review of POS users? I assume we have had at least a quarter since then.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** This one will also be implemented by the end of this year, so the first quarter will be at the end of the calendar year. That is what I am advised: the end of this calendar year.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** The end of the calendar year for the quarter ending 30 June or 30 September?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It will be the 31 December quarter that will be reviewed.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Sorry, I do not understand that. Quarterly means every three months, on my recollection.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It depends when you start.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** That may be so. Let us start then. This report—

**Mr Pisoni:** You could start on 1 July, though.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Since 1 July, has there been a quarterly assessment done for the last quarter of the last financial year?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** We will check.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Has there been one from 1 July to the end of September this year?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Again, I will check. What I have here says that there will be one that will look at the period concluding 31 December.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes. I will check whether there have been any others.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Are you satisfied with that, Attorney? There is identified risk, identified problems, identified deficiencies and a commitment to do something, including quarterly reviews of these two projects, these two particular aspects of work, and you are being told today that we are not going to have anything until possibly the end of the year. How is that compliant with what is being promised in the Auditor-General's Report to be done by this department?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Obviously, I want the agency to provide the reviews it has undertaken to provide as quickly as possible. I am not in any way supportive of there being any delay, tardiness or anything of that sort but, as I am presently advised, the period that will have the first of those quarterly reviews commenced on 1 October. Why it started on 1 October and not 1 July, I do not know. I will seek that information as well.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I ask that you do, Attorney, because, as a member of this committee, I am certainly not satisfied. Frankly, I do not think you should be, especially when they say, according to

the Auditor-General, that they have made a commitment to do this. We are now in November, and at best we are being told that they might have started some work that might possibly report by the end of the year. That is clearly inconsistent with what the Auditor-General has been told, according to what he has said here, what he expects to be done and certainly what this committee expects to be done when there has been such a history with this agency.

I will move to the SafeWork SA recommendations that came out of the report because since then there has been the appointment, according to your website, of an investigating officer. A detective chief inspector of South Australia Police has been appointed.

**The CHAIR:** Does this still relate to page 33?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Yes, it all relates to pages 32 and 33, SafeWork SA. My question is: has there been any increase in provision for SafeWork SA costs to accommodate this new person? It is a new role in SafeWork SA of Director, Investigations.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am advised that there has been no increase in budget for the new person. They have been accommodated within the existing budgetary allocation.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Still in relation to the Attorney-General's Department, at the top of page 37, the report states, 'Salaries and wages increased by \$5.1 million mainly reflecting the impact of the enterprise bargaining agreement indexation.' What is the period of the agreement and the indexation per year?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I will have to take that on notice, the reason being that there may well be multiple agreements and whatnot operating there. I will just have to take it on notice.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** At the end of the reference to the Fines Enforcement Recovery Unit (FERU) on page 43, the report states: 'The FERU is currently replacing the existing fines management system, with implementation expected to commence in 2017-18.' Just a reminder that we are in November 2017. Could you reassure the committee that that has actually happened?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I will provide an update. I do not know exactly where that is up to. I do know that the unit has been very actively working on improving its performance in a range of areas, but exactly where that is up to I do not know, so I will take that on notice and get back to the parliament.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I will raise the matter again, Attorney, when we deal with the legislation on this unit. No doubt, you will have advisers here then, so I will have a number of questions then. It certainly suggests that this fines management system is being replaced again. They are the words of the Auditor-General, so we do expect some response on that.

I refer to page 44, under the heading Taxation, there is reference to gaming machines and obviously a reduction in income for the year. At the bottom of that page there is a graph relating to 'Machines (installed as at 30 June)' for the years ending 2017 across to 2014. Could I have a breakdown of the number of machines in the Casino of those amounts for each of those four years?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am happy to get it, but I do not have it here.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Under Courts Administration Authority at page 101, we are back to that wonderful courts facilities planning, which has been announced, aborted, announced, aborted, announced, aborted. There are references to the \$1 million funding that facilitated a planning study which is described there as the CBD court facilities planning study. I asked some questions in estimates about this study. It had been read. There had been some assurances given that the recommendations in relation to work that is underway at the Sir Samuel Way Building are consistent with recommendations in that report. I am still asking about the report. Where is it and can we have a copy of it?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am not exactly sure what report, as such, we are talking about here.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** On page 101, point 8 states:

Last year we reported that the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure would receive \$1 million for a CBD Court facilities planning study in 2016-17.



That has happened. It has been prepared. The Chief Justice told us about it in estimates; he has read it, I think you have read it, everyone else has read it—

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Sorry, I was misled by the word 'report'. I am not saying that was deliberate, but you are talking about the planning study?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Correct.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I will see if we can provide that. It may or may not be that there is some commercial sensitivity around it, I do not know, but I can say very simply to the committee that the gist of it was that there was a possibility to do an incremental delivery of the medium and longer term physical resource needs of the courts and that there were certain moves which would be a 'no regrets' move as an initial element of that, which includes the works presently being undertaken in the old Supreme Court building and the Sir Samuel Way Building and that would leave options available thereafter for a second and third phase which would still be quite flexible, potentially, across alternative solutions to those problems.

That is the gist of it. I am happy to see if there is any reason why we cannot provide that. From my point of view, I cannot see any reason why I could not. As I said, if there is commercial material in there, that may or may not be problematic. Subject to that, I will make inquiries.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I just remind the committee, and for the benefit of the Attorney-General, that is about what you told me during estimates and we still have not had any answer or response or indication. If there is some commerciality, that is fine. We would accept it if there are aspects of it that you suggest are commercial-in-confidence that need to be, in some way, redacted, then we are happy to hear about that; but we would like an answer, at the very least.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I understand that and it is a perfectly reasonable question.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** On page 351 in relation to ReturnToWorkSA, the report states:

...income support decreasing by \$37 million to \$141 million as a result of fewer claimants receiving income support, due mainly to RTWSA's initiatives to get claimants back to work sooner. This is consistent with an increase of \$5 million in vocational rehabilitation expense

Again on page 351, the report states:

...the downturn in income support and medical expenses in 2017, due mainly to RTWSA's focus on early intervention by mobile case managers to get claimants back to work sooner.

To what extent does each of the factors contribute to the improvement of the scheme?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Do you want us to actually break up what percentage of that improvement comes from each one of those?

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Yes.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I think that is probably difficult but I will ask the ReturnToWorkSA people to consider what they can do by way of providing an answer to that question. I want to congratulate them on the work they have done there. That early intervention is making a material and positive difference to people getting back to work. It is certainly a serious improvement over the way things were a few years back. It is beneficial to everybody—the employers and the workers—and to the cost of doing business in South Australia. Everybody is better off. I do commend them for the work that they have done.

**The CHAIR:** Time for examination has expired.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Can I just ask this. In relation to page 352, the numbers on that chart are unaudited; can you give some explanation as to why they are not audited?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It may have been the point in time at which these numbers were sought compared with the point of time that the actual auditing is done, but again I will check.

**The CHAIR:** We thank the minister and his advisers for their attendance here today and the members of the opposition for their questions. We ask the Minister for Regional Development and

Local Government to move into position as quickly as he can with his advisers. We are going to local government first.

**Mr PISONI:** I refer to Part B, page 274—Local Government Finance Authority. Are you able to provide the total payroll for the 6.2 employees?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** The Local Government Finance Authority is under the direction of the Minister for Finance, so the member should be asking those questions of the Minister for Finance.

**Mr PEDERICK:** We will go to regional development, ma'am. Page 336 of Part B notes:

...little progress had been made in completing the 2016-17 internal audit program outlined in the three-year rolling 2016-18 internal audit plan.

The report further notes that:

Although internal audit performed a number of ad hoc reviews requested by management throughout the year, these were not reflected in an updated internal audit plan.

What were the ad hoc reviews requested by management?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** Two things: that comes under the responsibility of the Minister for Agriculture and I am advised that has already been asked previously and answered by the minister.

**Mr PEDERICK:** We will go to page 337. The Auditor-General notes that in late 2016 the Acting Deputy Chief Executive approved a \$3½ million RDF milestone payment to a funding recipient. It is further stated that there is a specific instruction from Treasury. It is Treasurer's Instruction 8—Financial Authorisations, which provides the acting deputy chief executive with authority to approve RDF payments up to \$500,000 only. Notwithstanding the department's response, that the \$3½ million was based on approval from the Minister for Regional Development, that \$3½ million was a substantial breach of the Treasurer's Instructions.

My question is: how did it come about that neither the Minister for Regional Development nor the acting chief executive had noted what I presume to be a standard Treasury instruction? Surely, significant procedural checks would have been precursory to such a substantial payment authority.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** I am advised that this issue relates to a payment made against the grant funding deed. I approved the grant funding deed, including a schedule of milestones and payment for each milestone as they were met. Officers within PIRSA have delegated authority to approve payments up to a certain dollar value, as you mentioned, depending on their role.

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** The minister is being distracted by the noise behind him.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** Sorry, ma'am.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** In this case, the grantee had met the milestone conditions and accordingly sought payment. This \$3.5 million milestone payment was larger than usual in terms of the RDF milestone payments made. The Auditor-General acknowledged that the payment was in line with the approved funding deed and that there were no inappropriate or adverse financial implications. However, the issue identified by the Auditor-General is that this payment exceeded the standard financial delegation for the person who made this, in this case, the acting deputy chief executive. I am advised that the standard financial delegation for the acting deputy chief executive is for payments of no more than \$550,000 (GST inclusive).

Accordingly, a specific payment authority should have been sought from me; however, in this particular circumstance, the acting deputy chief executive already held a special delegation of \$10 million (GST exclusive) or \$11 million (GST inclusive), but this did not incorporate RDF payments. A special delegation is provided to a limited number of positions within PIRSA to cover matters outside of normal day-to-day operations, such as higher value payments. What a special delegation can be exercised on and to what value is specifically defined for each person holding a specific or a special delegation.

While the acting deputy chief executive had been authorised to exercise special delegation to the value of \$11 million (GST inclusive) for a number of purposes, at the time of approving the

payments in Basware, PIRSA's invoice payment processing system, due to an administrative oversight he did not have any special delegated authority to approve the RDF payment greater than \$550,000 (GST inclusive). I am advised that PIRSA has since reminded its delegates for RDF payments to seek specific RDF payment authority from me in the future if payment amounts exceed their specified authorised limits.

As I mentioned earlier, I understand that the Auditor-General is satisfied that the payment was in line with the approved funding deed between myself, as Minister for Regional Development, and the funding recipient, as you can see in the Auditor-General's Report.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Minister, I just want a bit more explanation. The issue for me is that there is a fair difference between \$11 million and \$550,000. Does that mean Treasury Instruction 8 will be disregarded into the future and that those special allowances up to \$11 million (including GST) will become standard practice?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** First up, we do not anticipate that special delegations will become more common. The Treasurer's Instructions provide a framework for the spending of money; the values depend on the specific circumstances. As I said, a special delegation is provided to a limited number of positions within PIRSA to cover matters outside of normal day-to-day operations such as higher value payments.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Who was or who were the funding recipients of that \$3.5 million?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** I am advised that this \$3.5 million was for Sundrop Farms, just south of Port Augusta. I want to comment on what a great facility Sundrop Farms is with the innovation and the technology they are using. They are world leaders and everybody is looking at them. Certainly, \$3.5 million was GST exclusive, I am advised. It is for Sundrop Farms, located just south of Port Augusta on the Augusta Highway.

**Mr PEDERICK:** With regard to what happened with the granting of this money, who was the acting chief executive at that time?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** I am advised that at the time the acting deputy chief executive officer was Mr Will Zacharin.

**Mr PEDERICK:** On page 342 there is a breakdown of each round of RDF funding from 2014 to 2017. Specifically, the section identifies the total number of ongoing full-time equivalent jobs which it was expected that each round of funding would generate. Are these full-time equivalent estimates based on information submitted as part of the funding application or on the outcomes actually observed?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** The Auditor-General's Report notes, on page 342, the jobs that the Regional Development Fund grants will create. I can advise that as at 30 June 2017, in round 1 in 2014-15, \$17.8 million was committed for 39 projects. These projects involve direct investment of around \$331 million and aim to create 637 direct ongoing FTE jobs.

I can also advise that as at 30 June 2017, \$16.75 million has been paid out from the RDF. Nearly 500 of those jobs were filled as at 30 June, with the remainder to come online as key projects when this round reaches completion. Nearly \$300 million of private investment in our regions has been unlocked due to that round 1.

In round 2, 2015-16, \$14.2 million was committed for 25 projects. These projects involve direct investment of around \$152 million and aim to create around 270 direct ongoing FTE jobs. I can further advise that, as at 30 June 2017, \$11.89 million has been paid out from the RDF. Over 250 jobs have commenced, with the remainder to be delivered as projects near completion. Over \$77 million of private investment has already gone into these projects.

In round 3, which is 2016-17, \$13.9 million was committed for 23 projects. These projects involve direct investment of around \$148 million and aim to create around 425 direct ongoing FTE jobs. An amount of \$9.6 million has been paid out from the RDF. Despite being relatively recent, I can advise that some jobs from that round have already been created—in actual fact, 65. Again, the remaining jobs will be delivered when projects near completion. Nearly \$59 million of private investment has already been unlocked as a result of this round, with the remainder still to come. That

is over 800 jobs that have already been created as a direct result of the three rounds of the RDF grants.

Also, we talk about that but, in relation to the indirect jobs, we have had an economic analysis undertaken by EY of rounds 1 and 2 of the RDF, which shows that, in addition to direct job creation, the RDF will create indirect jobs. This report showed that the main benefits of the RDF to South Australia are through accelerating company's own investment, enabling additional investment to add further value and allowing projects to progress that otherwise would not have.

The report showed that projects supported by the RDF in the 2015-16 financial year alone would make an economic contribution to the state of over \$900 million and create over 2,000 regional jobs. To specifically answer the honourable member's question, Regions SA has rigorous processes to ensure that the actions claimed by grantees are completed before the money is paid. This can include site visits and also auditing.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Minister, do you have any figures on the number of jobs that have been ongoing since the end of June this year to the end of September 2017? Do you have an update on jobs in those three months?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** The Auditor-General's Report is up to 30 June 2017, but I am quite happy to endeavour to get that information and get back to the member.

**Mr PEDERICK:** In regard to these full-time equivalent projections, who prepared them and on what basis?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** When anybody applies for a grant, the companies specify how many jobs will be created. I think I have mentioned this before in this chamber in question time. Payment of any grant money is on a reimbursement basis against the milestones as they go through, which includes the FTE job creation numbers. I am just going to go back. The payment of grant money is on a reimbursement basis against milestones, and, as I think I mentioned a bit earlier, there are various ways of checking on that.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I know you went through a broad list of how projects are ongoing. Do you have actual stats of what projects are ongoing and what have been completed, the number of ongoing projects compared to the ones that have been finalised and completed their full grant eligibility?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** In the regional development grants round 1, there were some different categories. Under regional food initiatives, there were 10 projects and nine were completed. Under the small grants sector, there were 13 projects and three have been completed. Between the two of those, there were 109 jobs. Major projects was another category. There were seven projects: two were completed and 516 jobs created. Community infrastructure was another category we had in round 1 for the Regional Development Fund. That was three projects: one was completed and there were six jobs there.

No projects from round 2 or round 3 are complete yet. They are still being progressed as we go along, but all are on track and, as I have indicated previously here today, have already created many jobs. Again, they are all on track and definite milestones will come up there. In round 2, over 250 jobs have commenced, but bear in mind that they are not paid out until such time as the milestones have been met. In round 3, there are 65 jobs. The Regional Development Fund rounds 1, 2 and 3 have been a great success and in some cases are oversubscribed by businesses out there.

**Mr PEDERICK:** You mentioned projects that withdrew or did not receive funding. I note that the McLaren Vale Distillery withdrew, and I know that the—

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** What page are you on?

**Mr PEDERICK:** This is in regard to the same budget line, on page 342, and we are still talking about milestones, which you were just answering, minister. The McLaren Vale Distillery withdrew, and I note that the Clements Gap saltbush pellet project went ahead. Can you give me an outline of which companies did not meet their milestones or withdrew their funding, and did any projects have to return funding after receiving it?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** As of 30 June 2017, over 90 projects that have been offered funding from the Regional Development Fund in just three years; only a small number did not proceed. There are a number of reasons that a project may not proceed, including that an organisation may change the direction of its project or be unable to meet its coinvestment contribution or face other industry conditions that affect the demand for its product or service. Specific examples of why some projects that applied for the RDF grants did not proceed include—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** Hey! Thank you. A bit of quiet!

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** Yes, there is a bit of rirraff—the member for Schubert. Specific examples of why some projects that applied for RDF grants did not proceed include a commercial decision to rescope the project, a commercial decision to redirect business finances and not proceed with the project at the same scale, a commercial decision not to proceed with the project because of a downturn in the mining sector and a commercial decision to allow a third party not associated with the applicant to undertake the project.

RDF grant funding is offered on a number of conditions, including that the project will be completed at the same scale of investment and with the same job outcomes as stated in the application. A standard funding deed is prepared based on the project information provided by applicants in their grant application. Whilst it is of course disappointing when projects are not able to proceed as planned, I respect that commercial decisions need to be made by the various organisations and companies out there.

Grant payments are made on a reimbursement basis when agreed milestones are met, and accordingly no money was paid on any of these projects where the grant applicant was withdrawn. What this means is that any funding that had been offered to projects that ultimately did not proceed is reinvested in the Regional Development Fund for subsequent applications towards other projects, so that not one cent of funding is lost as part of the process of something being delayed.

Of 88 projects offered grants from the Regional Development Fund rounds, seven did not proceed; out of 88, seven did not proceed.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** We will just go back. We had a bit of interjection there. Of 88 projects offered grants from the Regional Development Fund grant rounds, seven did not proceed after they were announced. This includes six from round 1 and one from round 2.

**Mr PEDERICK:** In regard to those two projects that I previously mentioned, can you give me any more information around why the McLaren Vale Distillery withdrew from the program; was it because bureaucracy got in the way? And why didn't the Clements Gap saltbush pellet project go ahead?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** With these two projects—you talk about the McLaren Vale and also the Wilsons—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** —at Clements Gap. Let me also say, regarding both of those ones, the one in Clements Gap, the saltbush pellets, is innovative. It is a terrific thing. I do not know if you had an opportunity to see that. You want to go and have a look at it. But certainly out of 90 companies that have applied, there were just two, for various reasons. I cannot go into the particular reasons for which the decisions were made; it could be on a commercial basis or something else. I just want to reinforce that no money is paid out to these organisations or associations if they do not meet the milestones. Again, the money is only on a reimbursement basis.

**Mr PEDERICK:** In relation to the same page, given the \$15 million allocation has been overspent in 2015-16 and 2016-17, are the overspends relating to expenditures being rolled over from earlier years or pulled forward from subsequent allocations?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** I am advised it is primarily from rolled over funds, but I will certainly get more detail and come back to the member.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*Bills*

**BUDGET MEASURES BILL 2017**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the suggested amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which suggested amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Suggested Amendment No 7 [Lucas-1]—Long title—Delete 'enact legislation in relation to the 2017 State Budget so as to impose a levy on major banks operating in the State; and to'

No. 2. Suggested Amendment No 1 [Lucas-1]—Clause 2, 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.

No. 3. Suggested Amendment No 2 [Lucas-1]—Clause 3, page 4, line 24—Delete 'a Schedule' and substitute 'Schedule 1'

No. 4. Suggested Amendment No 3 [Lucas-1]—Clause 4, page 4, line 26 to clause 14, page 7, line 13 [clauses 4 to 14 inclusive]—Delete clauses 4 to 14 inclusive

No. 5. Suggested Amendment No 4 [Lucas-1]—Schedule 1, page 7, lines 14 to 21—Delete Schedule 1

No. 6. Suggested Amendment No 5 [Lucas-1]—Heading, page 7, line 22 [Heading to Schedule 2]—Delete the heading and substitute 'Schedule 1—Budget Measures'

No. 7. Suggested Amendment No 6 [Lucas-1]—Schedule 3, page 30, lines 22 to 31—Delete Schedule 3

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments be disagreed to.

In an unprecedented move, the Liberal Party of South Australia is attempting to stifle the ability of a government to set a budget. It is a dangerous precedent—a dangerous precedent being set by a dangerous Leader of the Opposition, who is creating, or attempting to create, an atmosphere of chaos.

If the Leader of the Opposition truly believed that he was capable of forming government after March next year, it would be a very different outcome today. I believe that if he had actually believed that he could win the next election, what he would have said was, 'We disagree with these measures the government has in its budget. We disagree with them being implemented, but the government has a right to pass its budget and, if we were elected, the first thing we would do in our budget is remove these measures.' That is what someone who wants to govern would say because

that is the precedent we have had in this parliament for generations. Only governments can and should amend budget bills, and we have done that in the past. Governments have amended budget bills.

**Mr Marshall:** So have oppositions.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, you have never amended them.

**The CHAIR:** I am on my feet! Sit down. Members are reminded that, even in committee, standing orders remain that the Treasurer is entitled to be heard in silence and interjections are out of place. Treasurer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Governments have amended money bills. Governments are entitled to do so. Governments that have amended their budgets are entitled to do so. Oppositions and the Legislative Council are not. They can make suggestions, and those suggestions will be rejected by this house.

The opposition then have a choice to make. They can follow the precedent that this leader is attempting to set from now on every budget measures bill, if they are successful in the next election. Let's be clear about this so that they all understand it. From what I can understand, it is almost impossible now for members opposite to gain a majority in their own right, given the third party that is wreaking havoc in their own seats and given the genius tactical advantage the Leader of the Opposition has given them by making sure they have so many open seats.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order on my left!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I know you do not like this. If they form government, it will be in a coalition with the Xenophon group. If they form government, it will be in a coalition with the Xenophon group, and the precedent that they are setting today by following this man off a cliff is that budget bills can be amended. If the opposition in the upper house sets this bill aside, that is a new precedent that the Liberal Party is setting in South Australia.

While the Leader of the Opposition thinks he is being clever, after waiting 11 days to decide whether he would back a budget or not back a budget and then did whatever the banks told him anyway, think of the imagery of the Liberal Party today that he has created. The National Australia Bank, one of the largest funders of the Australian Bankers' Association—the people who are running the campaign on behalf of the Liberal Party in the media and in print and saying that the bank levy will cost jobs—have today announced a super profit of \$6.6 billion—billion! It is 2½ per cent higher than last year.

And now, because of those super profits, what do they do? They are going to sack 6,000 people. This is the imagery the Liberal Party are aligning themselves with, with this Leader of the Opposition who has already lost one election that they thought they would win. Let's be clear about this: they lost it—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** They lost it through his own hand.

*Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order, member for Stuart!

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order on both sides of the house!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The bank levy will not cost jobs. The bank levy is affordable to the banks. The banks say so themselves. We know that profitability and job creation with the banks are no longer relevant because the banks themselves have said that, despite the super profits, they are still sacking people. On a per capita basis, if you allocate those 6,000 job losses across the country, that is 500 to South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition has aligned the Liberal Party brand with these people—himself.

This is his decision. He is the one who has decided that no, no, no, he is not interested in convention or precedent. He says, from opposition, he is going to team up with the crossbenchers and block a government's budget. He thinks there will be no consequences of that for governments in South Australia going forward. He thinks it will just be an aberration, that this is an extraordinary circumstance that the government wants to introduce a revenue measure. Well, new revenue measures are not extraordinary. They are not. Governments do them from time to time. I will give you a recent example: Scott Morrison introducing a brand-new levy on banks!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, I am not upset, because I have something—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order on my left!

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order on my right!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Madam Chair, the conventions of this parliament are important, and the people who drafted our constitution were very clear in their thinking. They have never wanted the Legislative Council to be able to amend money bills. That is why they did not give them the power to do so. All they gave them the power to do was to suggest changes, and then this house—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —is either to accept those suggestions or not. Well, I am going to submit to the house that we do not accept those suggestions and send this bill back to the other house for their support. I ask the opposition, and the more learned members of the Liberal Party—the ones who aspire to govern one day, the ones who aspire to implement their own ideology one day, the ones who are actually here to make a difference one day, the ones who actually believe in the philosophies that they campaign on and the reason they joined the Liberal Party—I say to them: if you are true conservatives, is trashing the constitution and conventions of this parliament what a true conservative does, or is it what a radical liberal does?

**Ms Sanderson:** What about ministerial responsibility?

**The CHAIR:** Order, member for Adelaide!

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** She doesn't even know what that is.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** She does.

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Member for Adelaide!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** She knows all about ministerial responsibility. If the member for Adelaide knew about ministerial responsibility—

**The CHAIR:** Minister, it is disorderly to respond to interjections. You just have to ignore them.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I apologise, ma'am.

**The CHAIR:** The interjections, that is.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** What is at stake here today is tax cuts of up to \$10,000 per business eligible for payroll tax cuts. People who are out there now signing up for apartments are buying them off the plan for concessions—First Home Owner Grants, preconstruction grants—and partnering with the Adelaide city council in a cooperative way to try to give people who buy apartments off the plan up to nearly \$40,000 in concessions. The Liberal Party make no argument in their budget speeches with expenditure but they have called on us to cut. They are happy with the level of expenditure we have. What they now say we should do is remove a revenue measure, then socialise that revenue amongst South Australians so that the banks do not pay. What



the opposition is really telling us to do is keep all the spending, do not charge the banks, charge South Australians.

*Ms Sanderson interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That was a profound interjection by the member for Adelaide.

**The CHAIR:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** No.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It is almost impossible to respond to. This Leader of the Opposition presents a risk to South Australia. He is a risk to his own party and the conventions of this parliament. He has shown his inability to take pressure, now on a number of occasions, by getting things dramatically wrong under pressure. Now he is taking the Liberal Party to the point of trashing hundreds of years of tradition and convention in this parliament for the sake of five banks which, no matter how much profit they make, still sack people.

This government will not be amending its budget. This government stands with the people of South Australia and the small businesses who are going to earn these tax cuts. I say to the real conservatives on the other side of the chamber: do not trash convention, aspire to govern, and if you are in government you do not want outside influences attempting to hijack your budget process for short-term gain. Fundamentally, it will worsen our democratic institutions and make it increasingly harder to govern. Do not follow this fool off a hill.

**Mr MARSHALL:** I rise to speak on this matter. The Liberal Party certainly supports the suggestions that have been made from the other place regarding the Budget Measures Bill. It is pretty galling to have to come into this chamber and listen to the most incompetent Treasurer this state has ever had. This guy who comes in here and tries to explain economics to this chamber in such an irrational and illogical way is nothing short of galling. The Liberal Party will be standing up for every—

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**Mr MARSHALL:** —single solitary person in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order! I am on my feet.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Excuse me, I am on my feet. That means people sit down. The leader is entitled to be heard in silence. We have tried to maintain some sort of order in the chamber so that we can all hear and Hansard can record this debate. Members need to observe the standing orders. The leader.

**Mr MARSHALL:** We are listening to the people of South Australia, who do not want to see the continuation of the wrecking ball economics presided over by this hopeless, dysfunctional, 15½-year-old Labor administration in South Australia. People aspire to more than they have been left with after 15 years of this hopeless government in South Australia. They want a growing economy in South Australia; they want jobs in South Australia. Most importantly, they want a future for the next generation in South Australia, and that is never going to be delivered by Labor. If you need any proof of that, you only have to look at the last 15 years in South Australia where our position as a state on the national stage has been diminished every single solitary year by this completely and utterly dysfunctional, self-serving, shameful government in South Australia.

Let me tell you about the problems that confront the people of South Australia. They are many and they are varied, but the solution is always the same from Labor. Every time we have a problem in South Australia, they say, 'I know what we'll do; we'll introduce a new tax.' How is that

working for the people of South Australia? I tell you that in the last 36 months, the last three years, we have had the highest trend unemployment rate for 33 of those 36 years. That is how it is working. There is a mass exodus of capital and young people out of this state, all put in place by these hopeless policy settings that Labor have inflicted upon the people of South Australia.

We are very proud on this side of the chamber to stand up and say, 'Enough is enough. No more taxes. No more Labor taxes inflicted on the people of South Australia.' They love taxes—the gambling tax increases and the emergency services levy tax increase inflicted upon the people of South Australia. When the former treasurer, the member for Playford, first contemplated a state-based land tax on the family home, he said that this would be something that would be introduced only after extensive consultation and only after a government took it to the people at an election. Let me tell you, there was no consultation and they did not take it to the 2014 election. Immediately thereafter, the government removed the remission, essentially putting a land tax on the family home. They are addicted to taxes.

Then they tried to introduce a car park tax, and again the Liberal Party, with responsible members in the other place, was called upon to save the people of South Australia from this tax-addicted government. Now, of course, they are running spurious commentary right throughout the media here in South Australia. Labor lies every single day. Let's consider some of these Labor lies—first of all, 'The Liberal Party is blocking the budget.' Actually, the Supply Bill went through a long time ago. I do not know whether or not you got a briefing from your office; perhaps you could get one. The reality is that the Liberal Party is not blocking the budget.

Yes, there is a Budget Measures Bill, and again Labor lies and puts out to the people of South Australia that if this Budget Measures Bill does not pass then, for some reason, this is going to block payroll tax concessions and stamp duty concessions in South Australia. This is another lie by Labor. The reality is that the only people in South Australia who are talking about blocking stamp duty concessions and payroll tax concessions are the Labor Party in South Australia. Not one other member in the other place even contemplated cutting those concessions. It is another Labor lie. In fact, the Under Treasurer gave evidence to the Budget and Finance Committee making it very clear—abundantly clear—that these two concessions did not require legislation to be continued. So this is another Labor lie that has been exposed here in South Australia.

Then, of course, the government says, 'We can't afford to pay these concessions if we don't increase taxes.' Their logic is: 'Let's increase taxes so that we can give a tax concession.' Only a Labor Party could invent something like that: 'We're going to increase taxes so that we can give you a tax reduction here in South Australia.' What a hopeless government this is. Why do they not stop this outrageous expenditure? There are taxpayer-funded advertising campaigns out there all day, every day, telling the people of South Australia that they are doing a really good job in terms of energy security in South Australia and a really good job in terms of lowering energy prices in South Australia, or that our hospital system is running really well, or that our school system is running really well.

It is outrageous that this government is spending so much money. They cannot be trusted with state taxpayers' money because they waste it each and every day. I would like to offer a statistic to this house regarding the difference between the budget that was brought down in June this year and the budget that was brought down in June the previous year. One of the statistics I want this chamber to consider is the writedown in state-based taxation revenue.

Between June 2016 and June 2017, the forward estimates provided for a \$380 million writedown in state-based taxation revenue. Why was there a writedown in state-based taxation revenue? I will tell you: because our economy in South Australia has ground to a halt after 15½ years of dysfunctional, incompetent Labor government, and for four of those years that guy has been sitting in the Treasurer role. It is completely and utterly incompetent—a \$380 million writedown in state-based taxation revenue.

Why has our economy ground to a halt? Because we have high taxes, high regulation and dysfunctional government, so the solution to the slowing economy is to increase taxes in South Australia and continue to put more and more red tape around business in South Australia. It is absolutely outrageous. It is no solution. The solution in South Australia is to create the most attractive place in the country for people to invest and the most attractive place in the country for people to

employ people, and to do that the Liberal Party wants to lower taxes. The Liberal Party in South Australia will always stand for lower taxes; Labor will always stand for higher taxes in South Australia.

For all these reasons, we are supporting those from the other place. We reject the government's suggestion that this is unprecedented; in fact, Mr Lucas, in the other place last night, outlined I think five, six or seven different occasions when the Australian Labor Party themselves, either in government or in opposition, moved amendments to budget measures bills. The concept that this is completely and utterly unprecedented is outrageous and incorrect, but that is exactly what we have come to expect from this hopeless Labor government.

What is unprecedented is the way the Leader of the Government behaved in the chamber last night. It was an outrageous threat that was made to our democracy in South Australia by the Labor Party that, if they did not get their way, they were going to be like a petulant child who said that they were going to inflict punishment on every successive government in South Australia, inflict vandalism on all future budgets in South Australia.

I note that the Treasurer very quickly distanced himself from those comments on a radio interview this morning; nevertheless, they exist in *Hansard*. This speaks to the mindset and the desperation of this hopeless government in South Australia. The reality is that the only way to get this state back on its feet is to elect a Liberal majority government at the next election. The Treasurer has been in this chamber talking about a whole pile of issues.

*Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.*

**Mr MARSHALL:** The reality is that this Treasurer was being too clever by half. He thought he was on a real winner bashing the banks, but the people of South Australia are far smarter than the Treasurer himself. He thought that, because there was some success with the federal government's imposition of a national major banks levy, this would be an easy target in South Australia, but the people of South Australia considered this. They considered it very carefully and they had to make a decision as to whether or not this would be good for the state. Was this something that was going to create additional jobs? No. Was this going to create greater investor confidence in South Australia? No. Was this something that was going to make sure that their kids had a future in South Australia? No.

I think the people of South Australia are far smarter than this Treasurer gives them credit for. The reality is that the people of South Australia do not want another massive tax hit on our economy. They know what nearly 16 years of Labor government in South Australia have inflicted upon the state and they do not want it anymore. I am very proud to be standing up on this side of the chamber fighting for the people of South Australia to make sure that we do not continue the wrecking ball economics being inflicted upon the people of South Australia by this Treasurer. We will be supporting, every step of the way, the suggestions made by those in the other place.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That was an appalling contribution by the Leader of the Opposition. It showed his naivety about what it is to be a government. He has just proven to all his colleagues that he is not fit to govern.

The opposition believes that this is not unprecedented. What is about to occur is that the government is not going to accept the suggestions. I know that this is a difficult and complex issue for the opposition to understand: we are not going to accept the suggestions. This is going back to the upper house. Then there are two options left for the opposition—support or set aside. That is it. You can take the legal advice of the member for Mitchell, or you can listen to the Clerk of the House of Assembly and the Clerk of the Legislative Council. This Leader of the Opposition is saying to members opposite—

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** He is saying to them that he cannot win an election in his own right anymore. He has created open seats throughout their backyard and the Xenophon group are hunting them in packs. They are going to win seats off them, seats that they expected to have in

their corner, and now he is telling them, 'But we will be able to govern because we can pass our budgets.' Well how, with the precedent you are setting today?

He cannot think ahead. It goes to the ability to think strategically—like, the night before an election do not tell everyone to vote for your opponents. That is just a bad strategy, but this is what they continually do. For 11 days after the budget he ummed and ahed about whether he supported it, and on the 11<sup>th</sup> day he succumbed to one meeting from one bank. So here we are again today making the same arguments and he is trying to convince his own backbench that this is all normal.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am sure the ones down here are going to follow you off a cliff, I am sure they are. Long may you reign, long may you stay Leader of the Opposition and long may they follow you, because there is nothing better than a bumbling Leader of the Opposition making up stupid things during a campaign for a government to use. You are going to star in our campaign. You are going to be the headline act, baby. You are going to be in charge. We are going to make sure that Steven Marshall is going to be on TV every single day telling everyone exactly how to vote.

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order.

**The CHAIR:** Order! We have a point of order on my left—and I know it will not be frivolous.

**Mr GARDNER:** Calling the Leader of the Opposition by his name is unparliamentary to start with, and relevance would go on top of that.

**The CHAIR:** I was still coping with 'baby' at that point, but I remind the Treasurer that it is not—

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order! Looking at me! It is unparliamentary to use names.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We want to give South Australian small businesses the tax cuts they deserve. We want to be able to take a part of the economy that is making super profits and is undertaxed by about \$4 billion per year, according to the commonwealth government of Australia, their political party. Their political party is the one that opened the door to these measures. We have argued long and hard that we need to make sure that banks pay their appropriate fair share of tax, and we are going to make sure they pay their fair share of tax.

As for the economic data that the Leader of the Opposition was rattling off, he keeps on saying over and over and over again that we should be growing at the same rate as the nation. Well, last year the nation's GDP grew by 1.9 per cent, and South Australia's grew by above 2. You want us to slow down? Here he goes, a low base. We have moved up the CommSec ratings, the bank's own ratings, CommSec's own ratings. We are now the third highest ranking state of all the states in economic activity on CommSec, but the Leader of the Opposition says, 'No, we're not. We're the worst in the nation. Ignore the facts.'

Our unemployment rate has gone from 8 per cent; it is now below 6 per cent. We have the third lowest unemployment rate in the nation because of tax cuts that have been targeted towards parts of the economy that are growing, making sure that South Australians have a tax system that is fair and efficient. We are saying to a very profitable part of the economy that are not paying their fair share of tax that they need to contribute more so we can contract create more jobs in small business. Why would any Liberal vote against a measure in the upper house to give small businesses tax cuts?

Just remember this: the Leader of the Opposition is telling is party to vote (1) against payroll tax cuts, (2) to vote against concessions for first homeowners, and (3) to vote against taxes of foreign investors who are competing with South Australians who are going to be buying properties. These measures will all be before the upper house, and the opposition have only one trigger to pull: support or block—that is it. That is all they have. It cannot come back. The Leader of the Opposition has no idea what he is making his members do. I urge the house to support the motion. The motion is that the suggested amendments of the Legislative Council be disagreed to.

**The CHAIR:** The question is actually the other way. The question before the house is that the suggested amendments made by the Legislative Council be disagreed to.

**Mr Marshall:** He only got it 100 per cent wrong.

**The CHAIR:** Actually, he is able to say it that way. I am a learner, too. The question is that they be disagreed to.

The committee divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 21  
Noes ..... 14  
Majority ..... 7

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Bettison, Z.L.	Griffiths, S.P.	Caica, P.
Tarzia, V.A.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Chapman, V.A.
Weatherill, J.W.	Pengilly, M.R.	

Motion thus carried.

At 18:11 the house adjourned until Tuesday 14 November 2017 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***RE-IMAGINING CHILDHOOD EARLY LEARNING CONFERENCE**

**371 Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (16 August 2017). In relation to the Re-imagining Childhood Early Learning Conference, being funded by \$500,000 of SA government funds in late 2017—

(a) How will the outcomes of this conference be funded for the long term, and implemented as to ensure equity, increase participation and productivity over time:

(b) Who suggested the expenditure of this money, was it a request from the conference organisers or was it a pro-active decision from within government and if so, who within government suggested this expense:

(c) Have the 'Residency Objectives' outlined in Professor Carla Rinaldi's Re-imagining Childhood Report released by the Premier in 2013 been achieved; and

(d) Has the challenge described in Professor Rinaldi's report: 'To create a pedagogy, with schools that are able to welcome all differences that come from the uniqueness of each child, all human beings, and create a context where the differences can learn to dialogue and enrich each other' been achieved and if so, in what way?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised of the following:

(a) Throughout 2018, the South Australian Collaborative Childhood Project will continue to provide opportunities for professional learning that will aim to build on the learnings from the conference. This includes providing forums for sharing the ongoing research of the services that are researching the Reggio Emilia education principles within their local context, and also engaging with key personnel from Reggio Children.

(b) The South Australian Collaborative Childhood project decided to host the Re-imagining Childhood—A Collaboration of Local and International Perspectives on Early Childhood conference to coincide with the Foundation – Reggio Children Centro Loris Malaguzzi Scientific Committee meeting in Adelaide 9–10 November 2017.

The international Scientific Committee members will each provide keynote addresses and participate in panels at the conference on 6-8 November 2017.

The South Australian government has supported the conference by contributing \$500,000 towards the costs of the conference including venue, catering and international keynote speakers' travel and accommodation costs.

(c) The 'Residency Objectives' continue to be achieved and can be described as ongoing community responsibilities. The objectives include:

- opening dialogue about the culture of childhood and the value of the child as citizen from birth
- building a collaborative culture among groups and sectors in the state to research the Reggio Emilia principles, in order to consider how these principles could inspire South Australian pedagogy and practices
- stimulating new research to sustain learning about the possible influences of the Reggio Emilia principles within South Australia.

To achieve these objectives the state government has invested in 3 inter-related strategies:

- establishing the South Australian Collaborative Childhood project;
- membership of the Foundation Reggio Children Centro Loris Malaguzzi
- collaboration with Reggio Children, to provide professional learning via study groups to Reggio Emilia and hosting pedagogistas, atelieristas and teachers from Reggio Emilia in Adelaide.

(d) Based on a strengths perspective that all children are capable of learning from the moment of birth, 'To create a pedagogy, with schools that are able to welcome all differences that come from the uniqueness of each child, all human beings, and create a context where the differences can learn to dialogue and enrich each other' is part of the aspirational vision Professor Rinaldi offered South Australia based on our rich history of investing in early childhood.

This vision requires the long-term, continuous commitment of our community affirming education as a responsibility and duty of the society in which a child lives and therefore does not have an end point.

**INVESTMENT EXPENDITURE**

**374 Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (16 August 2017). In relation to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, p14-15 (titled 'Investments') – for all projects, what are the budgeted expenditures for each project for each year of the forward estimates?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised of the following:

The table below details budgeted expenditures for each project of the forward estimates.

Capital Projects				
Major Projects	17-18 (\$'000)	18-19 (\$'000)	19-20 (\$'000)	20-21 (\$'000)
Adelaide Botanic High School	49,000	38,700	-	-
Children's Centres – Stage 2	8,280	-	-	-
Christie Downs Primary School	3,548	-	-	-
Christies Beach High School Disability Unit	4,309	-	-	-
Education Support Hub	6,321	4,981	-	-
Evanston Gardens Primary School	1,000	-	-	-
Le Fevre High School	-	-	-	-
Meningie Area School	4,500	-	-	-
National Quality Agenda – Compliance	4,559	-	-	-
National Quality Agenda – Preschools	-	-	-	-
Playford International College	7,093	-	-	-
Preschool Outdoor Learning Areas	1,627	-	-	-
Preschool Relocation Program	-	-	-	-
Renewable Energy Program	10,000	-	-	-
Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Facilities in Schools	119,109	115,000	-	-
Seaview High School	-	-	-	-
Swallowcliffe Primary School	3,247	-	-	-
Yalata Anangu School	-	-	-	-

#### VOLUNTARY AMALGAMATION PROGRAM

**375 Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (16 August 2017). In relation to the government's voluntary school mergers program—

- (a) how many schools over how many sites have identified expressions of interests since 1 July 2016;
- (b) which schools are these;
- (c) how many of these have proceeded to site valuations; and
- (d) what have been the values identified?

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised of the following:

There have been a total of 8 Amalgamation Expression of Interest (EOI) forms lodged during the period in question, involving 17 sites.

Of the 17 sites listed in the EOIs, 10 were schools. They are as follows:

- Bute Primary School
- Coomandook Area School
- Geranium Primary School
- Lameroo Regional Community School
- Laura Primary School
- Wirrabara Primary School
- Pt Vincent Primary School
- Minlaton Area School
- Wilsden Primary School
- Yorketown Area School

Out of the 10 schools listed above, 2 have had market valuations. I am unable to disclose market valuations because this could compromise the public sale process.

#### SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

In reply to **Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (9 May 2017).

**The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills):** I have been advised:

Attendance data is calculated over a period in time. The Department for Education and Child Development (DECD) use the annual census data recorded for the semester 1 period.

2016 Semester 1 consisted of 101 enrolled days and the numbers of students calculated at this point as having:

- the highest attendance (100% attendance/0 absent days) is 13,647 students (this equates to 8 per cent of the total school population); and
- the lowest attendance (0% attendance/101 absent days) is 25 students (this equates to 0.01 per cent of the total school population).

In semester 1 2016, the average days absent per student was 9.4 days.

Two parents have been successfully prosecuted for the non-attendance of their children in 2017. These have been the first successful prosecutions for the department in 24 years.

It is of note that all of the children involved in this process have successfully re-engaged with their educational programs.

The department and schools are continuing to work with the children and their families to ensure that appropriate supports are in place to address the complex matters which impact on their wellbeing and attendance at school.

Research demonstrates that prosecution is one way of emphasising to parents their legal responsibility with regard to their child's attendance.

The research further suggests that the prospect of prosecution can lead to a significant improvement in student attendance and/or parental engagement even if court proceedings do not eventuate. This may be because the prospect of prosecution and the potential consequences can provide sufficient coercion for parents and caregivers to change their behaviour. The process also necessitates an evidence-gathering process whereby the concerns must be detailed, the parents are given formal opportunities to respond, and the department must demonstrate the range of interventions that have been undertaken to support the family and re-engage the student with school. This process itself (regardless of the legal sanction) has been associated with greater responsiveness from parents and caregivers.

DECD will only consider prosecution of a parent in cases where it is determined to be in the best interests of the child, all other interventions and offers of support to the family have been unsuccessful and fair warnings have been provided.