

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 10 May 2018

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. A.L. McLachlan)** took the chair at 14:14 and read prayers.

The PRESIDENT: We acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia, and their connection to the land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to the elders both past and present.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Ombudsman SA—ISG Audit Report—Assessing State Government Agencies' Implementation of the Information Sharing Guidelines for Promoting Safety and Wellbeing, dated April 2018.

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 2 of 2018—2018 Review of Remuneration of Members of the Judiciary, Presidential Members of the South Australian Employment Tribunal, the State Coroner and Commissioners of the Environment, Resources and Development Court

Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 3 of 2018—2018 Review of Salary of the Governor of South Australia

Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 4 of 2018—Reimbursement of Expenses Applicable to the Electorate of Mawson—Travel by Ferry

Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 2 of 2018—Remuneration of Members of the Judiciary, Presidential Members of the South Australian Employment Tribunal, the State Coroner and Commissioners of the Environment, Resources and Development Court

Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 3 of 2018—2018 Review of Salary of the Governor of South Australia

Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 4 of 2018—Reimbursement of Expenses Applicable to the Electorate of Mawson—Travel by Ferry

Ministerial Statement

BATTLES FOR FIRE SUPPORT BASES CORAL AND BALMORAL ANNIVERSARY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:17): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the 50th anniversary of the battles for fire support bases Coral and Balmoral made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Premier.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:18): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the ICAC evaluation of SafeWork SA made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Attorney-General.

Question Time

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has now had 48 hours to reflect on the answers he provided in this chamber in question time on Tuesday. He has had counselling from his colleagues about his poor choice of answers and he has had to, embarrassingly, come into this place already to correct the record once.

The PRESIDENT: Be careful; supposition, Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My question is: does the minister stand by his comments from Tuesday that he would not rule out privatising hospitals, hospital services and clinical services, or will the minister admit that he misled parliament more than once on Tuesday?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:19): I think the simplest way to respond to this is to say what we said clearly on the record to the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation in January 2018, and I stand by this statement:

A Marshall Liberal government would not sell any public hospitals, nor would we move to have any public hospitals privately managed. The Labor Party has sourced a wide range of services from beyond the public sector. In assessing such options, the Liberal Party will be focused on health outcomes.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): I have a supplementary arising from the answer. I thank the minister for not ruling out any privatisation of any—

The PRESIDENT: Don't put words into the minister's mouth. Ask a simple question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Will the minister specifically rule out privatising hospital services?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:20): I defer to my senior colleague who suggested to the house that now is not the time to rule out and rule in options leading up to the budget. I will continue to have fruitful discussions with the Treasurer, but I assure the—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Allow the minister to speak. He's responding to your question, Leader of the Opposition. He's responding to your question. Minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I assure honourable members that we will be honouring our commitment to the people of South Australia before the election. We were upfront about it. You play games before elections and then break promises after. We were completely upfront that we will do what is best for the people of South Australia and health services.

It reminds me of a conversation I had earlier today with the chair of South Australia's largest non-government provider of aged-care services. I was talking to her about a service that the former Labor government contracted from them to provide public patients in the southern districts, so that when they are getting subacute care, all of their food and hotel services are provided by a non-government organisation. She and I agreed what good sense it made.

Now, suddenly, after 16 years of privatisation, whether it is the \$2.4 billion NRAH project or whether it is this particular project in southern Adelaide, Labor, with gay abandon, engaged the private sector in a whole range of areas, but suddenly, in less than six weeks, it becomes anathema. These are the hypocrites who now occupy the opposition benches. What we will continue to do is to deliver the best possible services for the people of South Australia, particularly for their health outcomes.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary arising from the original answer: will the minister rule out the wholesale privatisation of hospital and clinical services? Will he rule that out?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:22): Our government has no plans for the wholesale outsourcing of services.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary arising from the original answer: will the minister rule out the privatising of patient transport services?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:22): I am not going to play the rule-in rule-out game.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): A final supplementary question arising—

The PRESIDENT: I am going to be generous to you.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —from your original answer: does the minister agree then that everything is on the table and everything could be privatised and that they will flog off any single thing that they can?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let your minister—

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:23): My answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question is no, because I have already said—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: You won't rule it out.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Excuse me.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, let him answer your question.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I reiterate what I said—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Sorry, Mr President, I'm either given the chance to answer or not.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, please let him answer your question. It is your question.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I will reiterate what I said to the first question. A Marshall government will not sell any public hospital, nor will we move to have any public hospital privately managed, so we will rule that out.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:23): Supplementary: as a point of clarification—and this tends towards a supplementary question I think I asked yesterday—the question, as I understood it, was not—

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Point of order: supplementary questions are questions. They are not allowed to have an explanation.

The PRESIDENT: I appreciate that. Ask your question.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I will ask the question without giving the minister the benefit of the explanation. Minister, you confounded in your answer the proposition of privatising existing services with the proposition of privatising some extra additional services. You did that in your answer earlier this week. The Leader of the Opposition asked you—

The PRESIDENT: Get to the question

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: —will you privatise any existing clinical services, not contract with any further additional services. Will you privatise any existing clinical services?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:24): The Marshall Liberal government will not sell any public hospitals, nor will we move to have any public hospitals privately managed. In assessing other options, the Liberal Party will be focused on health outcomes.

HEALTH POLICY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: In question time on Tuesday, the minister informed the chamber that he would not be taking advice from his agency. Now he has had a few days to reflect on his answers, can he advise which areas of health policy he knows better than his department and which areas of health policy he will listen to his department on?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:25): I am afraid that the honourable member is showing her apprentice status very clearly in that question, because if she bothered to read my answer, I did not say that I would not listen to my department. What I said was that I would not listen to my department alone. Under the repeated hectoring from the Leader of the Opposition—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Excuse me, President.

The PRESIDENT: Let the minister answer in silence.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: I'm helping him because he doesn't remember what he said on Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, you have not—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: I am being helpful, President.

The PRESIDENT: No, you're not being helpful; you're not helping me. Minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I will continue to listen to a range of clinicians—clinicians within the department, within the professional organisations and within the private sector. The fact of the matter is that your former government, the party that you stand with, spent the last four years hand-picking the clinicians with which—

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order, Mr President: similar to a point of order that was made yesterday by the Hon. Tammy Franks. When the minister is using the word 'your', he is referring to you, the Chair, and he should be directing his answer more clearly, sir.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you for your concern for me, Hon. Mr Hunter. Minister, please continue with your answer.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Thank you, Mr President, and thanks for your coaching. In relation to the honourable member's question, her government, in contrast with the intention of this government, the former Weatherill Labor government persistently only consulted the select clinicians within the Transforming Health framework. What I hear continually from clinicians is that they do not accept that closed shop, almost clan-like approach of the former Labor government, and they are very committed to an inclusive discussion.

I can assure you that I spent a lot of time talking to clinicians within the department and giving their advice due consideration, but I will not stop listening to comments from the professional associations, comments from the wider profession. We do not believe, like the Labor Party, that somehow government is some sort of deal between the Labor Party and the bureaucracy.

HEALTH POLICY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:27): Supplementary arising from the answer: can the minister say what areas he will listen to his department on and what areas he will not?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:27): I will continue to listen to the department on all areas of advice, but I will not listen to the department alone.

HEALTH POLICY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:27): Supplementary: has—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Yes, I appreciate your point of order, but I can't hear the question because my two frontbenchers of the Liberal Party are talking across the aisle. Allow the member—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, you are cutting across your own member seeking to ask a supplementary question. Please continue.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you, Mr President. I note the minister talks about listening to his clinicians. Has he spoken to the 46 clinicians who wrote to the previous minister outlining their serious clinical concerns with the proposal for a stand-alone high dependency unit at Modbury Hospital? Will the minister also ignore the advice that they are giving?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:28): It is an interesting question. I suppose the supplementary question will be: after I have spoken to the 46 who signed that letter, should I speak to the 107 who signed—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Excuse me.

The PRESIDENT: Let the minister speak.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The honourable member wants me to speak to the 46 people who signed that letter. Should I also speak to the 107 people who marked—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Name one. Name a single one.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, you have ample questions to ask this question time. Wait for your opportunity to be called or have another member from the Labor Party ask the question subsequently as question time goes through. Otherwise, do not call out ancillary or supplementary questions at your leisure when the minister is on his feet.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: As I said, I could consult the 46 who signed that letter. I could consult the 107—103 of whom supported the restoration of an HDU. But to demonstrate my openness to a range of clinical opinions, when I visited Modbury Hospital with the member for Florey, the member for Newland and the member for King, I specifically convened a group of clinicians, some of whom I knew vehemently opposed our proposal, some of whom I knew vehemently supported it. That demonstrates what I have been saying to this council repeatedly. I will continue to be open to a range of clinical advice but, in the end, this government will take responsibility.

One of the pieces of advice we have also taken into consideration is the demand of the people of the north-east that they were not willing to tolerate Labor's downgrade of their community hospital. That is why Frances Bedford is the member for Florey and not one of your party. That is why the member for Newland and the member for King are in this parliament. Together with other elements of the Liberal agenda, we have shown that we not only listen to clinicians' advice but that we also listen to the people who elected us.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:30): Further supplementary: can the minister provide one name of a clinician who thinks that the high dependency unit at Modbury Hospital is safe?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:30): Professor Warren Jones.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:30): Further supplementary: is there a currently practising clinician who is associated closely with Modbury Hospital who thinks that a high dependency unit will be safe?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:31): It didn't take long before the new member started to display the same tactics as minister Snelling—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Don't debate the question, minister. Answer the question.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I'm not debating the question: I'm answering it. I find it offensive that minister Snelling, minister Malinauskas and now the new member want to demean people who continue to be highly respected in their profession. I can assure you that Professor Warren Jones—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Go on, name another one. You can't name one, can you?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the minister answer in silence.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I assure you that Professor Warren Jones has more credibility on health and wellbeing than your whole parliamentary party combined.

The PRESIDENT: You have pursued this sufficiently. We have had enough supplementaries on this topic. I am going to give the call to the Hon. Mr Wortley.

HOSPITAL ACCREDITATION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:31): I want to ask a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Given that the minister raised the importance of transparency on draft hospital accreditation reports, how quickly will you be publicly releasing all draft reports upon receipt?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:32): The Central Adelaide Local Health Network underwent a National Safety and Quality Health Care Services Standards survey in February 2018, conducted under the auspices of the Australian Council on Healthcare Standards. The survey found that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital failed to meet several core standards, including medication safety benchmarks.

I think it is very important that members understand that this was not about the physical fabric. We all know that there are problems at the Royal Adelaide Hospital with the size of the resuscitation rooms and we know that there are problems with the operation of the mental health wards, but these core standards and the accreditation process particularly related to process issues like discharge planning and medication safety benchmarks.

In the lead-up to the federal election, it became an open secret throughout the Adelaide community that there had been an accreditation failure in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network and the federal minister asked for a copy of that report. I think it took two days for the former minister to even get it into his hands, but he didn't choose to release it. We committed that if we were elected, we would table that report.

The fact of the matter is that, leading up to the March 2018 election, one of the most hotly debated issues was the former Labor government's handling of health. Nothing is more emblematic of the failure of the Labor Party than the way they have delivered the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Here we are, more than six months in, and it is still not functioning fully. We've still got 10 of the mental health beds closed—

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order, Mr President.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Excuse me, I'm answering.

The PRESIDENT: Point of order. The Hon. Mr Hunter.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I have also been waiting for several minutes, giving the minister some leniency in answering the question, but he hasn't. He was waffling on. He was asked how

quickly will he, the minister, publicly release draft reports upon their receipt into his hands. He hasn't even approached that time line yet.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The President has quite rightly said that he is not going to insist on opposition demands for yes/no answers; likewise, I would trust that the President will not force the government to respond to some sort of multiple choice test. I thank the honourable Leader of the Opposition for his suggestions on responses that I might give, but it's my response that I'm giving, and my response is that the—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: So, what is it? What's your response then, Stephen? What is it?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: My response—thanks; you're on the edge of your seat there, stay there. The fact of the matter is that—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: There's relevance deprivation over there.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Indeed.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the minister respond to the point of order.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Thank you, Mr President, for your protection. In the context of the lack of transparency of the former Labor government in the lead-up to the last election, we said that we would release the report they tabled because it should have been released in the context of the election. The fact of the matter is that the community was entitled to know whether the government was telling the truth when they were saying that everything was fine with the Royal Adelaide Hospital. What we now know is that it wasn't.

HOSPITAL ACCREDITATION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:35): Supplementary: I must say, Mr President, I have never—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: No, that's comment. Order, point of order.

The PRESIDENT: I am listening to the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: No, there's a point of order here.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Let me listen to the point of order. You had a point of order.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The supplementary question did not need an explanation.

The PRESIDENT: Please ask a concise supplementary question, Hon. Mr Wortley.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Yes. The question I asked was: will you be releasing these reports to the public? In opposition you rabbit on for years about transparency.

The PRESIDENT: No, Hon. Mr Wortley, sit down. You asked a question. It was a very fine supplementary, too.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Is this a point of order?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Yes. They continue to defy you, Mr President. Please make sure you keep the opposition to just asking supplementaries, not defying you.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you for your concern. That wasn't a point of order; that was gratuitous advice and so I'm going to ignore it.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:37): I will continue to release accreditation reports as the public interest demands.

HOSPITAL ACCREDITATION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): Further supplementary: what sort of time line? How many days does he think the public interest demands in this case for him to release it, or will he be keeping it secret?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:37): In this case, in relation to the Royal Adelaide report, I released it within 10 days.

HOSPITAL ACCREDITATION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:37): Supplementary: does the minister believe the public has a right to see these draft reports, all of these reports?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:37): I have already said that I believe the public had a very strong right to know about the poor state of the operation of the Royal Adelaide Hospital by the previous government, because leading up to the last election we had this two-year denial of the truth.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Let the minister answer in silence. He is answering your questions.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: For two years—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, sit down. He is answering your questions, not someone else's questions. Show the minister some respect for your own questions. Minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: For two years we had minister Snelling and minister Malinauskas deliberately misleading the people of South Australia, telling them that the hospital was fine, 'Just take a chill pill. It's wonderful.' The way they talked about it you would think it was a five-star international hotel. Yet, in spite of that, the people of South Australia, for months, were suffering under service problems at the Royal Adelaide and they were continually denied by both ministers. What this report shows is that not only did it fail to meet the test of public confidence, it failed to meet the basic requirements of hospital accreditation.

Let me put it in context. I understand there had been some recalibration of accreditation standards in recent years so it may not be directly comparable, but the most recent accreditation annual report from the Australian Council on Healthcare Standards, if my memory serves me correctly, only had one hospital that was subject to core standards not being met and that hospital, again if I recall correctly, had four standards not met. Here we have a hospital that had just been built for \$2.4 billion and it did not meet seven standards. This was a significant failure to deliver an effectively functioning hospital. We are working with SA Health to try to put in place the processes which will ensure that the accreditation is successfully achieved.

I am amazed that the Labor Party wants continually to remind this council of their appalling management in health. The new Royal Adelaide Hospital is a classic example: a \$2.4 billion hospital, delivered 18 months late. We now know that it is now \$776 million above its original budget, and they want to keep reminding us?

HOSPITAL ACCREDITATION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:39): Supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: I will allow one more supplementary on this question, because we are delaying time for the crossbench.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: It is a very important issue. Will the minister define public interest? If he is saying that he will release it if it is in the public interest, can he define what is public interest?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:40): Public interest is determined by the circumstances. Let's put it this way: considering that the Hon. Russell Wortley was the—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let him respond. The Hon. Mr Wortley wishes to hear his question in silence.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Considering that the Hon. Russell Wortley, when he was local government minister, seemed to make an art form of keeping a report secret, I don't think he's got any right to preach to me.

INTERNATIONAL GUIDE DOG DAY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:40): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services a question on guide dogs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Recently, my brother adopted a guide dog called Daphne. Daphne is gorgeous but, in addition to her good looks and good nature, guide dogs provide a critical service to people with impaired vision as well as special needs. Will the Minister for Human Services inform the chamber about the activities surrounding International Guide Dog Day?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:41): I thank the honourable member for her important question and commend her family for its important role in assisting people with disabilities with the training of guide dogs. The last Wednesday in April is International Guide Dog Day. This year it fell on ANZAC Day, so the events were scheduled on two separate days. I had the honour of attending two events as the Minister for Human Services. On 26 April, Assistance Dogs Australia had an event in the Rundle Mall, which was their first event ever to be held in South Australia, and five assistance dogs, which had been trained, were presented to their new owners—people with physical disabilities, dementia and PTSD.

Tim McCallum, who many honourable members would know from his appearance on *The Voice*, is an assistance dogs ambassador and was the MC for the event. Other guests included His Worship the Mayor, Martin Haese, and the executive officer of the Dog and Cat Management Board, Mr Andrew Lamb. Mr Lamb has an important role with the Dog and Cat Management Board because they have additional responsibilities under the act. Honourable members may recall the debate in the Legislative Council on the dog and cat management changes, which have made puppy farming and those sorts of practices illegal, and the Hon. Kelly Vincent actually achieved an expansion of the definition of 'assistance dogs', which means that a range of animals can be accredited.

Mr Lamb and I discussed the importance of the accreditation process, maintaining the professional standards and giving confidence in the public domain to the whole community in terms of assistance dogs. A lot of effort goes into the training of assistance dogs, obviously with the volunteers through to the breeders. We are all encouraged not to pat dogs, because it is not in their best interest, although we often have to restrain ourselves.

There was also an event held within the grounds of Government House the following day, which the Hon. Emily Bourke attended, for Guide Dogs SA/NT, and there again was a range of wonderful creatures who are providing greater independence to the people who look after them.

I pay tribute to the volunteers, to the breeders and to the organisations that are involved in the training, because they are providing a great deal of independence to the people they serve, as well as being the great companions that we are used to. We hear some wonderful stories at these sorts of events about how people's lives are transformed when they receive their assistance dogs. Dogs are trained to perform a range of tasks, which may include opening and closing doors, picking up dropped items, pressing buttons at traffic lights, taking the washing out of the machine, paying cashiers and alerting their owner if there is a particular danger. They certainly provide a great deal of independence to the people they work with, and long may this continue.

ONLINE PAYMENT SECURITY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:45): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Treasurer about the security of government online payment websites.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Recently, I received a query from a constituent who was concerned about the security of online payment gateways to state government agencies. In particular, we believe there is an issue with SA Pathology, although it may be that there are other government agencies or departments that face similar issues. The issue is that when you go to pay an invoice you see that the payment page, which is part of the sa.gov.au domain, is not secure, that is, it is a non-SSL website. I am sure the Treasurer knows that SSL stands for 'secure sockets layer' and that it is the standard security technology for establishing an encrypted link between a web server and a browser. The thing that we look for on web pages is the prefix 'https' rather than just 'http'.

The most significant risk of collecting payments through a non-secure website is that malicious third parties can potentially intercept and steal login information, passwords, credit card details and the like which are transmitted without encryption. My questions are:

1. How many government departments or agencies provide non-secure websites for the payment of invoices, accounts, fines or other payments?
2. What is the government doing to ensure that all online payments to government agencies are secure?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:47): That sounds like a very sensible and reasonable question from the honourable member. I will certainly take advice and bring back a reply as soon as I can.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN VIRTUAL EMERGENCY SERVICE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:47): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about the South Australian Virtual Emergency Service (SAVES).

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: The previous minister for health, Mr Peter Malinauskas, announced the launch of the South Australian Virtual Emergency Service, or SAVES, back in December last year, with the service already operational in many regional areas. The current minister, two days ago, made an announcement on more sites being included in this service, to which I now seek further detail. Can the minister advise the council what he believes the cost and time frame for the rollout of SAVES into regional areas he has identified will be?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:48): I will take the issue in relation to costs on notice, but my understanding of the second round is that all of the SAVES sites will be operational by the end of May. Again, I will check that but that's my understanding.

APY LANDS, RENAL DIALYSIS UNITS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister advise the council of opportunities to improve the delivery of renal dialysis on the APY lands?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:48): I thank the Hon. Mr Dawkins for the question. This week's federal budget brought very welcome investment in a range of health services. Some of those investments will make a significant difference for Aboriginal people with end-stage kidney disease living in remote Aboriginal communities, including people on the APY lands. The investments include \$25 million over three years for an expansion of remote dialysis clinics in central Australia through the groundbreaking work of Western Desert Dialysis, otherwise known as The Purple House.

Purple House is an Aboriginal organisation which already operates dialysis units in eight Aboriginal communities. It also runs dialysis facilities in Alice Springs and Darwin, and the Purple Truck, a mobile dialysis bus. Unfortunately, a growing number of people from the APY lands are in need of renal dialysis, but the absence of a permanent facility on the APY lands means that people with end-stage kidney dialysis currently have to relocate permanently to Adelaide or to regional

centres for their lifesaving treatment. Those relocations come at a significant personal, social and cultural cost to the patient, their family and their community.

Purple House has already been funded by the commonwealth government to build a dialysis unit in Pukatja on the APY lands, which I understand is expected to open next year. The other important announcement in this week's federal budget in relation to this issue is \$34.8 million over four years to fund a new dedicated Medicare item for remote dialysis treatment. I understand that the MBS item will be introduced in November 2018 and is expected to provide a rebate of around \$500 per dialysis treatment delivered in remote communities.

The creation of this new MBS item is, as Purple House CEO Sarah Brown said this week, 'absolutely a game changer for the delivery of dialysis in remote Aboriginal communities.' I congratulate Sarah Brown and the Aboriginal patients and their families who fought so hard for so many years for safe and sustainable permanent dialysis on their traditional lands.

I also want to acknowledge the advocacy of members of this and the other place in relation to this issue, including past and present members of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, particularly the Hon. Terry Stephens, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Tung Ngo and a former member of the other place, Dr Duncan McFetridge.

A permanent dialysis facility on the APY lands is something that the Liberal Party campaigned on in the run-up to both the 2014 and 2018 elections. Before the recent state election, the Marshall Liberal government committed to improving Aboriginal health outcomes and to negotiating a fair fee-for-service price for each dialysis treatment session Purple House delivered to a South Australian patient in Pukatja.

At the time, we committed to providing up to \$50,000 transitional funding as the facility moves to a fully-funded sustainable operation. Notwithstanding the announcement of the new MBS items, those commitments still stand and remain important. We are committed to ensuring the Pukatja facility is up and running as soon as possible and ensuring that SA Health does everything it can to ensure the smooth running of that facility in the long term.

This is another example of what can be done when governments work together to support regional, rural and remote communities on their journey to better health. I welcome the investment of the federal government and, in particular, the leadership of Purple House.

APY LANDS, RENAL DIALYSIS UNITS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Supplementary question arising from the answer: I wonder if the minister would be able to tell us the level of consultation at a clinical, community and administrative level that has taken place between Purple House and other service providers, particularly Nganampa Health, about the establishment of the facility in Pukatja?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:52): I thank the honourable Leader of the Opposition for his question. I appreciate that there have been discussions between Nganampa and Purple House. The fact of the matter is that both organisations are Aboriginal controlled, so I don't think it is in the interests of this house to start trying to pit one organisation against another. Of course, there were issues that needed to be ironed out as this service was delivered, but my understanding is that Nganampa is working with Purple House to deliver what is best for Aboriginal people on the APY lands.

APY LANDS, RENAL DIALYSIS UNITS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): A further supplementary: there was no insinuation that it wasn't a good thing or it wasn't being rolled out, I was just asking what the level of consultation was. The further supplementary is that in his original question the minister referred to further funding in this year's federal budget. Does he have an idea of where further permanent dialysis might go on the APY lands, or in his view does he have particular communities that he thinks would benefit most from the further rollout in the APY lands?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:54): There are a lot of issues to be worked through in relation to this, but I think it is really important to remember that this was a service championed by Aboriginal people themselves. It was not non-Aboriginal ministers

standing in the Legislative Council thousands of miles away telling them where these services need to be delivered, it was an Aboriginal-controlled health organisation, my understanding is particularly led by Aboriginal women, which saw the destructive impact of, shall we say, renal dialysis dislocation on their families and their communities. They worked hard to deliver this. I am going to let them continue to run the show because they are doing a much better job than the former Labor government.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question regarding the Repatriation General Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: In December last year, I was contacted by a constituent who is a client of the South Australian Brain Injury Rehabilitation Service. Prior to the closure of the Repat, my constituent was undergoing rehabilitation there three times a week. Since the closure of the Repat, my constituent does not have access to rehabilitation facilities close to her home in the south and has been advised that she can either access the facilities at Hampstead or pay to access private facilities.

Whilst the rehabilitation services that were available at the Repat were not entirely suitable for those with a brain injury, the option was much better than driving for over an hour or having to cover the cost themselves. I understand the minister is currently considering options to establish a health precinct at the site of the Repat. My questions are:

1. When will the details of the health precinct be finalised?
2. Are there any plans to incorporate rehabilitation services, including hydrotherapy, at the Repat site?
3. If rehabilitation services are being considered, will the minister ensure they are appropriate for those with brain injuries to ensure there is not cognitive overload?
4. If rehabilitation services at the Repat site are not being considered, can the minister advise if there are plans to expand rehabilitation services in the south so that residents in those areas are not required to go without or travel to access these services?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for his question. Obviously, all members of this house share the same constituents. I appreciate that your constituent is mine, and I suspect I have also had communications from the same person.

This case highlights what has been the experience of so many South Australians under Labor's toxic Transforming Health plan. No matter whether it was the downgrading of the community hospitals, such as Noarlunga, Queen Elizabeth and Modbury, and people having to travel further to the spine hospitals, or whether it was the dislocation of rehabilitation services with the closure of the Repat, this is the Repat that they promised a Labor government would never ever close, and yet, in November last year, that's exactly what they did.

I think the honourable member mentioned a hydrotherapy pool. When the government did that in November last year, not only did it close the hydrotherapy pool at the Repat, it also closed the former hydrotherapy pool at the FMC, so it basically halved the access to hydrotherapy pool services in the southern region. What that basically meant is that hydrotherapy pool services were only available to inpatients. We had people speaking on behalf of the government who were basically saying, 'We are focusing on our core business. We are focusing on inpatients.'

It just shows you the myopic Transforming Health view that you are only a South Australian with health needs when you are acutely sick in a hospital. We are all South Australians with health needs. The government should be with us, supporting us to stay healthy and avoiding illness escalating to the acute phase rather than waiting for us all to land in a hospital.

If I can now turn more specifically to the three or four questions the member asked. If I remember rightly, one was: when will the details of the health precinct be available? I would suggest

to the house that there are three particular waves of community consultation that will take place. Two of them will be absolutely crucial—in fact, perhaps all three of them, depending on how you read them. All three of them will impact on the shape of a health precinct, but let's be clear: the Liberal Party is committed to a genuine health precinct. What the discussion is about is how we maximise this opportunity.

The Labor Party broke a promise to never ever close the Repat. They tried to sell it off, significantly under value, but thankfully the people of South Australia made it clear in March 2017 that they weren't willing to tolerate that and we now have an opportunity for a genuine health precinct.

I would suggest there are three ways of shaping that process. One is the finalisation of the plan. The former Labor government, on almost Christmas Eve last year, did a new development assessment plan that opened up the site to wholesale redevelopment. That plan was not gazetted until 23 January—so much for a government that believes in transparency and accountability. That plan is going to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, and I am in the process of writing to that committee to suggest that the committee recommend to the Minister for Planning that the permitted uses under that plan be narrowed to reflect what the community would expect in a genuine health precinct.

The other process, which is already underway and which will become more formal in the coming weeks, is what I call the SA Health master planning process. It is this government's view that the public health assets of the south should, first and foremost, be available to provide public health services in the south. The process we are going through at the moment is with the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, in particular, to determine what are the best value uses it sees for the Repat site.

As I believe I have already reported to the council—I think it was last Thursday—I have had some very encouraging discussions with clinicians in the south in relation to possible uses. To be frank, the government itself, coming into the election and validated by the election result, has highlighted some particular assets we think would be useful for public health services; specifically, the surgical facilities, the hydrotherapy pool and Ward 18. However, that master planning process is underway.

The third process, which will be absolutely crucial to the development of the future shape of the health precinct, is what I would call the partnership dialogue. Once we know what the public health services will deliver on that site we can then have a conversation with community organisations, NGOs, the private sector, whatever it might be, about what other value-adds to health provision for South Australians could also be delivered on that site.

What we will not do is what the former Labor government did, which is say, 'Great, the private sector, NGOs, anybody can come in and tell us what they will buy the site for, but there will be no public health services on the site.' In our view, that is not the best way to get the best health use of that site. Unlike Labor, we want to have a true partnership between the public sector and other parties. That is the process.

In terms of when, which was the point of the member's question, I expect that process will take at least until August/September this year, so that we can have a better idea of what the future use of the site will be. I think the member asked if it will be available for rehabilitation services. I am very confident there will be a major rehabilitation focus on that site, simply because the Labor Party wanted to trash tens of millions of dollars of high quality rehabilitation assets on the site. You had this rehabilitation building with a fourth-generation rehabilitation clinic only three or four years ago—perhaps six, time flies. Relatively recently, we had the Labor Party saying how they would open these great facilities, but within years they wanted to—

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: The best in the state.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The honourable member, who has not only worked at the Repat but who also has skills in the health profession, describes those rehabilitation facilities as the best in the state. A physiotherapist I spoke to recently described the hydrotherapy pool at the Repat as the best in the state. I certainly have a high expectation that rehabilitation services will be a major focus of the health precinct at the Repat going forward. In that context, the hydrotherapy pool, as I have

already mentioned, is a key asset that the Marshall Liberal government expects will be a cornerstone asset in the genuine health precinct.

The honourable member refers to the constituent's concern in relation to brain injury services. To be frank, that is just another chapter in the Labor Party's degradation of health services. The BIRS service, which was previously located at Payneham, was transferred onto the Hampstead site. The Labor Party has failed to invest in the Hampstead campus for years. They tried to compress it into The QEH site but neither patients nor clinicians nor this parliament was willing to stand for that, and that was abandoned.

My understanding is that the current expectation is that it will be at least two years before the Hampstead site is vacated, but, in the meantime, as the honourable member highlights in his question, patients who have rehabilitation needs, whether they be inpatients or outpatients, but particularly outpatients, are needing to rely on travelling to the Hampstead site, even if they live at the other end of town. Implicit in the representations of that constituent to both the member and myself is that there is an opportunity with the Repat site to provide more accessible rehabilitation services to outpatients in the southern region. I am certainly very mindful of that opportunity and am keen for that to be part of the discussion.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): Supplementary arising from the answer: will the minister rule out the privatisation of any or all services provided at the Repat or, like every other hospital clinical service, are they completely up for grabs to the highest bidder as well?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:05): I just wonder if this guy is a punching bag or something. You almost seem sadomasochistic. He was a member of the government. He sat around the table and decided that the former Labor government would break its promise to never ever close the Repat, and what were they going to do? No, they weren't going to bequest it to the public benevolent uses of the people of South Australia. They put it up for sale. They wanted to privatise it.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: So that's a no; everything's up for grabs?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: No, I can assure you that we will not do what Labor did.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I have been sat down.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Supplementary?

The PRESIDENT: No, I am about to remonstrate with the Leader of the Opposition and then I will hear your point of order. Let the minister answer your own questions, Leader of the Opposition. I know you are passionate on the issue. The Hon. Mr Hunter, are you asking a supplementary or—

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I am indeed, sir.

The PRESIDENT: —making a point of order? May we hear your supplementary?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr President.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Mr President, I haven't finished my answer.

The PRESIDENT: Have you not finished your answer? Hon. Mr Hunter, sit down. Let the minister finish and then we will come to your supplementary.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Opposition, we do not need commentary. Minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: It's a very interesting tactic by the opposition. They think that if they disrupt the interests of the house, they can move to the next supplementary because no, nothing will stop the Leader of the Opposition being reminded of the treachery of the Labor Party that, under Mike Rann, promised that a Labor government would never ever sell the Repat. Not only did they

sell it, they put a condition on the sale process that no SA Health facility could be on the site. Why would we punish public patients by saying that not only are we going to take your asset away but we are going to make sure that you can't get services there? What hypocrites.

They were willing to sell this asset well below value. I think I would be able to use, in terms of value for money, perhaps three or four of the buildings for the value of what you sold it for. In other words, I think the ongoing health value of that site is three times the sale value. The former Labor government was willing to sell an asset well below the public utility for public services. They would break a promise to the people of South Australia and also put a bar on public patients being able to receive public health services on the site. It is absolutely bizarre.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, your supplementary.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:08): Indeed it is, sir. The minister told us about his plan to have conversations, but he didn't tell us what date the public could expect to have access to health services on site again, as previously was asked by the Hon. Mr Darley.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:08): I expect to be making announcements in the very near future.

OUTPATIENT CLINIC WAITING TIMES

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister guarantee that he will release information on outpatient clinic waiting times on a quarterly basis from 1 July 2018, as was outlined in the Liberal Party's election commitments?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for the question and, through you, Mr President, I assure the council that we will be delivering on that commitment, too.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is regaining ground in international trade?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his question and for his long and enduring interest in international trade. The Marshall Liberal government had a significant amount of ground to regain. We will implement a comprehensive policy to boost South Australia's international trade and support our exporters.

In recent years we have lost ground in major markets like China. Over the past three years, South Australian goods exported to China have dropped by more than 30 per cent, from 2016-17 versus 2013-14 figures, while Australia's trade in goods declined by only 5.4 per cent during the same period.

Three years ago, South Australia accounted for more than 3 per cent of Australia merchandise exports to China. However, over the past 12 months, South Australia has dropped to just 2.3 per cent.

The government believes that a new approach to international representation is required. To regain the ground in exports and foreign investment, my initial emphasis will be on the new trade arrangements to boost our presence in China and the United States, South Australia's largest and second largest markets.

I have recently returned from an intensive visit to China, visiting the city of Guangzhou, where we are considering deploying an officer. I visited Shanghai, as the location for our new office, and Jinan in Shandong to cement our government's relationship with the province. I should add that it is 32 years that we have had a relationship with the sister state of Shandong, and we have had an office there for some 23 years.

During the visit, I was able to meet with Australia's senior trade diplomatic representatives and observe the activities and presence of other Australian state governments in these key commercial centres.

There is a significant opportunity for South Australia in China as a provider of world-class services, premium food and wine and a collaboration in high-tech centres, including health care and other areas of research and development.

The government is considering other offices in Japan, Malaysia and the United Arab Emirates. Malaysia is the state's third most important export destination in goods and top four source of international students in 2016-17, whilst Japan is our fifth largest export market.

Japan and South Australia enjoy an extensive economic, educational and cultural engagement through Okayama—South Australia's sister state relationship that commenced in 1993 and celebrates 25 years this year. I met with the governor of Okayama in Adelaide earlier this month, and he was very pleased to hear of our renewed and sharpened focus to work with his region in sectors such as health industries and premium food and wine.

The South Australian government has maintained an overseas representative officer since 1970, but their role and function has frequently changed to reflect the different focus of successive governments. At the peak of our representation in the 1990s, there were 12 stand-alone offices. It is interesting to note that during the term of the previous Liberal government, our exports grew from some \$3 billion to \$9 billion.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: How much?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: From \$3 billion to \$9 billion. Following the election of the Rann Labor government, the premier then declared that he would treble the exports from \$9 billion, I think, to \$25 billion by 2013. But then, of course, he closed all but two of the offices. Over that period of time, our exports have gone from about 8 per cent of the nation's share of the exports in 2002 to less than 4 per cent in 2018. We have a lot of ground to make up and we have a strong plan to regain that ground.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:13): A supplementary question arising from the answer: will the minister continue to host incoming trade delegations at his beloved Adelaide Club?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:13): I will be happy to host incoming trade delegations, but I am not sure what the former minister and Leader of the Opposition didn't understand. I am not a member of the Adelaide Club; I have never been a member of the Adelaide Club, but it will always be a pleasure to host international visitors here in our great state and showcase our wonderful—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I will be very proud to host any incoming trade delegations from any country in the world that want to come here and do business with our great state, do business with this government, grow our exports, grow our economy and make South Australia a better place than it was under the government you were part of.

JUSTICENET

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:14): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government, representing the Attorney-General, about funding for JusticeNet.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: On 15 May 2018, the Attorney-General will open the 10th annual Walk for Justice, which raises awareness and funds for the continuing work of JusticeNet. JusticeNet provides assistance to at least 400 disadvantaged South Australians each year who would otherwise have no access to the legal help they need. It does not receive recurrent funding, state government funding; however, just before the state election a one-off \$120,000 grant was provided from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. That grant, together with the projected income from

fundraising, will cover core operating expenses only until mid-2019. My question to the Leader of the Government is: will the government commit to providing funding certainty to JusticeNet in the form of recurrent funding?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:15): I'm very happy to refer the honourable member's question to the Attorney-General and bring back a reply as quickly as possible.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): My questions are to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing:

1. What open and transparent application assessment process occurred prior to the hiring of the new SA Health CEO?

2. Is the minister aware that anyone from his government held conversations with Mr Chris McGowan about hiring him as the new CE of Health before the state election?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:15): Appointments of the CEOs to government departments are a matter for the Premier. I will refer the Leader of the Opposition's questions to the Premier.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): Supplementary: does the minister have any knowledge of any conversations that occurred with Mr Chris McGowan about becoming SA Health CEO before the election? Does he himself have any knowledge of such conversations?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:16): I will take the honourable member's questions to the Premier. He is the minister responsible for appointments.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): Further supplementary question arising from the answer: does the minister know what knowledge he has? Does he personally have any knowledge of any such conversations? Did he himself have any such conversations?

The PRESIDENT: I will allow you to ask it one more time. Minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:16): My understanding is that the selection process for the CEO was done through the DPC. The minister responsible for the DPC is the Premier. I will refer the question to the Premier.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): Supplementary question arising from the original answer: has anyone from the Premier's office counselled the minister about how to answer questions and not to put his foot in it?

The PRESIDENT: It's a proposition but I'm going to allow it. Minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:16): I presume that wasn't a serious question.

CHIEF PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICER

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:17): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question on the topic of the Chief Public Health Officer.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The council and the minister would no doubt be aware that Australia spends less than 2 per cent of our health budget on prevention; in contrast, Canada and New Zealand spend around 6 per cent. One in every two Australians have at least one prominent chronic condition. Chronic conditions such as heart disease and type 2 diabetes are largely

preventable. More than one in three potentially preventable hospitalisations in Australia are linked to chronic disease.

There is also inequality in health, with people in lower socio-economic groups experiencing higher rates of illness and disability. If we are to make an impact on addressing the pressures facing our health system, now more than ever we need leadership and focus on prevention. I note that the South Australian Public Health Act 2011 establishes the position of Chief Public Health Officer. However, currently the position is held by the Chief Medical Officer rather than as a stand-alone position—both positions held by the same person in a merged position.

To this end, I note that the Public Health Association of Australia, in partnership with groups such as the South Australian Council of Social Services, the Australian Health Promotion Association, the Anti-Poverty Network of South Australia and the People's Health Movement, put together an election platform. The key ask of three asks was that whoever was in government establish a discrete full-time position of Chief Public Health Officer to enable this state leadership, with a mandate for prevention, health promotion and wellbeing.

My question to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing is: will he investigate the establishment of a stand-alone discrete full-time Chief Public Health Officer?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:19): The answer to the honourable member's question is no, I won't investigate it because the Marshall Liberal government is committed to doing it. We will do it. Let's remind the house why we are going to do it. We are going to do it because in 2011 the former Labor government had a McCann review, which basically they used as an excuse to step out of preventive health.

We had a massive disinvestment in preventative health services in this state, I believe to the long-term detriment. It's another reflection of the hospital-centric approach of the former Labor government, particularly over the last half of the 16 years they were in power. I completely agree with the honourable member: to achieve significant health gains you need to reduce the number of people living with preventable health conditions, and help people out of hospital when they need not be there in the first place. You need sustainable and comprehensive prevention and health promotion strategies.

That is why two of our largest and most substantial policies in the election campaign were focused on prevention: one that we call better prevention, which is about the comprehensive, shall we say, population-based prevention strategies, and the other is what we call targeted prevention, helping people who already have acquired a condition, for whatever reason, whether it be genetic and they were born with it or they acquired it, to work with them, to support them and stopping their condition progressing to an acute phase.

So, the better health policy had, as I said, a focus on individual and community action, education, screening, vaccines, research, monitoring, evaluation, public health regulation, leadership and coordination. It would be fair to say that they are the sorts of areas you would expect a chief public health officer to lead on. The honourable member is completely correct: not only did the former Labor government publish the McCann review, and took it as an opportunity to vacate the public health space, but demonstrated their lack of interest by basically abolishing the position.

Labor members might want to be pedantic with me and say, 'No, no, no, we didn't abolish it, we just tacked the title onto the bottom of the signature block.' I'm sorry, that didn't fool anybody. This was another demonstration of the former Labor government's determination to get out of primary and preventative health.

We in the Liberal Party take seriously our responsibilities for health outcomes but also for a health funding regime that is financially rational and sustainable. I believe we will only have sustainable public health services when we invest across the domains, and that includes preventative and public health. Not only did the former Labor government not manage the acute services, for example, the \$776 million blowout on the NRAH project, but they couldn't manage primary health care services either.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 8 May 2018.)

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:22): I rise to support this motion and express my appreciation of the speech with which the Governor opened this parliament just last week. I thank both the Governor and Ms Le for their extensive work over the past four years on behalf of and for South Australians, and I commend their resolve to always act in the best interests of our state and its citizens.

I take this opportunity to wish them well as they continue in their very important and esteemed roles, and trust that our new parliament will endeavour to work and support their objectives to improve and advance the welfare of our state. I also acknowledge the Governor's attendance at the opening service to mark the beginning of the parliamentary year, hosted by the Parliamentary Christian Fellowship this morning at St Peter's Cathedral. Since the Governor's appointment in 2014, to the best of my knowledge, it is an annual event that he has not missed, and I commend him for it.

Sir, I also take the opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment as President of this place, and also to acknowledge the work of your predecessor, the Hon. Russell Wortley. I have no doubt that you, too, will fulfil the duties of your position with aplomb. It is not very often that one gets to use the word 'aplomb', so I thought I would take the opportunity.

I also join the Governor in welcoming the 19 new members to the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, particularly our colleagues in this place: the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Emily Bourke, the Hon. Frank Pangallo, the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos—close?

The Hon. I. Pnevmatikos: That'll do.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: That will do, thank you—and the Hon. Clare Scriven—I look forward to getting that right as time goes on—with whom I look forward to developing and enjoying good working relationships in the coming years.

I also acknowledge the contribution of members who were not re-elected, speaking specifically of the former member, the Hon. Kelly Vincent, the youngest woman ever to be elected to an Australian parliament, as I understand it. It would be remiss of me not to again take the opportunity to acknowledge the Hon. Robert Brokenshire, my close friend and colleague, with whom I had the privilege of working closely for just over a decade and who made a significant impact, in my estimation, to South Australian politics throughout his 22-year career in this parliament in both this and the other place.

Of course, I have already had the opportunity to speak at length about Robert's impressive achievements, which I outlined last week, but I want to make sure that I again take an opportunity to commend him for his contribution.

As evidenced by the result of the March election, there has been an indisputable desire for change within the South Australian community, resulting in the election of a new government. The health of our economy, the future and wellbeing of our children, the state of our essential services and opportunities for the next generation all depend upon an innovative long-term plan for our state. The Marshall Liberal team presented its plan to voters previous to the election and was subsequently elected. Following its election to government just over six weeks ago, it has already made progress towards delivering many aspects of the promises made prior to the election, as the Governor aptly indicated in his speech last week.

I would now like to take the opportunity to touch on some of those key policy initiatives which I have personally and publicly advocated for at some stage since my own election to this place some 12 years ago. I should point out that in doing so, I am only choosing to highlight those policy matters that I have personally advocated for prior to joining the Liberal Party. Each of these are policy positions that I am on the record as having supported in one form or another prior to their being adopted by the new government, and I commend them for it.

As most members well know, I have been a strong supporter of reducing what I would deem as unnecessary taxation. As a privileged member of this government, I am proud that the government is demonstrating leadership in revitalising our economy through implementing a number of measures that will directly, or at the very least indirectly, benefit every South Australian business enterprise and household. This is a very significant step in the right direction.

In an effort to decrease the unemployment rate, this government recognises the need to address the barriers to the creation of job opportunities that we have experienced under previous governments. South Australia has imposed payroll tax upon businesses with payrolls of just \$600,000 or greater, the lowest in the nation, effectively meaning small to medium-sized businesses, which should be given the most incentive to prosper, have experienced the most strain and difficulty and faced the highest cost burdens under the previous government system.

By relying on this stream of revenue for over a quarter of its income tax revenue, the previous state government has arguably perpetually prevented our state from reaching its economic potential. Fewer jobs inevitably leads to a greater reliance on government handouts and less money being injected back into the local economy. I am a big believer in a hand up. There is certainly a place for a handout on occasions, but people benefit the most from a hand up. Excessive payroll rate tax has been a deterrent for business owners to expand their operations and has undoubtedly made entrepreneurs think twice about whether this encumbrance—which is not contingent upon profitability, I should point out—has been worth the risk of undertaking a new venture in South Australia at all. I have no doubt that this has been a noose around our neck.

Our state government has needed to focus on creating an opportunity for existing businesses to thrive and to which start-ups are attracted. I am very pleased that it is one of the Marshall Liberal government strategies to achieve this, and that it will in fact remove payroll tax for small businesses with payrolls of between \$600,000 and \$1.5 million as of January next year. This welcome measure will contribute significantly to the growth and success of business enterprise in almost every industry.

In my discussions as I have moved around the community as a member of this place over the last 12 years, one of the most consistent issues that has been raised with me (and I am sure other members would agree) by business people, particularly small and medium-sized business people, is the noose around their neck, as they call it, that is payroll tax. It is a direct disincentive to employing people. Although it has significantly improved in recent times, for a very long time this state has struggled with the highest unemployment rate in the nation, and we also had the lowest threshold at which payroll tax applied. Our efforts to increase the level of employment were hampered by the fact that we imposed the greatest costs on those businesses wishing to employ people.

This is an obvious contradiction and a clear hampering of economic advancement in our state. It makes it more expensive for business to employ people unnecessarily. The thing about people getting jobs is that a job for somebody creates dignity. It creates an opportunity for them to pull themselves out of difficult situations, to provide for their families, and to create a sense of self worth which is ultimately, I think, the real value in employment. Why on earth would we make it difficult for small and medium businesses to employ people and make it expensive for them to do so? It works against our state interest and has served us very badly, in my estimation.

The new threshold of \$1.5 million represents an almost tripling of the previous threshold and there will be very many businesses that will benefit from that. As I have just outlined, my experience in moving around the state for the past 12 years as a member of this place in discussing this issue with businesses is that it is their most disliked form of taxation because it is a direct impediment to them employing more people.

In contrast to the former Labor government, this Liberal government will not be depending on ever-increasing taxes and new levies to counter incessant overspending. In addition to its reform of the payroll tax system, this government is improving our land tax regime to stop penalising current investors, many of whom have modest property portfolios with a view to becoming self-funded retirees, as well as to incentivise new investors and developers.

Our housing and construction industry is absolutely vital to the South Australian economy and will welcome this long overdue change to the system. Something that has been noted, again during my 12 years in this place, is that our property taxes have been substantially out of line with

those in other states in Australia. Indeed, it is not uncommon for a property investor in South Australia to purchase a home here but then, if they are in the fortunate position of being able to purchase another investment property, to do so interstate so that the combined value of their properties here does not exceed the threshold at which the land tax in particular increases very substantially.

I personally know dozens of people who, although they would like to invest in more property in South Australia, whether it be commercial or residential, have found themselves in a position of not being able to do so because of the punishing land tax regime that they would be facing for doing so.

This change will be a real boon to our housing and commercial construction industries. It will no doubt be the start of what I expect to be a very substantial increase in construction levels in our state. I can tell you from personal experience and discussions with those directly affected by this measure that they see it as a significant opportunity to increase their investment here in our state, something I am sure all of us would agree will be a terrific thing for South Australia for employment.

Of course, governments win from that as well. How do they do that? Because the greater the level of employment, the greater the level of investment, which also means the greater level of taxation revenue for the government of the day. Activity creates wealth creates taxation, and this is exactly, in simple terms, one of the measures that this government will adopt, which I must say I wholeheartedly endorse.

In addition to this, our emergency services levy is also not exempt from the reforms that this government will implement but in fact will be cut by some \$90 million per annum on all eligible fixed properties regardless of their type of land use, providing relief to households, businesses, farmers and community organisations. This is yet another tax impost that is simply a handbrake on our economy. The emergency services levy has continued to increase over the years. As we know, it had a very substantial increase under the previous government about—I am not quite sure—maybe two or three years ago, something in that order, in the last term of the parliament anyway, and it became a very substantial figure.

This government will wind that back, reintroducing the remissions so that it is wound back to the previous levels, which will make the taxation much more acceptable to the community. Again, high levels of taxation are a disincentive for business. They are a disincentive for individuals as well to acquire property and use it for productive purposes. All of this taxation has simply been a handbrake on our South Australian economy. We have seen the fruit of that, as I said, until very recently, with the state of South Australia consistently having the highest level of unemployment, which included Tasmania for a substantial amount of time. When one considers that, I think it really is an embarrassment for our state.

Not that long ago, in the seventies and early eighties, South Australia was always regarded as the third economy in Australia, the third most advanced state. We have since fallen down that ladder very substantially, as members know and would agree, and we are now in a position where we must rebuild. We must remove the high levels of taxation which act as a handbrake to our economy and provide the opportunity for individuals and businesses to restructure their situations and invest in our state to the benefit of all.

Further, the natural resources management levy scheme, which has been an additional burden to South Australians, will also be transformed under this government with the introduction of caps to yearly land and water levy increases. Transparency in how these particular funds are spent will also be a priority—just another example of the lower tax regime that will exist under the Marshall Liberal government.

All these things, when you add them up, create an environment that is more conducive to business, that will be attractive to capital, that will create employment and will find a situation, I believe, where our state will benefit substantially. We have already seen, in some of the economic press in recent times, that some of the economic think tanks have been speaking very positively of the future of South Australia. These measures will undoubtedly further enhance their opinion of the prospects for our great state.

As you would be aware, I fought hard to ensure that the former Labor government did not proceed with what I saw as a flawed bank tax proposal. I believe it would only have served as a further impediment to the growth of our economy, with the extraordinary \$370 million cost over the forward estimates being passed on to families and businesses who could least afford yet another tax impost. I am very thankful for and fully support the Marshall government's decision to not continue with this tax in government.

I noted in the budget paper just a moment ago that the projection for the 2017-18 budget was \$97 million in revenue from the bank tax—which, of course, will not be implemented—rising to some \$95 million per annum in the 2020-21 financial year. That is \$100 million to be taken out of the economy and, the reality is, what would the banks do? They would do what any other organisation would do and pass that tax directly onto the consumers. It is effectively another tax on households and businesses in our state, which our state can little afford.

As part of the sweeping reforms in taxation and many other areas that this Marshall government will be involved in, in both the public and private sectors, to help stimulate our economy and make South Australia a vibrant and attractive place in which to work, live and invest, this government will also deregulate shop trading hours, trial a new temporary visa for entrepreneurs and create a regional growth fund to provide more opportunities in rural South Australia. I have also been a strong advocate in this place, as people would know (you may have heard me in the media or elsewhere), for council rate capping, another Marshall government priority which I support.

The government will be establishing this through the administration of an independent regulator—an appropriate way to do so, in my view. This local government rate capping scheme will ensure councils do not raise their rates beyond what the regulator has determined as reasonable for each particular area. I do not accept the argument that councils would not be in a position to fulfil their most basic functions if rate capping were implemented. I have always been of the firm opinion that they should focus on providing what most ratepayers primarily expect of them, which is quality road maintenance and efficient rubbish collection. They are the primary tasks that the individual, as I would see it, would require of a council.

There are other things that councils legitimately do and I do not dispute that, but these, of course, are the primary tasks expected of them. Indeed, I believe councils should refrain from becoming involved in issues beyond the scope of their core business, including debates concerning whether Australia Day should be celebrated. That is a legitimate debate, but it is not a debate for local government. Just on that matter, I am also pleased that it is our government's intention to legislate for 26 January to continue being recognised as Australia Day. Not only is it this government's view, it is also my personal view. It is indeed an important tradition, in my view, that recognises the values upon which our society was founded and which have served to prosper our nation for generations.

Members in this place would be very familiar with my firm opinions on the Safe Schools program, which has existed for some time now, which I consider to be essentially a social engineering program under the guise of an antibullying measure. I have been very active in representing the views of many parents and teachers throughout South Australia who were uncomfortable with the program's content, which exposes children as young as 11 to various gender fluidity theories. Having seen many of the teaching tools associated with the program, I was surprised at what some schools were being asked to teach and the activities students were to undertake. Indeed, a number of teachers contacted me saying they felt unable to teach in accordance with what they were being asked to teach.

Although I agree that our schools should be responsible for cultivating a safe and secure environment for all students, Safe Schools, in my view, did not address any bullying unrelated to sexuality or gender confusion whatsoever. What value is an antibullying program that focuses on a small part of the community but ignores the overwhelming majority? We should focus on the whole community. I am pleased that the Marshall Liberal government is ceasing funding for this program and replacing it with a comprehensive package of measures to combat this problem within our schools, including development of new resources for teachers to address all forms of bullying to all those affected.

Of course, I also look forward to being involved in the introduction of legislation to make it easier for those responsible for bullying to be prosecuted. That will no doubt act as a deterrent for this unacceptable behaviour. I was encouraged that the private members' bill I introduced last year—members will recall it being referred to colloquially as 'Libby's law'—in seeking to achieve passage through the parliament, did actually receive passage in this place and, I understand, was likely to pass in the other place had there been sufficient time. The government is adopting legislation that will be similar if not identical to that, as I understand.

Another bill I introduced, which received passage in this place prior to the proroguing of parliament, sought to grant the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption the ability to hold open hearings in cases of maladministration and misconduct. This government has made it known publicly that it intends to introduce similar legislation—the Attorney-General has introduced that legislation in the other place today, I think—in order to allow cases dealing with maladministration and misconduct to be heard in public. I support this move. This is a further example of the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to transparency and openness. I am sure South Australians would agree that this is imperative in managing public integrity and confidence in our institutions in South Australia.

I am genuinely excited to be part of a government that has a comprehensive and systematic plan for achieving its compelling vision for South Australia. I am optimistic and confident that the Marshall Liberal government has the skill, capability and fortitude to succeed in implementing the policies upon which it was selected for the benefit of all South Australians.

I am particularly enthusiastic about the government's focus on the lowering of the tax burden to business and to households in South Australia. For too long, we have faced high levels of taxation in this state, which have been a burden to growth, which have been a challenge for our state to overcome. Finally, we find ourselves in a situation where much of that burden will be relieved. There is more work to do but this is a very good start, in my view.

With this contribution, I wish to join with honourable members in assuring His Excellency of our commitment to conduct all elements of our duties as elected representatives of our state and its people to the best of our abilities. I support the motion.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:43): I rise to support the motion and give thanks to His Excellency the Governor for his speech opening the Fifty-Fourth Parliament of South Australia. His Excellency has provided four outstanding years of service to the people of South Australia. I would like to express my gratitude to the Governor and Mrs Le for their dedication, generosity and hard work. They have done this state proud with their selfless service, opening their hearts to all South Australians, championing cultural diversity, education and economic opportunity, and tirelessly supporting many worthy organisations.

Sir, I offer my congratulations to you as the new President. I am sure that, as President, you will maintain the dignity and decorum of the chamber. I sincerely thank the people of South Australia for re-electing myself and my Liberal colleagues the Hon. David Ridgway, the Hon. Stephen Wade and the Hon. Jing Lee. It is, of course, an incredible honour, and I look forward to my work as the Government Whip in the Legislative Council as well as continuing my service on a number of committees.

I would also like to take the opportunity to congratulate and welcome the five new members to this chamber: the Hon. Emily Bourke, the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos, the Hon. Clare Scriven, the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Frank Pangallo. The extensive experience and enthusiasm of these members will no doubt greatly contribute to the spirited debates we have in this place. I will not go through their names, but I also congratulate all the new lower house MPs on both sides and look forward to hearing their maiden speeches. I also wish to acknowledge the service of two former members of this chamber, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire and the Hon. Kelly Vincent. Both were diligent members who stood up for their beliefs with integrity, and I know that their contributions have had a lasting impact on this state.

The Governor, in his opening speech, outlined the newly elected government's agenda for positive, enduring legislative reform in this state. It is a shame that the former premier did not bother to show up to hear it, as I believe His Excellency outlined a more detailed and comprehensive plan

for reform than any government we have seen in recent years. I was pleased to hear from the Governor's speech that the number of new members reflects a desire for change and renewal expressed by the people of South Australia.

As those in this chamber know, I stand here as a strong advocate for Liberal values. I believe that this government will fight to advance the prosperity of our state so that we can all enjoy the highest possible standard of living with efficient, quality services in health and education and a fair and transparent justice system. The Liberal government's agenda includes vitally important protections for the most vulnerable in our society and ensures that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed.

The government has planned for economic growth; however, on this side of the chamber we understand that constant government interventions in the economy do not create jobs and prosperity. Government subsidies and grants for business, which we have become familiar with under the previous government, do not provide long-term sustainability. We must do everything we can to create the best environment for business to thrive in South Australia.

His Excellency the Governor referred to the strong policy commitments made by the Liberal Party prior to the election, which were endorsed by the South Australian voters. The Governor highlighted our commitment to foster economic growth and job creation, make businesses more competitive, create more training opportunities and reduce the cost of living for all South Australians. The people of South Australia clearly want change.

They placed their trust in a majority Marshall Liberal government, which will work hard to deliver on every one of the policy commitments made prior to the election. As noted by the Governor, the government has already given instructions to government departments to pay bills on time, has begun preparing legislation for the reduction of payroll tax, and has initiated the procedure to implement \$90 million worth of ESL bill relief.

South Australia has enormous potential for economic growth. We can be nationally and internationally competitive in several key industries if we commit to reducing costs for business. We must ensure that our economy provides a capability for well-paid, highly skilled work. Economic growth is driven through the private sector, and the policies articulated by the Liberal Party will best support this. Our commitment to increase the tax-free threshold and reduce the top marginal rate for land tax is one example of a policy that will encourage investment.

While there was some temporary payroll relief provided by the former government, it was not nearly enough. The business sector in this state is struggling. Under the previous Labor government we saw increased red tape, fees and restrictive regulations for business. We need to be cutting payroll tax, and I am very pleased that the Leader of the Opposition in the other place supports our commitment on this issue, recognising that payroll tax is a tax on jobs. Perhaps he learnt something while he was in this chamber.

The reality is that the burden on business must be relieved to allow them the opportunity to grow and employ South Australians. Small and medium-sized businesses are the largest employer in our state and we need to support those individuals who make the decision to start their own business.

Under Labor, we saw a hostile business environment. As a result, the rate of business creation plummeted. The Liberal Party understands that, to generate growth and jobs in the small and medium business sector, the government must fix the fundamentals and leave the rest up to the private sector. Under Labor, business found it too difficult to meet the costs of higher taxes and fees. We must restore business confidence by supporting jobs and investment.

The Marshall Liberal government will reduce red tape and keep business costs as low as possible. Through this, we can make it easier and more cost-effective for the private sector to begin new ventures, grow business and, most importantly, employ more people. Critical to creating this environment will be supporting young entrepreneurs and fuelling innovation, as well as strengthening the technical skills industry through more apprenticeships and traineeships.

It is a shame that for 16 years under the previous Labor government so much was promised, yet so little delivered. When the previous government needed to stand tall in matters such as mental

health and aged care, it failed our most vulnerable citizens abysmally. Our government is listening and taking action. The Marshall Liberal government has appointed a new Chief Psychiatrist to implement a new clinical plan for state-funded mental health services across the state, as well as address the recommendations of the maladministration investigation into Oakden.

We have been handed the Labor government's legacy of a bloated bureaucracy, red tape and taxes, with failed economic, employment and educational outcomes. This government will implement an agenda to retain our bright young minds and attract talented professionals from interstate and overseas. Our state's economy simply cannot thrive when so many of our young graduates are leaving. Encouraging job creation will allow every young person in South Australia to have the same opportunity to achieve their ambitions and this comes from resetting the fundamentals to allow business the best chance to flourish.

The Governor notes that private business should not look to taxpayers for financial support before making investment and growth decisions, because my government does not intend to be a bank or part of private sector business decisions. History has proven to us that government and society interact most effectively when the size and impact of government is restricted and free enterprise is encouraged.

For too long, economic growth has been curbed by government mismanagement through excessive red tape and interference with private enterprise. Often when we grow the size of government bureaucracy, it is at the expense of growing our economy. A small and efficient government encourages growth. This government will seek to restrain debt by focusing on efficient, smarter spending. We saw, with the shameful experiences of Oakden, how a bigger government did not result in better outcomes.

In South Australia, industries such as food and wine, education, health, financial services, tourism and technology are growing and provide us with the opportunity to increase our exports to other states and countries. This is why the Marshall Liberal government has introduced a number of policies focused on supporting business owners to increase their exports. It will make a welcome change from the previous government, which had very little ambition to improve our export performance.

I look forward to a renewed focus on the regions under this new Marshall Liberal government. The regions are the economic powerhouse of this state. The government recognises that our regions must be supported with efficient infrastructure to grow their contribution to the South Australian economy. We will be held to account on our policy commitments to regional South Australia, including regional development and primary industries, and I know that my colleagues in both houses look forward to implementing them.

The regional roads and infrastructure fund will provide certainty to our struggling regional areas, and the regional growth fund will see more money directed to the regions over the next 10 years than under the entire 16 years of the previous government.

It is a pleasure to be part of the Marshall Liberal government—a liberal reformist government—which, with its focus on growing the economy, creating jobs and keeping young people in South Australia, will revitalise our state. Now is the time for our bold plan for reform to be implemented. There is so much opportunity in South Australia that has not been realised by the previous government over its 16 years. This government will modernise and grow our economy to realise these opportunities.

All members of this chamber brought their own mandate to the election and I am sure that, at times, those interests will bring us into conflict; however, I look forward to collaborating with members opposite to reach a consensus that effectively serves the interests of the state. We all want the best for South Australia. I am sure that we can all work together to achieve this.

As the Governor notes, the government is ultimately accountable for its actions through this parliament to the people of South Australia. I am sure that members opposite will work hard to hold this government to account. This Marshall Liberal government has a comprehensive program for reform. I look forward to those promises being brought forward to this house in the coming term.

Premier Steven Marshall and cabinet, whom I congratulate on their appointment, will provide strong leadership for this state. As always, my Liberal colleagues and I will work diligently in this house on behalf of the people of South Australia. I am confident that we will bring about beneficial change for all South Australians. I commend the motion to the chamber.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

At 15:56 the council adjourned until Tuesday 15 May 2018 at 14:15.