

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 15 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 Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Determination and Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 5 of 2018—Auditor-General,
Electoral Commissioner, Deputy Electoral Commissioner,
Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner

By the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (Hon. D.W. Ridgway)—

Reports, 2016-17—
Approvals to Remove Track Infrastructure
South Australian Local Government Grants Commission

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink)—

South Australian—Victorian Border Groundwaters Agreement Review Committee—
Report, 2016-17

By the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade)—

Reports, 2016-17—
South Australian Training Advocate
Training and Skills Commission

Ministerial Statement

ROYAL FLYING DOCTOR SERVICE

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:17): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I rise to mark two milestones of the Royal Flying Doctor Service: today is its birthday, 90 years to the day since the Reverend John Flynn proclaimed his aerial medical service on 15 May 1928; and Thursday is its anniversary, 90 years to the day since the inaugural flight of the service in outback Queensland on 17 May 1928. Over the 90 years since, the Royal Flying Doctor Service has become Australia's most reputable charity and an outstanding example of industry leadership.

The RFDS remains the lifeline to outback communities and, in more recent times, has become the trusted provider of 24/7 emergency evacuations of critically ill patients from our state's regional hospitals to our major metropolitan hospitals for life-saving and specialist care. Its founder, the Reverend John Flynn, once said, 'If you start something worthwhile nothing can stop it.'

Back in 1928, in its first year of service with one aircraft, John Flynn's flying doctor scheme provided medical assistance to 255 patients, the equivalent of someone every 1½ days. Today, with the nation's third largest fleet, the Royal Flying Doctor Service provides emergency aeromedical and essential primary healthcare services to more than 300,000 patients every year, the equivalent of someone every two minutes.

In our own state, the RFDS provides quality care to a South Australian every 10 minutes. Every 10 minutes the flying doctor will be delivering:

- an aeromedical retrieval of the sick or injured from an outback location; or
- a primary healthcare consultation during a remote fly-in GP clinic; or
- the aeromedical transfer of a patient from a country hospital to a major Adelaide hospital; or
- a face-to-face mental health consultation in a remote community; or
- an interstate transfer of a patient for life-saving surgery, such as an organ transplant; or
- in situ primary care by remote area nurses residing in outback communities; or
- a GP consult to a patient via telephone with a holder of a RFDS medical chest; or
- dental treatment and oral health education in a remote community.

The RFDS has, deservedly, earned the trust of the government and the community alike due to its proven track record of delivering the finest aeromedical and primary health care to the furthest corners of our state.

The Royal Flying Doctor Service is the South Australian government's preferred provider of fixed-wing interhospital transfer and aeromedical retrieval services. It is also a key partner of primary healthcare services to outback communities via its fly-in health clinic teams from Port Augusta base and its remote nurse outposts located at Marree, Andamooka and Marla. The RFDS is investing heavily in delivering care in the next 90 years and recently constructed a world-class aeromedical facility at Adelaide Airport and the order, pending delivery, of the RFDS PC 24 jet will soon be South Australia's first purpose-built aeromedical jet.

I think it is appropriate to recognise that, whilst the first buds of the RFDS service were in Queensland, its roots are in South Australia. The Reverend John Flynn, the founder of RFDS, commenced his spiritual, social and medical duties at the Smith of Dunesk mission at Beltana, soon after he was ordained as a minister of the Presbyterian Church on 24 January 1911 at Scots Church (not far from here). At Beltana, he witnessed firsthand the rigours of outback life and the lack of medical care available to inland residents and travellers.

In 1917, Flynn received an inspirational letter from Lieutenant Clifford Peel of Robe, a young airman and war hero, who suggested the use of aircraft to take medical help to the outback. After a decade of campaigning for an aeromedical service as a 'mantle of safety' for the people of the bush, his vision became a reality when industrialist Hugh Victor McKay left a large bequest to fund Flynn for his aerial experiment for one year.

Flynn had a doctor, a pilot and a plane, but he lacked the communication technology to deliver services efficiently. Flynn called on the innovative mind of Alfred Traeger of Adelaide, who overcame this barrier by inventing a pedal-operated generator to power a radio receiver. By 1929, people living in isolation were able to call the flying doctor to assist in an emergency, and later the School of the Air was established using the flying doctor network. On behalf of all South Australians, I offer congratulations and thanks to the Royal Flying Doctor Service.

ELECTRICITY METERING SERVICES

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:21): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to improvements in customer outcomes in metering made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Dan van Holst Pellekaan.

*Parliamentary Committees***ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE**

The PRESIDENT (14:23): I am required to give a statement to the chamber. I have to advise the council that, at its meeting held yesterday, the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee was unable to come to a decision as to who is to be its Presiding Member. Therefore, pursuant to section 7(1b) of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act, the matter is referred to the council for its determination.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:24): I move:

That the Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins be appointed Presiding Member of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee.

In speaking to the motion, I have to say, after a long period of service in the Legislative Council in the parliament, I think it is a sad day that, on behalf of government members in this chamber, I have to stand to move this particular motion. It has been a longstanding convention respected by governments and oppositions of both flavours—Labor and Liberal—in all of my time in parliament.

The joint standing committees of the parliament (we have more now than when I first started) comprise House of Assembly members and Legislative Council members. By convention, some of these are chaired by Legislative Council members and some are chaired by House of Assembly members. However, by longstanding convention, they have always been chaired by government members.

These processes have been governed, in part, by legislation but, significantly, by accepted and respected conventions between the two major parties: the government and the alternative government in the parliament. As I said, that has been the case irrespective of whether we have had a Labor government or a Liberal government. Most recently, for a very long period of time (16 years), we have had Labor governments in South Australia. I have been a member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition during all of that period and, as members of the Liberal party, as the opposition, we have respected that particular convention of the day, even though it was always possible to seek to get the numbers to reverse that particular convention.

The situation we are confronted with now, I have to say, has only occurred since the election of the new leader of the Labor party, Mr Peter Malinauskas, and I point the finger solely at him. Under previous leaders, there has been a respect for this longstanding convention and, sadly, since the election of the member for Croydon, all of a sudden this longstanding convention has been thrown out the window. As I understand it, it has been largely driven not just by Mr Malinauskas but by the Leader of the Opposition in this chamber, the Hon. Kyam Maher. I think the responsibility rests with both of those two gentlemen in relation to this particular position. Ultimately, it is for them to make a decision on behalf of their party rooms, or caucus, in terms of whether or not they are going to respect that longstanding convention.

There is a position in relation to the chair of these particular committees. They are important positions. Not only is there the additional remuneration and status that goes with those particular positions as a chair—it is an important position in the parliament in terms of chairing a committee—but it is also important in terms of the management and governance of the committees of the parliament. On the joint standing committees, if there is to be, on any particular issue in terms of a vote, a split vote, other than the election of the Presiding Member, which comes back to this particular chamber, the person who takes the position of Presiding Member has two votes: a casting vote and a deliberative vote.

The balance of these particular committees has been recognised in the past as two government members from the House of Assembly and one opposition member, and one government, one opposition and one crossbencher from the Legislative Council. The balance has been quite clear: three government members in total and three non-government members in total. Essentially, because the government member has been respected by convention to be the Chairperson or Presiding Member, then on an issue or a particular vote—whether an inquiry should be conducted, a witness should be called, a meeting should be called, all the process in governance issues—the Presiding Member has a deliberative vote and a casting vote.

So, if there is a split between government and non-government members, the convention in terms of the operations of these committees has been that the government, ultimately, through the casting vote of the Presiding Member, has been able to take the final decision. These committees are very important. This committee is very important in terms of the Aboriginal lands, but members of this chamber, on the opposition backbenches, have served on legislative review committees, the environment resources committees and a variety of other committees. The work of the Legislative Review Committee has been longstanding in terms of the work that it does. As I said, the convention has always been respected by governments and oppositions in the past.

I could say much more, but I do not intend to. I have spoken individually with members in this chamber. I know there are members within the government caucus collectively—I do not speak just about the upper house—who are mightily unhappy with the position Mr Malinauskas and the Hon. Kyam Maher have adopted in relation to this particular position, but loyalty to their party and the caucus means that they have not and will not speak out in relation to this issue. But, I would urge members in this chamber to respect the longstanding convention that has been respected in relation to the governance and processes of the joint standing committees of the parliament and I would urge members to support the Hon. Mr Dawkins, who is the government nominee on this particular committee.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:31): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out the words 'the Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins' and insert the words 'the Hon. T.A. Franks'.

In doing so, I rise to speak to both the amendment and the motion. I am deeply sorry to have disappointed the Treasurer in that, in his long service in this place, he has come across something that he was not aware of. It may have escaped his attention that we changed the act for the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee in the last term of parliament. We did so to remove the minister from the committee and we did so to ensure that the committee was not in a position where a government minister was, in fact, writing to themselves on behalf of the committee. We did so because the working of the committee was actually hampered by that model. So, there is no convention when it comes to this particular committee.

We also have an act that provides for a crossbench member to be from the Legislative Council on this committee and for the leadership, the Presiding Member, should there be a tied vote, to be decided for this Legislative Council. Both of those things are in the act. They are not subject to convention. They were provided for when we debated the law that is the foundation of this particular committee.

What I would also point out, through you, Mr President, to the honourable Treasurer is that, in the last term of parliament, we had a crossbencher sitting on this committee, not just from the upper house, which, of course, was myself, but, indeed, the member for Morphett, who lost his party mid-term on the committee and served as a crossbencher in the lower house on this particular committee. So, in fact, this committee has a fine tradition of breaking all of those conventions that the honourable Treasurer holds so dear.

The other point I would like to note in the long, long period of service that the honourable Treasurer noted that he had—it may have escaped his attention that, as a member of this committee, I served on the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee for some eight years. The members who supported me in the vote of this committee to be its Presiding Member have also served on this committee previously—one for four years and one for less than a year but then in a role as shadow minister in this portfolio. Prior to this session of parliament, the sum total of service of the government appointees to the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee is zero days. I think, when one is talking about respect for processes, it is the government which has not shown respect for this committee.

I also point to other instances where, in other parliaments around the country, crossbenchers do act as presiding members of committees. It is commonplace in the Senate, it is commonplace in the New South Wales parliament, it is commonplace in the WA parliament and all of these things have happened because somebody was the first to do it.

I would note that I would be the first woman crossbencher to be a Presiding Member of this committee; that would be a first I would be proud to achieve, but it would be something I would do

not because I woke up one day and decided I wanted to chair this committee but because I have served eight years and have developed connections with the communities that hold this particular committee in high regard and hold hopes for us because of the very terms of reference, because of the carriage that it has for the APY lands act, the carriage that it has for the Maralinga Tjarutja act and the carriage that it has for, and the current inquiry that is underway into, the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act.

I note that the Hon. John Dawkins has put himself forward and that he has indeed received the support of the Liberal government members of the committee. I ask him to speak to this chamber; the Legislative Council is the chamber that will now decide the presiding officer. I ask him to address this chamber about why he wishes to put himself forward to be the Presiding Member. I would say that we were halfway through a review and that I have the history in and the commitment to this committee. Yes, I am a crossbencher, but I am the one who has the runs on the board, regardless of your conventions. Convention seems to me simply a polite way to put a crossbencher in their place and also a reason you have when you do not really have a reason. With those few words, I commend the amendment.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:36): I rise to support the amended motion and the candidacy of my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks to be the Presiding Member of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee.

I was not going to weigh into this debate, but the Treasurer's contribution in relation to what he described as longstanding conventions, accepted and respected conventions, does need to be challenged. I would particularly like, through you, Mr President, to address my remarks to the opposition and crossbench members.

The opposition, as I understand it, are supporting the Hon. Tammy Franks, but the crossbench members, I think, need to bear in mind that one thing we who are not part of the government all have in common is that our job is to hold the government to account. We know that in our toolkit there are various tools for holding the government to account. Question time is coming up soon; that is one of them. Another of the most important tools is parliamentary committees, where we can get witnesses in, we can ask them questions and we can determine whether government policies are hitting the mark or not. It is a very valuable tool of accountability.

To suggest that there is some unwritten rule—and that is really all a convention is: some sort of unwritten rule—that says that the government that we are seeking to hold to account somehow has a right to run the committee and to have a deliberative and a casting vote on the committee that holds that government to account is, I think, an absolute nonsense. The Treasurer said he was disappointed he had had to do this; he is lucky it has not happened sooner. From talking to my colleagues interstate, I can note that in the Senate the Greens regularly—after every election—put up a candidate to be president, and we insist on a vote. As my colleague mentioned before, crossbench members are routinely appointed as chairs of committees in the federal parliament and in the parliaments of other states.

The Hon. Tammy Franks has a long track record in and a commitment to this area, and I think that makes her the best candidate to be the presiding member. The Treasurer conceded that, with a deliberative vote and a casting vote, the chairperson of this committee can determine whether a meeting is held and they can determine whether a witness will be heard, if there is a division on the committee. Really, how does that tie in with accountability—the fact that in the event of a division the government would get the deciding vote on whether to hear from a witness on a committee that is in large part to hold the government to account? It makes no sense.

I have had many discussions with government members over the last 12 months or so along the lines of, if they are elected, we need a complete overhaul of committees, how they are constructed and how they operate. I make no secret of the fact that I have been chewing anyone's ear who will listen, that some of the lucrative consolation prizes that have gone along with committees need to come to an end. I congratulate the government for getting rid of those chauffeur-driven cars and drivers from those two government-controlled committees that were nothing other than consolation prizes for wannabe ministers—the disgruntled backbench, not quite enough spots on the front bench, give them a car and driver, that will make them happy.

Let us also remind ourselves that there is a lucrative consolation prize that goes with this: \$26,000 extra salary goes with this position. Again, I have made no secret, whether to my colleague or to others, that we will be moving to get rid of all these salary bonuses for chairs of parliamentary committees. I just do not think it is necessary—we get paid well enough. We do not need extra lumps of salary exclusively for government members of parliament. It is an anachronism, it has to go; it does not pass the water cooler test or the front bar test.

I will support my colleague in her bid to be the chairperson of this committee. As I have said, she has a long and sustained interest and good connections with these local communities, but, most importantly—and I say it again for the benefit of those on the crossbench—whatever other differences we have, our collective job is to keep the government to account. If we can have a non-government chair of as many standing committees as possible, then I think we are doing proper credit to the role with which the people of South Australia have entrusted us.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): I was not intending to speak, but, as often happens, the Hon. Rob Lucas provokes a response in what he says. The Hon. Rob Lucas spoke to us about needing to abide by longstanding conventions, and I note how quickly and how hypocritically his view has changed from his time in opposition about needing to do that. I know that in opposition there were longstanding conventions that they saw no need to abide by, but now, all of a sudden, when they are in government it is sacrosanct and has to be abided by.

It is important to remember, when the Hon. Rob Lucas implores us to vote for, amongst other things, the extra pay and prestige associated with the position, why we are here voting as we are today. I think everyone in this place has a huge amount of respect for the Hon. John Dawkins: a more decent, honest and earnest member of parliament I do not think any one of us will have met. He is one of the people who will end his time here having made a difference on issues he has consistently championed, and I pay a great deal of respect to the Hon. John Dawkins for that.

But the reason we are being implored by the Hon. Rob Lucas to afford the extra pay and prestige of the position is because of the Hon. Rob Lucas's own role in the position of President in this chamber. We know, from the Hon. Rob Lucas bragging about it himself to InDaily, that, contrary to the expectation of most people in this chamber (and I expect most people opposite), the Hon. John Dawkins was not made President of this chamber. A little Kirribilli deal happened, that the Hon. Rob Lucas bragged to InDaily about, that saw you, Mr President, installed, acting in the role for two years before the Hon. Terry Stephens takes over. That was well publicised, admitted and bragged about to InDaily by the Hon. Rob Lucas, and that is why we are here today, with the Hon. Rob Lucas imploring us to afford the Hon. John Dawkins the extra pay and extra prestige because of his own role in having done over the Hon. John Dawkins only weeks ago.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:43): I had not intended to speak, but I will briefly and I would say, just to respond to the last comment from the Leader of the Opposition (and I thank him for his remarks), that I have no interest in this job for the pay. If the Hon. Mr Parnell was successful in removing the pay from it, then I would still be as interested. The role I have been given by the government in suicide prevention, which I welcome, has no extra pay.

I very briefly want to pay respect to the Hon. Tammy Franks and others who have served on the Aboriginal lands committee for some period. It was my wish, some time ago, to serve on that committee. That did not work out. I have served on a number of other committees that have had quite a bit to do with the Aboriginal lands, both in the north and the west of the state and in other areas I have visited, where there has been a plea to me in relation to the work I do in suicide prevention. However, that is not the abiding reason for my wanting to serve this committee. I have respect for those who have served. I would be happy to learn from those as we go, but I do have strong contacts with people, who I value very highly, from the various Indigenous communities around this state.

The council divided on the amendment:

Ayes	9
Noes	11
Majority	2

AYES

Bourke, E.S.
Hunter, I.K.
Parnell, M.C.

Franks, T.A. (teller)
Maher, K.J.
Pnevmatikos, I.

Hanson, J.E.
Ngo, T.T.
Scriven, C.M.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Hood, D.G.E.
Lucas, R.I. (teller)
Stephens, T.J.

Darley, J.A.
Lee, J.S.
Pangallo, F.
Wade, S.G.

Dawkins, J.S.L.
Lensink, J.M.A.
Ridgway, D.W.

Amendment thus negated; motion carried.

*Question Time***HEALTH SERVICES**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about health services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Over the last week in parliament, the Minister for Health has refused to provide time lines for the release of hospital accreditation reports, has said that on some issues he refuses to take advice from his own department, has had to ask the Premier whether he, as health minister, has talked to someone about becoming chief executive of his own department, and has refused to rule out privatising hospital and clinical services. It is possible that some of these lines of questioning were too complicated for the health minister so I will be more specific.

My question, very specifically, is: can the minister name any of the services that he will not privatise? Specifically, will the minister rule out privatising:

1. All or any part of SA Pathology?
2. Any aspect of the Patient Transport Service?
3. Any part of the SA Ambulance Service?
4. Any part of the clinical services that form part of the SA Prison Health Service?
5. Any clinical services performed outside of hospitals, including but not limited to in-home palliative care?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:52): I would like to make a very solemn and clear commitment to this council that I have no intention of privatising the Repatriation General Hospital site, contrary to the commitment of the previous government. Soon after I was appointed as minister, I went into discussions with ACH. I have terminated that contract, unlike the former—

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order: I know it is early, but the honourable minister is answering a question he was not, in fact, asked. He was not asked a question about the Repatriation General Hospital.

The PRESIDENT: It was a general question and the minister has not concluded his answer. Ministers of the Crown have some latitude, as you would well remember, Hon. Mr Hunter.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I don't think it was a general question, sir. I think it was very specific.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, continue.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Thank you, Mr President. I appreciate that you heard the question, which was whether I could name one service that I wouldn't privatise. I can make it very clear that I am not privatising the Repatriation General Hospital site.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Let the minister answer.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, we have had this before. It is your question. Show the minister respect regarding your question and allow him to answer.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: The Premier won't be happy if you are not ruling it out.

The PRESIDENT: You do not know the mood of the Premier, Leader of the Opposition. Let the minister answer in silence.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I would like to commend the Leader of the Opposition for his cognitive development over the last couple of years. In the last parliament he seemed to make an art form of giving 'yes/no' answers; we had to give a 'yes/no' answer to everything. At least now the Leader of the Opposition, having assumed the opposition role, has discovered the art of multiple choice.

It was very kind of him to give me a range of opportunities that I might want to privatise. That might be the approach of a Labor cabinet. Mr Rann signs a billboard-sized 'I will not privatise anything' and then they go into the \$2.4 billion NRAH project and then they run around outsourcing all the hospital services. Then, once they go back to the blissful side of the opposition benches, they suddenly rediscover their values and also the art of multiple choice, so congratulations to the Leader of the Opposition. I will take up the challenge. I will identify a privatisation opportunity that I will not take, and that is the privatisation of the Repat hospital.

The PRESIDENT: Is this a supplementary, Leader of the Opposition, or something different?

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): A supplementary arising of and from the answer given to the original question, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: We'll see.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: So, minister, it's all up for grabs, except for that, is it?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:55): I am waiting for the question mark.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will rephrase my question.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): A further supplementary question arising from the answer to the original question: all parts of SA Pathology are up for grabs then, are they?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:55): No.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): Supplementary arising from the answer.

The PRESIDENT: Original answer.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Are you ruling out any part of SA Pathology, patient transport services, SA Ambulance Service, SA prison services or services performed outside hospitals being privatised in any way? Is that what you are ruling out with your 'n-o' answer, or are you going to mislead parliament like you did last week?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:55): Mr President, I actually take that last comment from the Leader of the Opposition offensively. If he wants—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: You had to come in and correct yourself because you misled us.

The PRESIDENT: Let the minister—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: He misled us last week and had to come in and correct himself; the first minister to do that.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, stop making gratuitous statements to the house; you have other opportunities for that.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I will restate what I said last week: a Marshall Liberal government will not sell any public hospitals, nor will we move—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: You're not ruling any of these out.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Childish. Absolutely childish.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: You will have the Premier talking to you again, Stephen.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: He is such a schoolboy. He should follow the former minister Malinauskas down to the other place; that's where this sort of behaviour belongs. A Marshall Liberal government will not sell any public hospitals, nor will we move to have any public hospital 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.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:56): My supplementary derives from the minister's answer: if the minister is not privatising the Repatriation General Hospital, will he be encouraging his colleague the planning minister to change the zoning that was gazetted by the previous government, noting that he only has a week or two to do so?

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Good question.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:57): It is a good question; I agree with the Leader of the Opposition on that point. It's a good question because, as the honourable member is clearly trying to give me the opportunity—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, you should know better. Minister, continue.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —to highlight the hypocrisy of the former Labor government. This was a government which, right up to election day, was telling us that, yes, they believed in a genuine health precinct for the Repat, too. Well, if they did believe in a genuine health precinct on the Repat site, why did the former minister for planning approve a DPA variation to the Repat site on 23 or 24 December and then wait a month until, I think, 23 January to gazette it? Then, what did the gazettal show? This is a government which said, 'Yes, we believe in health services on this site,' and yet that DPA permitted a hotel, a warehouse, a convention centre, I recall, and restaurants. This is not a genuine health precinct.

That's the first point on why I would say to the honourable member that the government wasn't serious about a genuine health precinct. I have heard your question and I will come back to the issue of how we respond to that. The second point of why the former Labor government was completely hypocritical on the Repat was that the former Labor Party government committed to releasing the master plan and consulting with the community about the master plan. This is the master plan coming out of the contract. They also committed to a land management agreement that would protect the site in perpetuity. Then what we find is that the conditions precedent expired—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The minister is attempting to answer the question. Let him answer the question.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —on 30 April. With all due respect to the former member of the government which sold the Repat, but through you, Mr President, there was no chance—I am not exactly sure how many days there are between 17 March and 30 April, but there was not nearly enough time, if the Labor government was re-elected, for them to have had a genuine consultation on the master plan and to go through a proper community consultation. The former Labor government was not fair dinkum about a genuine health precinct. The honourable member's question, as I understand it, was inviting me to reflect on what—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I think the honourable member is entitled to an answer and I would thank him for the opportunity to do it in one statement rather than the Leader of the Opposition who likes it in a series of six bites. Going to the issue of the planning, we went to the election with a commitment to revoke, to replace that DPA on day one. That was on the assumption that the Labor Party could actually deliver on a commitment, which was to sell the Repat site. I think just before we came to government we became aware that the sale had not been executed, so there was a range of planning opportunities to vary the DPA.

We will be engaging the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. There are at least four different options in terms of how we as a government and we as a parliament can progress. Certainly, in a statement I made, I think, on 2 May, when I announced that I was acting to terminate the contract, I indicated that I would be writing to the ERDC. I appreciate that the ERD Committee meets on 17 May (which is two days from now) and I am taking final advice to finalise that letter.

On 17 March, I think the people of South Australia voted not just for the retention of the Repat site but also for the protection of the site as a genuine health precinct. We do not believe the DPA that was issued on 23 or 24 December by minister Rau, nor the contract that was drafted by former minister Snelling and pursued by former minister Malinauskas, honours the determination of the South Australian community that that continue as a genuine health precinct. We will continue to act accordingly.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:01): I have a supplementary question: will the minister guarantee that some of the services that were transferred out to the local hospital will be brought back to the Repat?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02): Was that a supplementary question?

The PRESIDENT: I think it was a supplementary but it repeats—

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I'm sorry, I thought the Hon. Mark Parnell's question was about planning.

The PRESIDENT: Yes. That was a supplementary. The Hon. Tung Ngo is off your original—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Planning is not services but let me give you an example straightaway: hydrotherapy pool. From 28 May, less than two weeks away, the South Australian government will return hydrotherapy pool services to the Repat site. I can just feel the warmth flowing over from the Hon. Michelle Lensink, a former physiotherapist from that site—she knows the value of hydrotherapy pool services.

The former Labor government didn't understand health. They thought you could transform health by shuffling services between hospitals, closing down three and downgrading three emergency departments. That's not how you transform health. You transform health by linking up all the services, all the partnerships, from the GP right through to palliative care, to make sure that services work together to support people to stay healthy.

We will not be able to cope with an ageing population if we do not empower people to stay healthy and, when they do become unwell, to avoid hospitalisation. That is one of the fundamental

purposes of hydrotherapy pools. Apparently, the former Labor government thought that hydrotherapy pools mattered so little to health that they could close not just the Repat pool but also the pool at Flinders Medical Centre.

They kept that very quiet. People thought, 'Oh, no, that's fine; we're closing the Repat pool and we're building a new one up the hill at FMC.' But, no, by stealth they were closing two pools. What was the response from the former Labor government when it was challenged on that? 'Our priority is our inpatients.' I'm sorry, our priority should be South Australians keeping healthy. We shouldn't wait until they get into hospital before we start caring about them.

I assure you that this government, the Marshall Liberal government, has a strong focus on preventative health—not just primary preventative health but also targeted preventative health, health that talks about keeping people out of hospital when they are at risk of a chronic condition worsening. So, I thank the honourable member for the question, and the example of services that will be returning to the Repat site as a result of our moves is the hydrotherapy pool.

The PRESIDENT: I am not going to allow another supplementary on that issue, because I am anxious to get to the crossbench.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In question time last week, the minister didn't know who he would be taking advice from in relation to the establishment of a stand-alone high dependency unit at Modbury Hospital. The minister, who couldn't name a single practising specialist who supports a stand-alone HDU at Modbury, named Warren Jones as the only person he could think of who supports him on this issue, said he would ignore the advice of his department on this issue, said he would act against the advice of the Australian Medical Association on this issue and claimed in parliament—where one can mislead if they are not telling the truth—not to know the views of the College of Intensive Care Medicine on this subject.

Will the minister give a personal undertaking to this chamber that no patient will have their safety compromised by his policy of locating a stand-alone high dependency unit at Modbury Hospital without a co-located intensive care unit?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:05): I thank the honourable member for his question. I assure the house that I will continue to give priority to patient safety. The fact of the matter is that the former Labor government at Modbury has severely undermined patient safety—severely undermined patient safety. What they have done is they have downgraded the emergency department.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: What does your department say about it?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Maher, you have ample opportunity to ask questions in question time. Let the minister answer in silence; he is on his feet.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Thank you, Mr President. The former Labor government undermined patient safety by downgrading the emergency department. In spite of the growing community in the north-east, they downgraded the emergency department, which meant that, if you had a life-threatening condition, you had to go to Lyell McEwin or the RAH, depending on where you were based.

The former Labor government undermined patient safety by downgrading the acute services on that site, leading to, I think, on average, 10 patient transfers a day. In other words, people who could previously have got their services at Modbury Hospital now need to get them at Lyell McEwin or some other hospital. You can talk to any clinician and they will tell you—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Name one. Go on. A practising clinician.

The PRESIDENT: You have had your opportunity to ask the question, Leader of the Opposition. Let the minister answer.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Any clinician—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Name one practising clinician. Forty-eight said no; name one. Go on, name them.

The PRESIDENT: You have asked that question and he has answered it.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: We are not going to name people. You people are vindictive. All you will do is just try to destroy them.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens, let the minister speak. Thank you, minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Any clinician will tell you that the process of transferring a patient by—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, please. It is an important issue.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: A third attempt at this one. Any clinician will tell you that the transfer of a patient from one acute site to another acute site by ambulance, or by any form of transport, is a high-risk activity. In other words, if you can deliver the acute care at the first site, you reduce risks. Yet, not only did this former Labor government downgrade the emergency department at Modbury Hospital, meaning that people with life-threatening conditions had to go elsewhere, they also reduced the medical support within the hospital, such that people who were deteriorating or people who had emergency requirements needed to be transferred. They actually, if you like, established an ambulance taxi, in other words, a dedicated shuttle ambulance that was there to transfer Modbury patients who could no longer be cared for at the acute hospital.

The Leader of the Opposition can talk about patient safety. I would say to the Leader of the Opposition: where was he in the last Labor government when he should have been standing up for the people of the north-east? Instead, he undermined patient safety by being part of a bizarre plan to downgrade three emergency departments around metropolitan Adelaide and close three hospitals.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): I have a supplementary question arising from the answer. I ask the minister to be very careful how he answers this. He has already apologised for misleading this chamber last week.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, supplementaries do not allow you to insert a warning.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My question is: has the minister received any advice from his department that a stand-alone high dependency unit without an intensive care unit would compromise patient safety? Has he received any such advice from his department?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:09): I am more than happy to indicate to the Legislative Council that there was advice from the department that raised concerns about patient safety in relation to an HDU. To be frank, I thought I said that last week. The fact of the matter is that the department is one source of advice that I take and, to be frank, I have also found the department in itself is not a monolithic source of advice. I will continue to take the range of advice within the department and the range of advice within the community and make what I think are decisions in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

What I will also do is take into account the views of South Australians who are actually the recipients of these services. The arrogance of the former Labor government—thinking that they could close three hospitals, downgrade three emergency departments, breach commitments to 'never ever' close the Repat and think they could somehow hold their heads high in relation to health. That is the tragedy of the former Labor government: they were so deaf, they couldn't even hear their own people speak.

MOUNT GAMBIER RENAL DIALYSIS UNIT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:11): 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 last week, the minister stated that the previous Labor government did not support the renal dialysis unit in Mount Gambier. However, on 24 January 2018, *The Border Watch* newspaper correctly reported that the Labor government had committed to funding the unit. In fact—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: In fact, the funding was in the state Labor government's Mid-Year Budget Review. Since this funding was in the former state Labor government's Mid-Year Budget Review, will the minister now admit that he has once again effectively misled the chamber?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:12): My comment was in the context of the term as a whole. I acknowledge that the honourable member may well be right and it may well have been in the Mid-Year Budget Review, but the fact of the matter is that this former Labor government had form when it came to breaching commitments. Let's look at the—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Let the minister answer in silence.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: You are learning bad habits from your leader.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Okay, well let's talk about TQEH stage 3 redevelopment. It was in the budget—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Budgets come and budgets go, elections come and elections go, but a Labor Party will continue to break promises, whether it is delivering on the Repat or delivering on TQEH stage 3 redevelopment. They promised it in 2010, they promised it in 2014 going into the election, it was in the budget—it was still a broken promise.

The Labor Party announced their Mount Gambier renal commitment after we did—we did that in late 2017. Yet the former minister, Mr Malinauskas, actually went to Mount Gambier after the Bollywood event, which I attended, and did not make a commitment. The fact that it was in the Mid-Year Budget Review would be of no comfort to the people of Mount Gambier because Labor Party governments break promises and they break budgets.

MOUNT GAMBIER RENAL DIALYSIS UNIT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:13): Supplementary: could the minister advise:

1. How much will it cost to expand the renal dialysis unit in Mount Gambier under his government?
2. What ongoing funding has been allocated, and over what period of time?
3. What additional staffing has been allocated?
4. When will the build commence and when will the build finish?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:14): I am advised by the department that the redevelopment of the renal dialysis unit will require a capital investment and will

include the re-accommodation of other services to make way for the larger unit. Detailed cost estimates are not yet available but are anticipated to be in the order of \$2.1 million.

The fact that detailed cost estimates are not available is interesting because the Hon. Clare Scriven is trying to tell us that they really had this under control—they had it in their Mid-Year Budget Review and they were going to deliver—and yet my department is telling me that detailed cost estimates are not available. Be that as it may—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: It was funded, Stephen. Don't you know the difference?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: It was funded but we didn't know how much we needed. The department advises me that, whilst detailed cost estimates are not available, they expect it will be \$2.1 million.

MOUNT GAMBIER RENAL DIALYSIS UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): I have a supplementary question arising from the answer: when are you going to stop misleading parliament, minister?

The PRESIDENT: I am not going to allow that question.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:15): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Would the minister provide the chamber with more information about the announcement earlier today about the record number of visitation nights associated with the Santos Tour Down Under earlier this year?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for his very important question. The 20th Santos Tour Down Under (TDU) was held from 13 to 21 January 2018. Today, I was pleased to be joined by Mike Turtur and the SATC to announce that the 2018 event generated a record \$63.7 million in economic benefit for South Australia.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson: Under the previous Labor government.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: This year's event marked 20 years since the inauguration of the event in 1999 under a Liberal government, Mr Hanson—maybe when you were still in short pants, I know, but it was 20 years ago.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I do beg your pardon, I am sure Mr Hanson was still in short pants when this event was started some 20 years ago. I don't think any of us could have predicted the heights the TDU would reach some two decades on. It is certainly an exceptional example of how powerful these events are for the state's economy and community spirit. Some of the key results announced today include the economic impact of \$63.7 million, up 12.7 per cent from last year; 46,000 event visitors, up 7 per cent from 43,000 last year (2017); 810,000 spectators, and we acknowledge they were down 3.6 per cent from the 840,000 in 2017, but we had a couple of extreme weather days. All events that are held in January will occasionally be confronted with extreme hot weather.

I think there were 774 full-time job equivalents created, up 13 per cent on the previous year, and an average of 8.7 visitor bed nights, up 5 per cent from the previous year. With the exception of total spectators, all above indicators demonstrate strong growth and were records for the event. There were certainly some extreme conditions to contend with this year and it was the second hottest temperature in the race's 20-year history. Still though, fans came out to line the race routes and cheer the world's best riders, with over 46,000 visitors travelling from interstate and overseas just to attend the event.

The event generated more than 27,500 items of media coverage, with a potential reach of some 558 million people. International print media coverage appeared in 46 countries around the world and across 566 different publications and 882 hours of broadcast TV were screened across

190 territories, with a potential audience of 1.087 billion people. This year, the festival of cycling kicked off with a city tour of Adelaide village, with a teams presentation and a free concert by the South Australian ARIA award winning artist, Guy Sebastian.

Local communities relished the atmosphere, with successful street parties held in Prospect, Unley, Norwood and Glenelg across the nine days of the festival, with various associated events in the regions. South African Daryl Impey won the event for the first time, ahead of the 2017 winner from Tasmania, Richie Porte, and the 2013 winner, Tom-Jelte Slagter from the Netherlands.

Three-time reigning world champion, Peter Sagan, returned to the TDU for the second consecutive year, participating in his only race in Australia for the season with his team. His presence was a key contributor to the strong visitation for the event and his social media reached more than one million followers on Facebook alone and helped showcase Adelaide and South Australia strongly again.

The 2018 Santos Women's Tour Down Under saw an increase in status to UCI 2.1 level, bringing it one step closer to the UCI Women's World Tour level. This resulted in greater UCI points and prize money being offered for the women's teams to help attract an even stronger field of international teams from Australia, Denmark, Great Britain, Italy, New Zealand, the Netherlands and the United States. Ten of these were UCI women's teams, compared with eight in 2017, and five of them ranked in the world's top 10 teams, compared to four in 2017. Amanda Spratt from New South Wales won the WTDU for the second consecutive year.

Exciting new initiatives this year included the TDU After Dark program, which was promoted as evening content in the City of Adelaide Tour Village and CBD on seven different nights of the event week. Those included Roller Frenzy X, an established 500-metre roller—bike trainer—challenge in collaboration with the Port Adelaide Cycling Club. There was also the VirtuGO legends race, a virtual cycling challenge showcasing Willunga Hill.

From a mass participation perspective, 702 riders took part in the Bupa Family Ride, prior to the People's Choice Classic, 108 more than 2017, representing an 18 per cent increase, while 371 children rode in the Bupa mini tour for kids stage in conjunction with stage 1, 85 less than 2017. Unfortunately, the Bupa Challenge Tour was cancelled as a result of the extreme heat experienced during the event week, a decision supported by all state emergency services bodies, with the heat eventually reaching 43.7 on that day.

With the completion of 20 editions of the TDU, some 1,106 unique riders have competed in the race, with approximately 16,024 kilometres covered across South Australia, while 10.5 million spectators have enjoyed the event over the last 20 years.

The 2019 Santos Tour Down Under will take place from 10 to 20 January 2019. Race routes for the men's and women's races will be announced somewhere between July and August. Our sights are firmly set on the next race, and we are committed to making the event bigger and better yet again. We are expecting bigger crowds and more competitors, with the women's peloton continuing in equal prize money at the 2019 Women's Tour Down Under.

Finally, a big thank you to all of those who made this year's event such a success, particularly those who came out to watch the race, and to all of the hardworking volunteers and staff at the South Australian Tourism Commission who make this event a world-class event that we are very proud of in South Australia.

MINISTER FOR TRADE, TOURISM AND INVESTMENT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:22): Will the minister be presenting all of his ministerial statements as Dorothy Dixers for the session of this parliament, or was that an aberration?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:22): I will answer the questions that I am asked as I see fit.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:22): Whilst on his feet, the minister said he was committed to making the next race, the TDU, bigger and better and that he has expectations it will be. What are

the initiatives that he will put in place as minister to drive the continued high growth in tourism outcomes which he has inherited from former minister Leon Bignell and his advocacy and leadership for this race?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:22): We have a range of initiatives that we are talking to the Tourism Commission about to make all of our events bigger and better. Of course, this event is one of those strange ones that started under a Liberal government—Mike Turtur came to the former Liberal government with an idea—and has enjoyed bipartisan support across the years. I think that is something South Australia should be proud of—that it has enjoyed bipartisan support—notwithstanding that I think on the day it was announced some members of the then opposition said to minister Joan Hall and I think maybe premier Olsen, 'What, a bike race? You're mad. Nobody will ever come to that.' Ten million visitors later, 10 million people have proved them wrong.

I am not going to be talking about the initiatives we will be rolling out in the coming months or even in the coming years. While this event is particularly good, actual growth in tourism numbers has been slipping behind the national average and our share of the national pie has been shrinking, as it has with exports, with population growth and on a whole range of measures. In fact, I suspect that's why we have lost one federal seat, because over the last 16 years we have continued to contract across a number of indicators and we are less important on the national stage than we were some 16 years—

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order, President, on relevance. I was asking about continued improved growth in tourism outcomes in the TDU, which the honourable minister was telling us about. What are your plans, minister, through you, Mr Chair?

The PRESIDENT: I understand the point of order, Hon. Mr Hunter. The Hon. Mr Hunter has a point.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: As I said earlier, we will be unrolling our plans—

The PRESIDENT: I am giving you some latitude, minister, but please stay on track with the point of his question.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Thank you. I won't be rolling out the specific plans to this particular opposition member today, but I will talk quickly, in a cycling vein, about a policy that we took to the election, which was to develop a touring route from Adelaide to Melbourne, a cycling route to capitalise on the wonderful tradition of the Tour Down Under and the Herald Sun Tour and join the two great cycling states in a new spirit of collaboration. The mob opposite, the opposition, when they were in government, had a sport of picking fights with other states. We have taken a different approach. I have gone to the Victorians—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Rolling over.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I have gone to the Victorians. We know how the former minister—I know it is rude to point, so I won't—deals with conflict. What sort of language do you use? Unparliamentary language! You were a disgrace to South Australia, an embarrassment to South Australia the way you conducted yourself as a minister.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: You were a disgrace.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, sit down, I've had enough. The Hon. Mr Pangallo.

MUSIC FESTIVAL PILL TESTING

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:25): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Hon. Stephen Wade, Minister for Health and Wellbeing, about pill testing at music events.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Recently, the ACT government allowed a trial of pill testing, a harm reduction service that analyses the contents of drugs to detect unknown or potentially lethal

substances in illicit drugs at a music festival known as Groovin the Moo. Police had agreed to turn a blind eye to the service, which was used by 128 participants. Of the samples tested, 50 per cent contained harmless substances; the rest was pure MDMA, also known as ecstasy or molly. Two samples were found to be deadly and were discarded, perhaps saving the lives of those who had them. Some hailed the trial a success.

At a dance festival a week later there was no pill testing; police seized thousands of drugs, hundreds sought treatment and three were taken to hospital. My question to the minister is: is his government considering implementing a pill testing trial at coming music events?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:27): I thank the honourable member for his question. The Marshall Liberal government has no plans for a pill testing trial. The fact that the ACT government has done this, and the fact that it is an Australian first, demonstrates the fact that it's not evidence based. We believe that such an approach sends the wrong message to people that illicit drugs can be safe. The fact that the police had to turn a blind eye, to me, is very concerning.

If a harm minimisation approach is well founded on evidence, then a government should have the courage to take it to the parliament and argue its case. The fact that law enforcement officers were asked to turn a blind eye, to me, raises concerns. I think it also raises concerns in terms of the message it sends to young people. We certainly have no intention of a trial in South Australia.

MUSIC FESTIVAL PILL TESTING

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:28): Supplementary: has the government been approached to conduct a trial in South Australia, has South Australia Police provided advice to the government about pill testing, and what is the nature of that advice?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:28): If I can answer on behalf of myself, I am not aware, in the two months since I was appointed as minister, of anybody approaching us in relation to pill testing, but I will certainly seek advice from my office and bring back an answer for the honourable member.

MUSIC FESTIVAL PILL TESTING

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:28): Supplementary arising from the original answer: where the minister stated that pill testing was not evidenced based, is he aware that the European Union has been pill testing for a long time, and is he cognisant of that evidence?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:28): I wasn't trying to suggest that there was nobody in the world who thought that pill testing wasn't efficacious. I made the point, coming out of the Hon. Mr Pangallo's question, that he was highlighting the fact that the ACT is an Australian first. That, to me, suggests that it is not well established and evidence based. I thank the honourable member for her reference and I will continue to look for strategies to reduce the impact of illicit drugs on Australians, but pill testing is not on my list of strategies.

HOSPITAL ACCREDITATION

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:29): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Last week, in question time, the minister said he would not be automatically releasing draft hospital accreditation reports he received despite his previous public calls for such reports to be publicly released. He indicated that he would only determine their release on their public interest, which he himself would determine. My question to the minister is: apart from the NRAH report, have there been other draft hospital accreditation reports received since he was the minister? Do they meet any of his public interest tests for release, and will he release them?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:30): Since I have been appointed minister, I am not aware of any Australian Council on Healthcare Standards accreditation reports in relation to any other hospitals, but I will check with my department and come back to the member with advice.

HOSPITAL ACCREDITATION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:31): A supplementary arising from the original answer: does the minister have any legal advice about his view that he will determine a public interest test before releasing them?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure that arises out of the answer, Leader of the Opposition. I am not going to allow it.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: You have an ample opportunity later to ask questions.

YOUNG ACHIEVER AWARDS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:31): My question is directly related to the Minister for Human Services. As a minister who is passionate about youth development and youth affairs, can the minister inform the chamber about the Channel 9 Young Achiever Awards?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:31): I thank the honourable member for her question. Yes, I am delighted to provide some information about the winners of the series of Channel 9 Young Achiever Awards, which was held last Friday night at the Hilton Hotel.

On behalf of the new government, the member for Adelaide was there to represent the Premier. As well as myself, there was also the member for Chaffey, the Hon. Tim Whetstone, and the member for Unley, the Hon. David Pisoni, who was a previous awardee some time ago, I understand, of an award in this range. The member for Chaffey was there to support a number of participants who were from his Riverland electorate.

There are probably about a dozen categories that are awarded to young people. I think it is fair to say that we were all in awe of the work that these young people have been involved in and the significant achievements that they have achieved at such a young age. There are a number of categories, for those who are not familiar with the awards, that cover the arts, environment, community, STEM and so forth.

From the successful winners, I would like to raise a few highlights. From my own Department of Human Services, the Aboriginal achievement award was presented to Christine Glenn, who is the founder of—someone will correct me if I pronounce this incorrectly—the Kaleteya Netball Club in our northern suburbs. She manages several teams and 200 members. She has also been the co-creator of the SA Aboriginal Junior Football Carnival. In 2016, she won the Australia Post One Netball Community Award, and she is clearly doing an amazing job in her community as well as being a mum to two small children.

There were a couple of other awardees, too. I was fortunate to be situated in the room right next to my DHS table, and I was able to meet all of the people who were working in my department, including two of the people who are on the panel. They said to me that they had a great deal of difficulty choosing between the awardees and so our congratulations go to all of those in relation to that particular award.

The Multicultural Youth South Australia Spirit of Resilience Award was awarded to Mimona Abdalla, a young lady whom I met last year who was participating in the YMCA Youth Parliament. Mimona is from Salisbury East. She migrated to Australia at a young age and founded Women of MYSA (Multicultural Youth SA) and co-organised last year's Miss Africa event. She participates in the Salisbury Youth Council and is currently studying health and medical science. She has been back to Sudan establishing English classes and wishes to practice medicine there soon. Clearly, we wish her all the best.

Sarah Hammond of Echunga has founded Kids Arthritis, Australia's first organisation dedicated to juvenile arthritis. Emily Rawlings of Whyalla has organised a range of community clean-ups and VANJAM—I assume the Hon. Tammy Franks would understand that sort of language—where local musicians raise funds towards specialised vehicles for local people with disabilities. Kira Bain of Ingle farm, a young Ngarrindjeri woman, is working to revitalise the language of the Adelaide Plains. She teaches Kurna through a range of schools and supports a number of young at-risk

Aboriginals. It is always a problem when you pick out certain winners, but I was not going to name them all for fear of raising the ire of those opposite.

The winner of the Small Business Achiever Award is Jordan Gruber, the founder of Frontier Microscopy, which uses robotics and artificial intelligence to manage asbestos issues. I am advised that this software saves lives during demolition activities. He left a role in the defence industry to pitch his idea to 30 investors and founded Frontier Microscopy. He has managed to raise \$400,000 in grants and investments and employs three engineers. He was the overall winner of the South Australian Young Achiever of the Year. We wish them all well.

NUCLEAR WASTE

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:36): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Tourism—my inaugural question of the Minister for Tourism—about tourism and nuclear waste.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: The federal government is pressing ahead with its plans to dump the nation's intermediate and low-level nuclear waste somewhere in South Australia, either near Kimba at the top of Eyre Peninsula or at Barndioota near Hawker in the Flinders Ranges. One of the main concerns expressed by locals about both sites, but particularly in relation to the Flinders Ranges proposal, is that it could adversely impact on tourism, which is a key part of the local economy. My questions are:

1. Has the minister commissioned any research on the potential impact on tourism of hosting Australia's national nuclear waste dump in South Australia's Flinders Ranges?

2. If not, will the minister now consider investigating this matter before the federal government makes its final decision?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:37): I thank the honourable member for his question. Certainly, there is a concern in the community, especially in the Flinders Ranges, if the low-level and intermediate waste dump or storage facility or disposal facility—

The Hon. M.C. Parnell: You can say 'dump'; I do.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Whatever it is called. I have had some representation on that. I have not had any from the Kimba community other than prior to the election. As members would know, the community was initially very divided. I don't think they are as divided as they were, so I had some representation from the Kimba community prior to the election.

I have not commissioned any further work on that but I do think it is an important issue. I will be having one of my regular meetings with the SATC in the next few days and I will certainly put it on their agenda if there has been any work done. We have this material, and we all agree that it needs to be dealt with in a sensible and responsible manner, but we also do not want it to impact on our great tourism assets. I thank the honourable member for his question and if I have any further information I will provide it to him.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Given the Minister for Police's office has advised that it is government policy that if an opposition MP asks for a briefing and visits then they will receive them, why has the minister not responded to the shadow minister for health's request to receive briefings and organise hospital visits, a request that was sent approximately 4½ weeks ago?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:39): I won't be distracted and suggest, 'How did I go getting my briefing with chief executive Swan when I asked 3½ years

ago?' What I will say is that I have already spoken to my chief executive to ensure that the visits by the opposition shadow minister are facilitated.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:40): A supplementary question: does the minister see it as the role of the chief executive to approve visits and briefings and has nothing to do with his minister's office?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:40): The fact of the matter is that the chief executive of Health manages the health networks, including the CEOs. A number of the requests were to meet with CEOs of LHNs; they all answer to the chief executive. I will certainly be facilitating the visits by the shadow minister. It's normal practice for those visits to be coordinated by the minister's office, but they will be facilitated.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:40): A supplementary question arising from the original answer: will the minister give an approximate time frame of what he thinks would be a reasonable request to be answered by his office and is he personally aware that the request has been made to his office for these briefings more than a month ago?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:41): I think today is 15 May and I think we were elected on 17 March, so it is less than two months since this government was elected. I must admit that our office is not fully staffed and does have a backlog in correspondence, but I can assure the honourable members opposite—and if they would like to convey this to the honourable member for Kaurua—that he will get a response.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:41): A supplementary arising from the original answer: is the minister personally aware of this request or not?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:42): Yes.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:42): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister advise the council of the government's plan for the hydrotherapy pool at the Repat hospital?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the minister answer. We still have time to get to another crossbencher.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Let the minister answer. Minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:43): I know that the honourable member who asked the question will be tantalised by the fresh information that will be provided to the house by this answer. After all, I can hear the member now; he is asking himself, 'When will the first patients be able to access that facility?' The answer to that question, of course, is 28 May, less than two weeks away.

Less than two weeks away, we will have 20 patients, who are currently using ViTA V—it's ViTA V; it might be ViTA 5; I am not sure what the 'V' is for. Anyway, these are public hospital patients who are currently being housed in the southern part of the ViTA complex. So, the barmy situation that I inherited as minister is that the former Labor government closed the Repat pool and we had about 20 rehabilitation patients in the southern part of the ViTA building. They are being bussed up the hill to the Flinders Medical Centre pool because they weren't willing to operate a pool which, as you would have seen on Channel 9, Channel 2 and goodness knows how many other networks on Sunday, was being maintained.

It was ready, willing and able to take patients, but no, this spiteful Labor government was willing to inconvenience inpatients on the very precinct that the pool existed. On 28 May, we are going to stop the barmy bus. We are going to have inpatients from the Repat site getting access to hydrotherapy pools 100 metres or so—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Sorry, through you, Mr President—the barmy bus will stop because we will have patients being able to access a pool on the same precinct. My understanding is that, on 28 May, it will also give the opportunity for people who have received acute services at the Flinders Medical Centre and other parts of the health network to get rehabilitation support.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order, Mr President: it's not parliamentary for the minister on his feet to have his back towards the chair. We reminded him of this last week. He should not turn his back on—

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

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I thank the honourable member for his coaching. I am trying to do better. I will try to do better. That was 28 May.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, do you have any more in response?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Yes, sorry. The point being that 28 May was stage 1, because what happens on 1 July is what I would call stage 2 of the reactivation of the hydrotherapy pool. We will have the joy—and honestly, the joy—to welcome back people whose services were basically closed down as a result of the callous former Labor government.

On Sunday, it was my pleasure to join the Premier in celebrating the fact that YWCA Encore will be able to return to delivering important services to women recovering from breast cancer as a result of the actions of the Marshall Liberal government to reactivate the hydrotherapy pool. The YWCA Encore group is only one of a number of community groups that were displaced. Of course, there will have to be discussions with those groups as to how many of them want to come back.

The Encore experience was interesting. They had their last class in early December 2017. In spite of the former government's approach that, 'There are lots of pools in the south, go find another pool', that group did not secure an appropriate site. Let's remember the situation for women recovering from breast cancer. It can be quite a confronting experience to go into a public pool and engage in rehabilitation programs, and they did not find an acceptable site—they did not find a site where it could work.

So, basically that Encore program has not been offered to women in the south since December last year. It's only going to be possible by the actions of the Marshall Liberal government delivering on our commitment to reactivate the hydrotherapy pool. That service is continuing to be available in the north and we will continue to make sure that that service and others are available in the south. The fact of the matter is that the hydrotherapy pool is a very good asset. Physiotherapists have told me that they regard it as one of the best hydrotherapy pools in the state. It has all of the weight-bearing lifts that a hydrotherapy pool might need, graded access and, for that matter, disability accessible facilities.

I am proud to be part of a government that is delivering on its commitments but doubly proud to be part of a government that is delivering on commitments to provide better community health care, not just in the acute phase but right across the continuum of care and right across the community.

LAND TAX

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:49): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question regarding land tax.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I understand the government intends to reduce the top land tax rate and to raise the threshold before land tax becomes payable. In a recent example that I became aware of involving a small business property, the site value of the land increased by 16 per cent, but the resultant land tax account increased by 21 per cent. Had the property moved to the next tax rate range, the increase in land tax would have been significantly higher. My question to the Treasurer is: will the government consider capping total land tax receipts at CPI or capping individual land tax increases for any ownership at CPI, and if not, why not?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:50): I thank the honourable member for his question, and in doing so acknowledge his many years of campaigning for land tax reform. Perhaps my first contact with the honourable member was before he was an honourable member and a member of the Land Tax Reform—

The Hon. S.G. Wade: He was honourable.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He was honourable, but he wasn't an honourable member at that stage—Land Tax Reform Association meetings of many hundreds of people in the north-eastern suburbs, in and around the Payneham and Glynde area and in the Norwood area and others. He, at that time, was associated with another former prominent member of parliament and members of the Liberal Party who were part of that campaign as well.

The honourable member has raised those issues with me obliquely in the past. I will certainly bring back a more detailed response to the honourable member's question. The problem with the first of the options that the honourable member has identified, that is, capping land tax at the CPI or some other indexation rate, is that there are some significant challenges and issues. As the honourable member would understand, land tax is pitched and set on 30 June of any particular year, and the estimates of Treasury are not always 100 per cent accurate in terms of what the land tax collections will be for the following 12 months. They do an estimate that is included in the budget, which may or may not be above the CPI level.

The issue would be, if you were to cap it at the CPI, do you cap it at the CPI at the start of the year, and if you do, how would you then apply that to the individual categories and properties within the various classifications? If you have set a 2 per cent cap, or something, in terms of total land tax collections, how would you allocate that between a small property and the land tax payable by the biggest commercial property owner, who might have tens or hundreds of millions of dollars of properties, paying land tax on that? Do you cap it at 2 per cent for everybody? What do you do if, at the end of that financial year, you haven't actually collected more than the capped rate?

More problematically, if, for example, the estimate was that there would be less than a 2 per cent increase in the total land tax collections for the year, but because of changes through the year you ended up collecting 10 per cent higher land tax collections for that particular year, would the government then be required to rebate in some way, and if you did that, how would you actually do it?

I think there are some practical questions with the first option, which I have discussed with the honourable member in years gone by, in terms of how that would actually be applied. I will take some advice on that and bring back a reply in relation to the practical questions, and I am happy to engage in further discussion with the honourable member on that.

The second one I will need to take a little bit more advice on, and that is in relation to CPI for individual land tax payers. The first issue I would raise there is that there are, again, some issues that would need to be considered before you went down that particular path. I am thinking of an example where you go above a particular threshold, let's say \$1 million dollars. In a particular year, a land tax payer's property was worth just under \$1 million and there was a 20 per cent increase in valuations in that year because it was a time of huge valuation increases and his or her property was capped at a 2 per cent CPI increase.

So, their property might have been worth just under \$1 million and is now worth \$1.1 million or \$1.2 million, but they have had their land tax capped at 2 per cent, and yet the person who already has a property at \$1.1 million somewhere else in the state and hasn't experienced a huge increase in valuations is paying land tax at the old rate, which hasn't been CPI capped. So, you might actually have two land tax payers with property of exactly the same value but, depending on when the

property valuation increases occurred, one of them might be paying a higher land tax rate than the other, even though they had property of exactly the same value.

I think these are the sorts of issues you would need to consider. I am happy to take some further advice and bring back a slightly more detailed reply for the member but, more importantly, I think, I am more than happy to sit down, as I have over the years, and engage in earnest and fruitful discussion with the honourable member about potential areas of land tax reform. I didn't get a chance, and I won't delay the house any further, but we do have a comprehensive land tax reform policy. The honourable member has, in brief, outlined that. Perhaps, on another occasion, if I am asked another question, I will expand in greater detail on the Marshall Liberal government's reform proposals for land tax.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 10 May 2018.)

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:55): In supporting the passage of the motion to note the Governor's speech, I wish to place on record my grateful thanks to the way in which His Excellency undertakes his work across this state. He and Mrs Le visit many parts of this state, but are also very gracious hosts to many people in the community who have never had a chance to visit Government House.

I have known His Excellency for many years. I first met him when he visited Gawler many years ago to assist the Gawler branch of what was then known as the Indo-Chinese Refugee Association, which has now changed its name to Australian Refugee Association. That branch did some wonderful work with people who were refugees from Vietnam who were in the Gawler area, and His Excellency did great work to assist those people, not only with learning the English language but also in becoming part of the general South Australian community.

It was also excellent to attend the service to mark the opening of the parliamentary year, conducted last Thursday by the Parliamentary Christian Fellowship under the new chairmanship of Mr Sam Duluk, the member for Waite. It was also conducted in cooperation, as has been the case under previous leaders of the group, with the leaders of Christian churches, and the Governor attended that. I must say that the Hon. Mr Hood and others, like myself, who have been involved for many years were delighted to see the larger numbers of not only members of parliament and leaders of churches but the general public who were there last Thursday morning. Once again, it was very good of the Governor to come along to that event, as well as a wide range of events within the South Australian community.

Sir, I wish to once again extend my congratulations to you, and I am delighted that in the early days of your presidency you are showing the level of integrity and honour that has been a highlight of your career and your community work. It is always a pleasure to go to events such as the ANZAC vigil in Smithfield, where your links with the community are demonstrated. I congratulate you on your appointment to the presidency of this chamber.

I would also like to extend a welcome to all the new members of this chamber. If I run around the chamber from my right, we have the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Frank Pangallo, the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos, the Hon. Emily Bourke and the Hon. Clare Scriven. I welcome them all to the chamber. I am sure they will all keep me and others who have been here a bit longer on our toes.

Before the election, someone I was hosting in the lounge asked me how many members of the Legislative Council I had served with, so I looked at the mugshots and counted them up. It was just after the Hon. Mr Hanson had arrived and I think at that stage the number had reached 49, so now it would be well over 50 in the 20½ years that I have been here. That is a rather large turnover, really—much larger than was probably the case many years ago. I welcome all the new members and look forward to working with them, whether it be on committees or in this chamber. As this is my first opportunity, I would also like to extend a welcome to the Hon. Dennis Hood to the Liberal Party ranks.

I want to make some remarks in relation to His Excellency's speech, which outlined the government's program for the next four years. One of the first items I would like to highlight is the point about the government implementing targeted policies to reduce South Australia's demographic imbalance and to grow the state's population. That is one policy that is really important not only to me but also to the younger generations. I now have five grandchildren and I want a promising future for them—hopefully for all of them—in South Australia. I really do think that is an important point.

It was pointed out to me last year that, in 1993, Western Australia and South Australia had the same number of seats in the federal parliament, with 13 seats each. Now, 25 years later, Western Australia has 16 seats in the lower house of the federal parliament and South Australia has 10. I think that is a pretty stark demonstration of the fact that over 25 years our population, without going backwards, has had a very, very low growth rate. Of course, that has been exacerbated particularly over the last 16 years where we have had a Labor government that has had no interest in making this state grow. Unfortunately, many people have had to leave the state. One of my children did that and was gone for a while but, thankfully, has returned. That is something this government very genuinely believes in doing something about.

No-one who knows me well would be surprised to know that I am delighted with the government's focus on the regions. As someone who headed up a regional communities task force when I was first elected under premier Olsen and deputy premier Kerin, who was also convener of the regional development council and chair of the regional development issues group, I am delighted that this government has such a strong focus on a great part of South Australia. It is a part of South Australia that everybody in the metropolitan area enjoys when they get the opportunity to go there, because the communities are of great strength.

As was highlighted by the member for Narungga in his maiden speech today, we have fabulous parts of magnificent coastline in this state, as well as fabulous river frontage, but we also have some of the best communities that you could ever want to live in, and we need to support them far better than has been done over the last 16 years in particular.

The government is keen on the regions having safe and efficient infrastructure to grow the important contribution they already make to the economy. The establishment of a regional roads and infrastructure fund as a dedicated funding stream for regional infrastructure is something that I worked hard to achieve in the days when I was the shadow minister for regional development. It took us a while to get to the stage where we are now, but I am delighted that that has been achieved and that we are now in government and are able to implement that. Another area that has been developing for a while is the Regional Growth Fund, which will be created to inject \$150 million over 10 years to support employment and, importantly, that community growth.

The emphasis in the Governor's speech about the plans of the Marshall Liberal government to support the most vulnerable in our statewide community is also very high on my radar. I think this is something that we need to do to enhance this community for future generations. I note the plans for legislation to provide legal safeguards for adults who are vulnerable to abuse or neglect; the protection of children from bullying; the Disability Inclusion Bill, which has already been introduced by the Minister for Human Services; the establishment of a community visitors scheme for people living with a disability; and the appointment of a commission to help improve the safety and wellbeing of Aboriginal children and young people.

In the health area, there is the development of public health services to provide quality and safe care for people when they need it, the restoration of a focus on quality care and patient safety, and the decentralisation of the public health system through the establishment of metropolitan and regional boards of management. This puts real responsibility and accountability back at the local level. In so many of the communities that I know well and work in, there is that ownership of the local hospital or health facilities, which has been undermined under the Labor government without a shadow of a doubt. I think that is a key point in the policy that was taken to the election and demonstrated as a policy of the new government.

We heard today from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing that the improvement of patient safety is so important. We have seen so many policies that have threatened the safety of patients in a range of ways. We heard today about the Modbury Hospital. I have been working in the north-eastern suburbs of this city since before the 1996 federal election, and I saw the significant

campaigns run by the Labor Party about Modbury and the private management of Modbury under the Brown-Olsen government. However, the way in which the Labor Party has treated Modbury Hospital, where it had about 14 different directions for that hospital in 15 years, was appalling.

The bottom line of all that bad treatment of the people who rely on the Modbury Hospital is the fact that the member for Florey now sits as an Independent because she got sick of the way the Labor Party treated the Modbury Hospital and the people who relied on it. It is not just the people of the north-eastern suburbs. A significant number of people who live in the northern part of the Adelaide Hills rely on Modbury, and have done for many years.

Since the creation of the Modbury Hospital, all of the people in the areas of Mount Pleasant, Birdwood, Gumeracha and even Williamstown—lots of those southern Barossa places—have all come to the Modbury Hospital. Now, if they go to the Modbury Hospital, there is a very strong chance that they will finish up in the Lyell McEwin. They feel at home at Modbury. There is nothing against the siting of the Lyell McEwin where it is, but they feel a lot further away from home at the Lyell McEwin Hospital in Elizabeth Vale than they do at Modbury, and that is something we need to go back to, not taking people out of their localities, for the best health care we can give them.

Obviously, the other things that have been mentioned have been the reopening of key health facilities at the Repat, the establishment of the high dependency unit at Modbury and, I think, the public release of information about outpatient clinic waiting times. There are many other initiatives in the health area about which I am very pleased and on which I am very keen to work with the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Another key area, of course, for me is the appointment a few weeks ago as the Premier's advocate for suicide prevention and, in that, the development and chairmanship of the Premier's Council on Suicide Prevention. I am working very closely with both the Premier and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing as we put together the very important but small resources that I will have in assisting me in that role as we work towards the announcement of that Premier's Council on Suicide Prevention.

I appreciate the support of the minister as I look to enhance the work that has already been done by the Suicide Prevention Unit within the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist. In due course, that group of very hardworking people—a very small unit but made up of people who have done a great job in the development of suicide prevention networks—will transfer across to Wellbeing SA.

In that role, obviously, I will work very closely with the large number of networks—I think it is in the high 30s at the moment—in South Australia, including those which have been working for a number of years and others that are very much still in the development phase. It includes not only the ones developed by the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist but also those done through federal funding via the Wesley LifeForce organisation based in Sydney.

I want to work closely with all of those groups and make sure that we have more communication in the way they all operate—generally that has been the case, but not always. There are many other associated groups in the provision of suicide prevention and, very importantly, in the postvention area, because the area of dealing with the families that have been bereaved by suicide is one of the most important areas. Very sadly, far too many families have lost more than one member to suicide. Only last year, I heard of a family that had lost three generations to suicide. That is something we have to do everything we can to stop, and I will dedicate myself to working in that area.

I think there is great potential to develop more links through many of the football and sporting clubs around South Australia. On Saturday, I was privileged to attend the annual suicide prevention round that is run by the Gawler Central and South Gawler football clubs in the Barossa Light and Gawler Football Association. Both clubs have been hit very hard in recent years by suicide. I commend them for the work they do with the local Gawler Suicide Prevention Community Group in that promotion.

There is also potential in the multicultural area. On Saturday, I spoke at the 10th settlement celebrations of the Bhutanese community in South Australia. Like many of those communities that have come to this country in recent years, some of the community attitudes to mental health, suicide

and, indeed, domestic violence and many other social issues are not as advanced as we would like them to be.

In the general community, awareness of mental health, suicide and many other issues has come a long way, but certainly a lot of those communities have shown a willingness to work with me in that area. That is something that I will prioritise, as well as other areas that have significantly higher rates of suicide—the veterans' community, the Indigenous community and also, of course, the LGBTIQ community. I have a strong interest in making sure that we do a lot of work with all of those groups.

In the near future, I will be engaging with all members of parliament in this state, including federal members, to see what more they can do. I have to say that there are many here and in the other chamber and in the federal sphere who have been very supportive of my work. There are others who have not done that, but I think over the time I have done this work, some who were indifferent at first, when they see the impact of suicide in their communities, have come on board very strongly. So, I will be engaging with every member of parliament to see what they can do with their individual networks and contacts. Some have been very close to the suicide prevention networks in their own areas and to other groups that work in mental health, and I will be pleased to learn from their experiences.

Indeed, in local government, many of the local councils have played a really good role in the establishment of suicide prevention networks, but there are others that have not seen the benefit of that and we will need to work with those councils to see if we can change that mindset. The value of these community people across the state is enormous. We have a lot more to do with the development of networks. I give the previous government credit for the work they did. When I started this work, they would not give a cracker to suicide prevention, but that changed. We need to continue that change, but the development of these groups can be enhanced. It is my hope and wish to continue to do that significantly.

In closing, I think the work that I am being supported to do, as the Premier's advocate for suicide prevention, is a great indication that the Liberal government, under Steven Marshall, has acted very early in its commitment to preventative health and wellbeing in this state. I am very happy, at any stage, to discuss with members of this chamber or anyone else the ways in which we can advance suicide prevention but also any other issues to do with how better we bring forward awareness about mental illness generally and any of the other social issues like domestic violence and drugs that are so intertwined with mental illness and, unfortunately, suicide. With those words, I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (16:20): First, I would like to thank His Excellency the Governor for discharging his delivery of his speech on the opening of this Fifty-Fourth Parliament of South Australia. I would also like to commend yourself, Mr President, on your elevation to President. I hope you will be able to maintain the integrity of this chamber as your predecessor did. Less refined members of this chamber probably would not even know that fine piece of attire, the jabot, that you have added to your gown, and I must compliment you on your very refined look.

I would also like to express my congratulations to the newly elected members of this chamber, and I would especially like to welcome my three colleagues on the Labor side: the Hon. Ms Clare Scriven, the Hon. Ms Emily Bourke, and the Hon. Ms Irene Pnevmatikos. I would also like to congratulate the Hon. Ms Connie Bonaros on her elevation, as well as the Hon. Frank Pangallo. I have known Connie for quite a few years and have worked with her when I was a minister, and I know that the expertise she gained before coming to this place will serve this council well. All the experience that the Hon. Mr Pangallo has had over his years as a journalist will, I am sure, also serve this council well.

I would like to reflect on two previous members who are no longer here. The first is the Hon. Ms Kelly Vincent, who was a real inspiration to everyone in this chamber. She truly reflected what the people of South Australia would expect of a member of this council. The Hon. Mr Robert Brokenshire was a true character. He gave me a lot of grief when I was President but he was a decent human being and he will be truly missed. Of course, now that the Hon. Mr Hood is a member of the Liberal Party we have one less party in this chamber, the Australian Conservatives, but I think it was a wise move by the Hon. Mr Hood, and I congratulate him on that move.

I would also like to congratulate the Hon. Mr John Dawkins on being appointed head of the task force looking into suicide prevention. The Hon. Mr Dawkins has a long history of working to help people with issues that may lead them to commit suicide, and I am sure his valuable knowledge will serve that task force very well. I must say that our Legislative Council team has a good mix of experience and new members with new ideas, and that will serve us well into the future.

Our role as opposition will be to scrutinise the work of the new government and review legislation from another place as well as legislation introduced in this place. Our task, as it were, is to hold this new government to account on behalf of all South Australians. Although we will not oppose for the sake of opposing, should a government bill be brought before this chamber that could have an adverse effect on the quality of life of South Australians, then this government can expect fierce and fiery debate and scrutiny from this opposition.

I would now like to refer to the Liberals' first 100 days, which includes a promise to establish a local government rate capping scheme. I would like to point out to this government that six out of 10 South Australians voted for a political party opposed to rate capping. The truth of the matter is that rate capping does not work. It is a populist motion and I believe it was just a thought bubble that went through the minds of the opposition before the election as they tried to put some sort of substance to their reduction in the cost of living.

I will go through a brochure that I have here from the Australian Services Union. The Australian Services Union and the Australian Workers Union are the two major unions in the local government industry. Both are very strong unions that have a great record of looking after their members in local government, as well as the interests of the community. Obviously, this Liberal government has this idea that local government is only concerned with the three Rs: rates, rubbish and roads.

I would like to go through a number of the services that local government provides to people and their communities. Of course, there is roads and footpaths, libraries, parks and gardens, sporting facilities, aquatic centres, home support, community centres, dog parks and open space, clean streets, health education, jetties and coastal parks, playgrounds, youth centres, new parent support, waste collection, and festivals and events. These are just some of the essential services that make a community whole and, when we cap council rates, we cap our communities' potential to grow.

I would like to draw the chamber's attention to examples from the United Kingdom whereby councils had to introduce fees for service or, in some extreme cases, have privatised local libraries. I ask members opposite to carefully consider this for a moment: imagine your local council in a position where it had no choice but to privatise its local library. Public libraries are a lifeline to people from all backgrounds, from young mums who are introducing their babies to the world of story time to pensioners who can enjoy an incredible catalogue of books, DVDs and CDs from all over the world.

Libraries are inclusive and promote connectivity within communities. Our public libraries are a place of learning, a place to provide our community with the opportunity to develop a deeper knowledge of the world that we live in. For some people, were it not for libraries that provide free internet and PC services, they would find themselves cut off from modern technology and totally isolated. We have seen examples from New South Wales and Victoria where the introduction of rate capping has meant the declining financial sustainability of councils and, furthermore, a declining capacity to deliver the services those communities need and rely on.

As a former union official and a member of the Labor movement, it is of course in my DNA to fight for the interests of working people and communities, especially workers who will be adversely impacted by rate capping. A reduction in services will mean job losses, an increase to insecure work arrangements and little or no wage growth.

Once again, interstate experience has shown that rate capping is used by councils in enterprise bargaining negotiations as a reason that they cannot offer a fair wage increase and that they require a flexible and casual workforce. Ultimately, where a council must cap a variable component then that council must charge for other services. When a council has to start charging for services that have previously been free of charge then it becomes a user-pays system.

Rate capping will hurt the members of our community who can least afford it. Furthermore, as other—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Mr President, I can't hear myself speak half the time.

The PRESIDENT: Members, show the Hon. Mr Wortley some courtesy.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Thank you for your kind protection. Furthermore, other fees and charges imposed by councils increased by much more than the council rates. Consumers are ultimately still being charged more. I think this policy is a very poorly thought out policy. There are other ways for councils to improve accountability, such as a thorough engagement with the public and financial planning and oversight to ensure that ratepayers are getting value for their dollar. I call upon the Liberal government to work with other political parties in this place and look at a meaningful reform in a bipartisan way. Rate capping is a quick fix and will not have the effect that the Liberals promise.

I now turn my attention to another Liberal Party policy: the deregulation of retail shop trading hours. The new government has specifically promised to introduce amendments to the Shop Trading Hours Act 1977. A number of my colleagues have already spoken on this issue and placed their views on the record, and I plan to join them now. A key challenge when approaching deregulation of the existing trading hours is to ensure that small and local businesses are not undermined as they currently enjoy protection under the current laws.

Campaigns in favour of deregulation of trading hours tend to be driven by the major supermarket chains, in particular Coles and Woolworths. Independent stores and retailers employ approximately 15,000 people in South Australia. The high market share in South Australia for independent retailers provides a positive benefit for our local economy and allows for increased consumer choice. I have not seen any evidence that the proposed new changes in regulation will definitely not negatively affect small or independent businesses. The Liberal government cannot point to a proven consumer benefit from deregulation in a jurisdiction such as South Australia. However, what is known is that local independently-owned businesses will start losing their customers to the large retail giants and this will have an adverse effect on both consumer choice and on employment in our state.

My other main concern is for the welfare of retail workers should this policy be introduced. In January this year, ReachTEL was commissioned to conduct a survey of approximately 1,000 respondents across South Australia to gauge public opinion about deregulation. Statements were provided such as:

I have a young family and treasure weekends and public holidays spending time with them.

This was by Dino. Susan stated:

...as a mum of 4 kids, I already miss too many soccer games and do not want to miss out on any more special milestones. My family matters as much as yours Mr Marshall.

Of particular concern to me were statements provided by sole parents, including Helen, who stated:

I am a sole parent of a four year old and already work unfriendly family hours—this will devastate me if the hours change.

A statement from Lee also pointed out that:

It's not fair on families. There are no childcare facilities at night so it's not good for single parent families.

These testimonies are powerful and cut to the very heart of what is at stake here for retail workers: time with their families, time with their precious children, and time to relax with their loved ones and recuperate from busy work periods.

It also concerns me that in the short time the Liberals have been in government already complacency and arrogance is starting to set in. For instance, in this chamber the Hon. Mr Wade has been asked on numerous occasions for guarantees with regard to privatisation and guarantees on transparency and public disclosure. At almost no time has he been honest with this chamber and given us an answer that we can believe. It is a bit of a worry for someone like the Hon. Mr Wade,

who was so fierce in his views on transparency and accountability prior to the election, that we get no comfort from any answers that he gives us in this chamber.

I also mention the Hon. Mr Ridgway. I was having a chat with the Hon. Mr Ridgway only last week about XXXX—not the beer, but his shirt size. These very large shirts have very wide necks. I was trying to give him some locations where he could buy these shirts. It suddenly occurred to me that in such a short amount of time, the Hon. Mr Ridgway has only thought about his first trip into China and is already planning his next two or three trips.

The PRESIDENT: You are skating on thin ice here, the Hon. Mr Wortley. Please restrain your injurious comments on other members.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Time will show. The Labor government never treated their positions with such a sense of privilege or entitlement.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: Kevin Foley went to New York for an hour before he went on a cruise for a week in the Caribbean.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Will I get your protection, Mr President?

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: No.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: These wild interjections are a little bit too much to bear. It does worry me that already the sense of entitlement and privilege has crept into the ranks of the Liberal government. It will be up to us in this chamber to pull them in and make them accountable to the people of South Australia. With that, Mr President, it gives me great pleasure to support the Address in Reply and wish you a very productive four years coming.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:36): Firstly, I wish to congratulate and thank the Governor, His Excellency Hieu Van Le, for his address on the opening of the First Session of the Fifty-Fourth Parliament. It is interesting reading the media this week around the incredible story of Meghan Markle and her association with our royal family back in England, and then, of course, reading His Excellency's personal story, being one of incredible achievement. Pardon my bias, but I think that His Excellency comes off a little better of the two. I believe His Excellency Hieu Van Le will continue to serve our wonderful state with great passion and enthusiasm, as he has done in the past, and possibly long into the future.

I would like to take this moment also, as many have, Mr President, to congratulate you on your ascension—or perhaps I could cheekily say exodus—to the role of president. I know that many will be missing your deliberative matters of interest speeches on this floor. I will certainly miss those cutting supplementary observations to otherwise fairly predictable Dorothy Dixers. I hate to think what the Hon. Mr Ridgway would be facing now should you still be on the floor. I will be keenly awaiting your return. Until then, like many others who have made such observations here, I am certain that you will conduct yourself in the role with great aplomb, and I agree with the Hon. Mr Hood about that word.

It has already been discussed at length in the media and in this place, but it is important, I feel, that I also formally mention and acknowledge the Hon. Ms Kelly Vincent, who was unsuccessful at the last election. Kelly was a great asset to this place and always fought hard for those in our community with a disability or who had a concern that needed a voice, something I am certain everyone in this chamber aspires to do, but she did.

Kelly was, and will continue to be, a strong advocate for inclusion and people with a disability. Those who were here during her term far longer than I was can say, and have said, more words than possibly I need to or can say here. If a measure of your achievements is how many people remember you after you have gone, then clearly Kelly achieved much, and must have a lot more to give, given her age. I certainly hope so. In an age when often the younger you are, the less engaged in democracies you are, I think Kelly has been a shining light to the South Australian democracy.

I also wish to acknowledge the Hon. Robert Brokenshire and wish him all the best in his future endeavours, most likely spending his days tending to his often-mentioned dairy cows in Mount Compass. While he and I could rarely agree, for instance, on the colour of an orange, his service to

this place and as a servant of the South Australian people is laudable and speaks of a life dedicated to something greater than himself. Those cows he has are very lucky to have him.

I would like to convey my congratulations to our three newly elected Labor members of the Legislative Council. The first is the deputy leader in the Legislative Council, shadow minister for industry skills and shadow minister for forestry, the Hon. Clare Scriven. I have had the great fortune of working closely with Clare over the last few weeks in her new role as deputy leader in the Legislative Council. I can see that she is doing very well in the role and I have full confidence in her leadership and shadow ministry skills. I am sure she will further develop and mature in these roles. As she outlined in her first speech, I believe her previous experience will aid her greatly in her roles.

Along with Clare, I would like to acknowledge the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos—it is 'Pnevmatikos' to everybody else—another newly elected member of the Legislative Council. Irene has worked hard all her life to fight for and protect workers' rights in her role as a lawyer, fiercely fighting for those in our community who need a voice. I am sure she will continue this hard work in this place, never giving up the fight to protect workers, no matter what their industry or circumstance.

I would also like to acknowledge my currently absent colleague, the Hon. Emily Bourke. Emily spent her early years sharpening her media skills, working for the Yorke Peninsula newspaper, the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times*, and later taking these skills with her when she began as an advisor with the former great premier Jay Weatherill. Emily will be an asset to this place as she knows the struggles and strengths of regional South Australia. I look forward to getting out to the regions—especially Yorke Peninsula—with Emily to engage with these local communities.

I also give special mention, as others have, to those from the ALP who did not contest the 2018 state election and dedicated so much of their working lives to this place. Of course, I speak of John Gazzola and Gail Gago in particular. They were both first elected in 2002 to represent South Australian communities, probably not knowing at the time just how lucky they were going to be in terms of their careers. I would like to personally thank both Gail and John for all their hard work and commitment to service. It is quite easy to be glib about serving in this place, but I can tell you that the long hours were taxing on both of them at different times, for different reasons.

I would also like to thank John Gazzola for his service as secretary of the Australian Services Union, which represents workers in the white-collar services of local government. As members here would know, this is a tier of government that is very close to my heart. The Australian Services Union is now being led by the very capable and talented Abbie Spencer and Scott Cowen, both of whom will be taking the fight—as did Gail and John—to this government over rate capping and slashing services in local government, which is a fine segue into addressing the government's new attitude to councils in this state.

I have read many of the comments of those in the other place on this issue and, from what I can tell, it actually seems, even now, to be a fairly vexed internal issue. Certainly, there is expressed concern about regional investment and about the status of regional jobs, should rate capping be introduced, and rightfully so I might say. It appears from comments made by the new government that it has concerns about council spending on matters it considers to be non-core business.

Rather than simply make the rather obvious observations about the cost-shifting disasters of rate capping that have occurred interstate, I will instead make the following observation. Every year, when your rates envelope arrives in your letterbox, I am sure everyone here and, indeed, most South Australians do not read the contents with any great joy or sense of fulfilment. I think the same could also be said whenever we receive any notice of the rising cost of our lives—certainly power bills, water bills or any other bill that arrives by mail.

However, I think it is worth saying that I encourage this new government to think again, as a result of what has come out of this election, if it thinks it has anything more than its political messaging on point in regard to rate capping. Without being too obvious about this, the fact that people do not like paying bills is a bit of an easy political point to make, but alleging that therefore any cap will solve all the problems that may exist in the local government community—like golf memberships, trips overseas or mismanagement of council budgets, for example—is another issue entirely.

I am aware that in 2013 there was an expert panel on local government reform. I encourage the new government to seek out the advice provided by this panel to provide a remedy to its

grievances with the local government community and the alleged mismanagement therein. The report recommends a whole range of other things that should be done to improve the democracy, accountability and financial management of local councils.

These are all tools that are very helpful and instructive in terms of governance. These things that the new government might want to look at include better financial oversight, reforms to council elections, performance monitoring of councils, meaningful community engagement and work between councils to get better efficiencies in services, such as rubbish collection.

It is clear to me that the problem the new government has, and indeed many people who I have spoken to have, with local government is one of governance. Certainly, from the speeches I have read of its own regional Liberal members in the other place, a blanket approach is not supported if it will result in degrading services and infrastructure in those communities, particularly regional road networks. Rightfully so, because what is financially good in terms of infrastructure and services for Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Adelaide or Kangaroo Island will be as varied as the geography that makes up those locations. In terms of good governance, however, there should be no difference between any of them, and it is to this end—better governance—that I would direct all members of this place with respect to this matter.

It is with great pleasure that I can look around this chamber and see seven female members of the Legislative Council. I knew when writing this that they may not be here when I said it, and I thought I would adjust what I was going to say, and I forgot to do that. While I think this is a positive development in terms of diversity, I think it would be easy to make the fairly obvious beneficial points here in terms of representation and gender diversity, so perhaps instead I might make the following observation.

The notion of a work-life balance is a common yet still misunderstood phrase of this decade and perhaps even of the last. If this chamber and the other place are still very much devoid of women then it also means something else, which is that the homes of many who are here are devoid of the fathers, brothers and uncles, all of whom I am certain would very much prefer to spend time with their families than debating things with me at odd hours of the morning, as strange as I might find that.

One of the great male-dominated industries, manufacturing, has been in decline or change for many years now. In the same time, the service economy, a much more gender-varied workplace, has exploded into an expansion of sorts. Despite this, we continue to see the same outcome across the workforce, repeated accurately in this workplace as in any other—that is, you see men at work and women performing the primary caregiving role.

As an aside to this, I note that it has been advocated by those opposite that the workplace has changed and that we allegedly live in a 24/7 economy where shop trading hours should reflect some brave or perhaps not so brave new world. I wonder about the common sense of this approach that is allegedly creating more jobs in the service economy. While I remain unconvinced about the facts behind deregulating shop trading hours generally, particularly given that I have travelled much of the world and have observed that Sundays and public holidays are commonly associated with shop closures, what I wish to say now is in the context of what I have just said about work-life balance. If we really are about change in the workplace and creating better jobs that promote healthier families, something I am certain everyone here actually wants, then does making people work on public holidays assist in this or detract from it?

As I said earlier, this is not so much an observation solely about the representation of women in this chamber but also the question of how many men would prefer to spend more family-friendly hours sharing the load with their partner or wife or family. The question must be asked at some point, I believe, of whether we are making workplaces that encourage the kind of life we all profess to want or whether we are in fact doing the maddest thing possible of not changing anything and expecting a different result.

Moving on from those observations, I note that the government states that it has met with the federal government since being elected, and this, of course, is a good thing. This is most certainly required, since South Australia has some significant challenges ahead of it no matter the stripe of those who might occupy the Treasury benches. However, I have to observe with some sadness that

many of these challenges are made a lot harder by the current federal Coalition government, a government which, in my opinion, is wreaking havoc on the state's finances by historically abandoning previous commitments to various partnership agreements, particularly in health and education and, more noticeably, with the ongoing delay and destruction they wreak on the superb workforce at ASC Shipbuilding.

Particularly disappointing has been the complete failure of the federal government in ignoring the regions in SA. It would not have escaped the notice of the electors in Frome that it was only the state government that stepped up to the plate in underwriting the reinvestment in that community. Equally, the electors in Giles resoundingly returned Labor again, and we have seen Labor retain the seat of Mawson, even though it includes the very regional voters of Kangaroo Island.

It certainly did not escape the notice of electors in the federal seat of Grey at the last election when they reduced the margin to the lowest it has been, I think, in over three decades. I mention all this because I hope it is something of a warning to our new state government, that being the fairly glib concept: don't take the regions for granted just because the federal government does. I hope to see the Marshall government take a stronger stance against the federal government than it has recently shown in its stony silence about the Holden's closure, the Arrium administration and, most recently, the federal budget infrastructure grants regarding South Road.

In a distinctly more metropolitan vein, the recent silence of our new state government on the 200 workers being sacked at ASC was as concerning as it was, unfortunately, intriguing. It is a trend to which not just those in this place but many South Australians will be paying close attention. They may well ask themselves: who is giving orders to our new Premier—them or someone else?

While there is no doubt that I am being more than a little combative in my previous comments, I do rush to add that I am so combative because this really should not be up for debate. I would not ask any state government to not cooperate with our federal colleagues, no matter who occupies the Treasury benches, but there is a distinct air to our new government of asking how high the federal government would like our new state government to jump or, to perhaps put this metaphor more practically, how silent would the federal government like our state government to be on issues that are critical to South Australians in favour of interstate political expediency?

While the political levers surrounding some matters will, no doubt, change, given the priorities of any new government, I cannot stress enough that now is not the time to take our eye off the need for continuing pressure for federal government support. It is trite but accurate to state that South Australia is an economy in transition. Co-investment into sectors of the economy to drive private investment and micro-economic reform has been a hallmark of economic growth in South Australia since the Labor government first came into office in the early 2000s. It is something of which we, from the speeches that have been given, are incredibly proud, and so we should be.

While creating jobs in macro or regional sectors is one thing, it is important to also remember that investment in the public realm creates the kind of city in which we would all like to live or visit. It has been noted by many from my party in the other place that the former Labor administration oversaw a redeveloped Adelaide Oval, the Riverbank Precinct, Convention Centre and Festival Plaza. More than that, we were consistently rated in *The Economist* and *Lonely Planet* as the fifth (and other various rankings below 10) most liveable city in the world over the last six years running.

It has been Labor's investment of more than \$33 billion into the South Australian economy over its 16 years that has kept hospitals, roads, schools and public transport growing to serve its citizens and to keep its private companies well serviced. It was not that long ago—roughly when I was entering this place a year ago—that many of those who formed this new government were predicting something of an end to the South Australian economy, that the closure of Holden's and the uncertainty surrounding the submarines would soon create double digit unemployment and that the challenge was too great for any government to face.

I am proud the Labor government kept its hands on the wheel, that it made record investments in infrastructure and kept a focus on sound industry policy that, yes, occasionally required investment in growth sectors. The fact is that, while the Marshall government is stating that private business should not look to taxpayers for financial support, we see in this state that that kind

of support and priority is a significant factor in creating the positive business environment in a transitioning economy that we now see after 16 years of Labor government.

In summing-up, it is clear to me that the new government may need to soon review its stated intention to take its hands off the wheel, that it may need to think about what kinds of jobs the private sector would create and how desirable they will be without regulation or intervention. It may need to think about how small tasks, like regional road investment or local services, are best governed and by whom, not just about how much they might spend. It may need to stop meeting with the federal government and instead start demanding or, at the least, seeking more than just what is given. It may need to start looking to its regional voters who are crying out for ongoing investment and regional jobs and review its stated intention to tell them to look elsewhere. In that regard, I support the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher.

At 16:55 the council adjourned until Wednesday 16 May 2018 at 14:15.