

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 16 May 2018

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

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

Bills

ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:31): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The legislation I bring in today mirrors some work done last year as part of the then minister's Statutes Amendment (Drink and Drug Driving) Bill. That particular bill, ultimately successful, had a fairly tortuous passage through the houses, during which time some good measures, including the one I will outline today, were eventually dropped from the bill, I understand to allow for the passage of the other measures before the parliament was prorogued ahead of the March election.

This legislation is fairly simple on the surface. It allows police to search a person or their vehicle for illicit substances if they return a positive roadside drug test. That is, it explicitly allows police to exercise their search and seizure powers under the Controlled Substances Act. Currently, of course, the Road Traffic Act explicitly prevents police from using a positive test as a reason to conduct a search. The bill also allows the results of such a test and subsequent search to be used as evidence in proceedings against the Controlled Substances Act.

This particular measure did not form part of the first iteration of the Statute Amendments (Drink and Drug Driving) Bill, as introduced by the previous minister. It was initially mooted by the Australian Conservatives, or Family First—whichever name they were known by then—by the Hon. Robert Brokenshire. However, I think it is generally agreed that that member's original amendment was far too prescriptive. It did compel the police to act under certain circumstances. It essentially said that if the person tested positive for drugs on the roadside, then the police must search the person and vehicle. There was, I think, legitimate criticism of this type of compulsion from the then shadow minister.

The then government subsequently sought to introduce an amendment, which, rather than give the police new powers, would allow the police to exercise their existing powers under the Controlled Substances Act, currently prohibited by the Road Traffic Act. It is that amendment that was eventually lost, I understand, after negotiations to ensure the passage of the other important measures in the original bill, which is—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Point of order: I do not wish to interrupt the flow of the member's presentation but he is, of course, prohibited from reflecting on the vote in another place.

The SPEAKER: He is.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think he is getting too close to suggesting that, at this point.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully. Continue.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will sum up the bill then, sir. First of all, it allows the results of positive roadside drug tests to be used in forming a reasonable suspicion, which can then be used as grounds

for the exercise of a search power without the need for a warrant; that is, a search power already established under the Controlled Substances Act. Removing Schedule 1 clause 8(2)(b) will go some way to removing legal challenges to roadside searches and the results of those searches.

Secondly, it positively sanctions the use of the results of the roadside drug tests in evidence in proceedings against the Controlled Substances Act by inserting an explicit reference to the Controlled Substances Act in clause 8(2)(a)(i).

This bill is a simple measure to give police another tool to combat the spread of drugs, particularly ice, in our community. It is important to note that these changes reflect recommendations made by the Ice Taskforce and were supported at the time by police. Labor, on this side of the house, wants to give police all the tools they need to keep the community safe. I hope that the government has changed its mind on this issue and that the house will come together to support this measure. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. V.A. Chapman.

Motions

GOLD COAST COMMONWEALTH GAMES

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (10:37): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the outstanding performance of South Australia's 60 athletes, both able-bodied and para sport, at the 2018 Gold Coast Commonwealth Games;
- (b) recognises the gold medal winning performances of South Australian and South Australian Sports Institute (SASI) athletes Kurtis Marschall (pole vault), Cayla George, Brad Newley, Nicole Seekamp, Stephanie Talbot (basketball), Christopher McHugh, Damien Schumann (beach volleyball), Cameron Meyer, Ashlee Ankudinoff, Amy Cure, Annette Edmondson, Matthew Glaetzer, Alexandra Manly, Kaarle McCulloch, Stephanie Morton, Alex Porter, Sam Welsford, Rebecca Wiasak (cycling), and Kyle Chalmers and Jesse Aungles (swimming); and
- (c) recognises the many family members and partners of our South Australian athletes for the support they give and sacrifices they make to provide our athletes with the opportunity to succeed and represent our state and country with distinction.

We sent to this most recent Commonwealth Games that took place on the Gold Coast one of the biggest contingents of South Australian athletes in history. Given my background, I am sure you are aware that I was lucky enough to have been at a number of the previous Commonwealth Games and be part of both the South Australian and Australian contingents, but this, by far, at 60 athletes, is one of the biggest teams we have ever sent to a games.

I would like to acknowledge the fantastic work of the South Australian Sports Institute. To have our athletes have clear pathways of development here in South Australia is extremely important, both from a grassroots perspective and from a high-performance sport perspective. Wes and his team at SASI have done a fantastic job.

Wes has been there certainly as long as I can remember, so at least the past 15 years, and has ably led the South Australian Sports Institute through a number of reforms and reviews of the Australian sporting landscape, how the Australian sporting landscape is constructed and how and where we are directing the funding, whether that be towards high-performance elite sport or whether that be more tailored to grassroots participation.

It is always a very tough thing to understand where you get the most value as a government, but it is certainly something that has been consistent across my time in the sporting world that South Australia and its athletes have always performed well above our population share. We should be very proud of that fact, that our South Australian athletes for many years have gone and have conquered. Whether it be at the Commonwealth Games, world championships or an Olympics, they have gone and well and truly performed, and outperformed everybody else involved.

I also at this point want to make a quick reference to the Chef de Mission of the Commonwealth Games Association, the CGA team or the Australian team at the Commonwealth Games, Mr Steve Moneghetti, who is a fantastic athlete in his own right and somebody who has

represented Australia with distinction on numerous occasions. Mr Moneghetti announced post the Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast that this would be his last Chef de Mission duty. He has served both the Commonwealth Games Association and Australia for many years in his capacity both as a sports administrator and as an athlete but, most notably, as the Chef de Mission of the Commonwealth Games team.

I think one of the stark points of difference between him and many other people who seek to lead our Australian teams was evident on the opening ceremony night at the Commonwealth Games. Every single athlete walked in front of Steve. He was the last person to enter the stadium. He stayed at the rear of the team right the way through. I think that is a very important sentiment, that he always has and always will lead from behind. He never made himself the point of attention for the Commonwealth Games team and he went about his duties in a way that he should be applauded for. I think everybody who has been part of a Commonwealth Games team over that time is very thankful to have had Steve lead those teams.

From a personal perspective and as the member for Colton, I certainly am very proud of the athletes from my area who took part in the Commonwealth Games. We have some of the best athletes in the world. I am lucky enough to have the South Australian Sports Institute located in Colton as well, which is something I am very proud of, obviously. Of note, the clear standout in the Colton area is Kyle Chalmers, a man originally from Port Lincoln who has come across to Adelaide.

As I said, given my background, I have had a lot to do with the Kyle over my time. I trained with him for a short period of time as well. He is an outstanding young man, first and foremost, and certainly an outstanding athlete. He made it very clear on his arrival to the international scene that he was there not only to participate but to dominate competition right from the very beginning. Nowhere was this more evident than in his performance at the Rio Olympic Games in 2016. I do not think many, other than himself and his coach, would have expected him to have gone and performed in the way that he did.

I think he captured the imagination of both the South Australian public and the Australian public with the extreme performance that he had in the final of the 100 metres freestyle. As a swimming person, he certainly would not have been in the top eight or the top 16 fastest people in the world leading into that event. He certainly was not in the fastest top eight people in the world leaving that event, but he was the one who raced on the night, and he proved that again at the Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast with a thrilling performance in the 200 metres freestyle. He is well known for his ability to finish races very quickly and to swim over the top of people, and that is certainly what he did again in that 200 metres freestyle.

I also want to quickly point out the performance of one of our young parasport athletes by the name of Jesse Aungles. I have also got to know Jesse over the years, and he is a fantastic lad. He swam at the Norwood Swimming Club for a number of years and has spent the past three years at the Australian Institute of Sport in Canberra. He has dedicated himself entirely to his sport and making an impact. He was fortunate to win the 200 metres individual medley on the Gold Coast.

It was fantastic to see his first breakthrough performance at an international meet. For a guy who faces circumstances that perhaps others do not—he was born without his lower limbs—he has overcome that in strides and continues to show a fantastic example for what can be done. I coached Jesse when he was very young as well and it has been fantastic to see his progression through sport.

We are very lucky in South Australia. I have already touched on the South Australian Sports Institute, but we also have the Australian Institute of Sport cycling program based in South Australia, and that is something that at times helps add to our medal tally as a state, and we are very thankful for having those athletes based here. It is incredibly important for the grassroots development of a number of young South Australian riders to have that program based in South Australia. The likes of Anna Meares would never have come here to South Australia to be a part of our great state had it not been for that program being located in South Australia, so we are very thankful for their contribution to our South Australian performance at those games as well.

There were many standout performances across the Commonwealth Games. I am sure many in this chamber, as in the broader South Australian population, were glued to their screens. I think some ventured up there as well to see the great performances of our Australian team. Our

women's basketball team dominated like no women's basketball team has in recent times. They did not drop a single game through the competition and very much dominated every game they participated in, and I think we should be very proud of the performance of our women's basketball team as well.

However, you do not have a great performance by a team without great coaches and great administrators behind them. Again, I am going to indulge in a way and turn to my swimming past and mention a guy by the name of Peter Bishop, who has been unheralded for most of his career, who is the coach of Kyle Chalmers. I was lucky enough to be under his tutelage for quite a number of years through my swimming career—16 years, I think. In South Australia, in terms of a swimming state, we often do not get the recognition that we probably deserve.

As I said, similarly, we generally bat above our weight in terms of performance. To have Peter here in South Australia, who I note is now attracting swimmers from Queensland to our great state, is a feat that we could never have imagined in the swimming world just three or four years ago. To have Olympians moving to South Australia to swim at our fantastic facility at Marion, but to be part of what we have here based on our coaching capacity and capability, is an incredible change in the swimming landscape in Australia, and that has to be put down to one of the quietest achievers in national sport.

Peter Bishop has done a fantastic job with Kyle and his development and in bringing him here to Adelaide; keeping him here in Adelaide as well, I think, is an important thing to remember. Often clubs and states compete for talent—that is essentially the game that we are playing in many ways—and to have him stay in South Australia and commit to South Australia is a feat. Unfortunately, he is a very proud Port Power supporter; I am not sure how that happened. I am sure his father had something to do with that, but we will not hold that against him. As I said, we have many great coaches across all the sports, but I wanted to highlight that about Peter.

Mr Pederick: He backs a winning team.

Mr COWDREY: I can't agree with that. In terms of the management of the Commonwealth Games federation, or association as it is known now, the CGA went through quite a substantial change when the long-term CEO, Perry Crosswhite, retired three years ago and moved to a new CEO in Craig Phillips who came over from the Olympic committee. He has done a fantastic job in ably leading that organisation for a number of years.

The Commonwealth Games are the friendly games. There is a slight difference in how our athletes approach those games, but, as a learning opportunity, it is an incredibly invaluable event. Coupled with the main Commonwealth Games, we also have the Commonwealth Youth Games, which provide young athletes who are 15 to 18 years old with an opportunity to compete in a multisport event similar to the Commonwealth Games but with fewer sports. To have that pathway for our athletes is incredibly important.

We had a number of South Australian athletes compete in the Commonwealth Youth Games both in 2015 and in 2017. To have had the ability to see their progression through sport is an incredible thing to be a part of. Hosting the Commonwealth Youth Games is something that we should potentially look at as a state in the near future because the possibilities and the eyes that are opened through those events to what could be in the future is very special.

As I touched on earlier, the opening ceremony of this Commonwealth Games and the way the team came out was certainly something that the Commonwealth Games Association made a very distinct point of doing and doing well. The opening ceremony was fantastic for our athletes to be a part of. One thing that does change between an Olympic Games and a Commonwealth Games is the ability to go out and walk in the opening ceremony, no matter when you compete.

Finally, I would like to touch on the motion that I put to the house, particularly outlining and recognising the importance and the contribution that families, friends and supporters make to the performances of each of our athletes, and none more so than Jesse, or Kyle, or Annette Edmondson and their families—those I know are on this list of athletes who have been so ably supported by their families and friends.

No athlete, like no person in this house in regard to making their way here, can achieve what they do without the support of their families and friends, and that is all so important. If I can take the liberty to speak on their behalf, I give a vote of thanks to their families and friends for the hours, for the effort, for the time commitment, for everything that they do to get them to that point. The sacrifices, both financially and in family time, are incredible, but the results speak for themselves. Sixty athletes and the gold medal performances are certainly the highlights that should be noted by this house.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (10:52): I rise to wholeheartedly echo the member for Colton's remarks and also to convey Labor's support for this motion and our deep congratulations to all the fine athletes who participated in this year's Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast. It was an absolutely brilliant event made possible by the Queensland government, numerous dedicated staff, an extraordinary cohort of generous volunteers, talented athletes, all who support them, and many, many others who can all be rightly proud of bringing this mammoth event to life so successfully.

This Commonwealth Games were, I believe, the most inclusive in their history, and our nation's efforts have set the bar high for future games. We rightly brought everyone together into one inclusive event. We equally highlighted and celebrated the talent, determination and courage of every athlete, and we sent a message across the globe about what is important in sport and everywhere else: equality, inclusion and respect. I hope that every athlete enjoyed the outstanding competition, forged new friendships and is filled with pride about the many memorable moments of excellent sportspersonship that they created throughout the games.

It is such an honour to represent your country, but it is an honour that comes with a lot of hard work, mental, physical and emotional strength and commitment, and we thank you for all of it. We also thank those who coach those athletes and perform the many other support roles that enable them and put them at the centre of well-supported teams. I also pay tribute to the other crucial members of our athletes' teams, their family members, loved ones and friends. Their love and support is critical, and for the parents of many of our athletes that support often begins when their child is at school and they are doing the early morning runs to the pool, to the court, to the track or to the field for training and often doing it again in the evenings and on weekends. Their unwavering love and support makes our athletes who they are today, and to them I say thank you.

South Australian athletes comprised 13 per cent of our Australian team, took home 20 per cent of the medals and, through some outstanding perseverance, achieved many personal bests and brilliant performances. I want to make special mention today of Stephanie Morton. Steph, everyone in our southern community is so proud of you. Steph won three gold medals in cycling: the women's sprint, the women's team sprint with Kaarle McCulloch, and the keirin. I cannot wait to see what is next for Steph. Thank you, Steph, for thrilling us with your cycling but also for inspiring us with your friendliness, your humility and willingness to include others. You are inspiring girls and women in cycling to follow their sporting dreams.

I also want to pay tribute to Jess Trengove for her incredible performance and sheer mental and emotional determination in the marathon where she claimed a bronze medal. Jess said this about the final stages of the marathon:

They say that practice makes perfect. I don't feel that any form of practice can totally prepare one for the final stage of a Marathon. Mastery requires a whole-hearted desire in the given moment and the choice to commit when at your most vulnerable. Don't get me wrong, physical and mental training, an appropriate taper, footwear, nutrition and hydration strategies are crucial but when you are stripped to your core and the inevitable hurt kicks in, none of this matters unless one is prepared to fight. It boils down to how badly you want it.

I continue her remarks:

After a short period of tuning out to escape my body's physical signs, I brought my awareness back to the race. I was on the final hill and told myself that it would be easier on the other side. Adam had talked to me about this climb during our jog together. The simple postural cues that he had provided teased my limbs as they desperately tried to respond. I was aware of familiar voices to my right as I hugged the fence to draw on the crowd's energy and the soothing shade. If I had been an antelope with a Lion chasing me, I honestly don't know if I could have run any faster. This was 'survival mode' (as Liam Adams described his experience in the men's Marathon). The downhill run was not providing the dose of pain relief that I hoped it would...

'One foot in front of the other' I chanted—so easy one day, so hard the next. Finally, it was time to make that highly-anticipated turn towards the final straight. My body and brain felt like sponges, desperately trying to soak up and enjoy every second but too wet to absorb much more. Crossing the line was bliss. I smiled with relief. Delayed

reflexes caught me as I fell to the left. My eyes were crossed and moving my body in a forward direction required more concentration than I had the energy to give. Two women swept their arms under my own and provided much appreciated support. A bottle of water was handed to me and a wet towel placed behind my neck...

If I were to sum up the emotions of the final seven kilometers with seven words I would choose heart, belief, desire, strength, commitment, will and skill. Training and preparation create the appropriately equipped vehicle but it is a combination of these crucial values which power the drive. It's not always a pretty journey which makes reaching the destination all the more satisfying. Would I do it all again?

Yes.

Jess's words and her performance are incredible and inspiring. I have had the pleasure of working alongside Jess over the past couple of years on our South Australian Women in Sport Task Force. Jess is wise, relentlessly focused on what she can give back to her sport and the young people who aspire to follow in her footsteps, and she is a fierce advocate for equality and respect in sport. She is a person who is an absolute pleasure to know, and she is a credit to our state.

I was also thrilled to see local southern community member Kurtis Marschall take gold in the pole vault. Kurtis is an absolutely lovely person who always takes time to give to his former school community and to our broader southern community. Some of his early athletics was undertaken with Southern Athletics, a brilliant local club of which I am proud to be patron. Kurtis is standing shoulder to shoulder with our club currently as we seek support from the City of Onkaparinga for a home ground for the club at Knox Park. Taliqua Clancy, the first Aboriginal Australian to represent Australia in beach volleyball, and Mariafe Artacho del Solar impressed with their silver medal winning performance in the beach volleyball.

There are so many favourite moments and performances, but one that will long stick in my mind happened at the conclusion of a race. In a display of sportspersonship that demonstrated what was so special about the Gold Coast Commonwealth Games, three Australian women—Celia Sullohern, Madeline Hills and Eloise Wellings—who had all crossed the finish line of the 10,000 metres minutes earlier and were exhausted, waited for Lineo Chaka, representing the southern African nation of Lesotho, to run the last few laps on her own. They cheered, clapped and encouraged her on as she crossed.

It was a moment that demonstrated what should be at the heart of every sporting contest: grit and determination to do your best, yes, but also inclusion, camaraderie, friendship and respect for your fellow athletes. Thank you once again to everyone involved in these Commonwealth Games. They were all part of something we can all be proud of.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (11:00): Can I just begin by congratulating the member for Colton on bringing forward this, his first private member's motion and obviously a motion he has a lot of knowledge of and involvement with through his participation in the Commonwealth Games and the Paralympics as well as being one of South Australia's great Paralympians and champions. So congratulations to the member for Colton for his initiative in this motion.

I do not want to speak for too long, but I just want to congratulate all Australian able-bodied and para sports athletes who participated in the recent Commonwealth Games up on the Gold Coast, which were a fantastic success, especially for those South Australian athletes. The time, effort and determination that athletes put into their sports are amazing, and they should be so proud of all they do in representing their state and, more broadly, their nation. The Australian athletes should be particularly proud of their performance, ranking first in the medal tally, with 198 gold, silver and bronze medals.

In particular, obviously quite a few South Australians did exceptionally well at the Commonwealth Games, but I want to talk about one South Australian in terms of his results and efforts at the games—that is, Mr Alex Porter. Alex Porter is a local in my electorate of Waite, and his efforts are just fantastic. This year alone Alex has participated in the Tour Down Under here in Adelaide, the Cadel Evans Great Ocean Road Race, the track nationals and, of course, the Commonwealth Games.

Alex also participated in the 4,000 metres team pursuit in the world championships in Hong Kong last year, the team ranking first. As world champions, there was a lot of pressure going into the Commonwealth Games for our team pursuit members. I congratulate Alex on his gold medal winning

performance in the 4,000 metres team pursuit. I want to congratulate Alex and his team on not only winning the gold medal but also their record-breaking time of three minutes, 49 seconds. The team smashed not only the Commonwealth Games record but also the world record in that event. Alex is only 21 years old, and I am sure he will be a fixture in the cycling calendar for many, many years to come. I certainly look forward to following his achievements, and I am sure his selection and participation in the 2020 Tokyo Olympics is a sure thing.

I also want to recognise all the family members and the partners of the athletes who competed. Athletes do not reach selection for the Commonwealth Games alone; it involves many, many years of support from parents, paying the sports fees, driving their children to events and to training, especially, as the member for Colton alluded to in his maiden speech, in the swimming, where most of the practice is done in the wee hours of the morning. So all those parents who have supported their children to achieve their ambition by participating in the Commonwealth Games I think are truly to be commended.

The Australian Institute of Sport has been recently conducting research into the benefits that the early support of family and friends has on the development of an athlete. The research has demonstrated that the type of support parents provide can include helping with physical preparation, emotional and financial support, technical advice and providing access to appropriate coaching. Parents play a huge role, and for any potential athletes looking forward to participating in future games, getting their parents on board is so important. Partners also provide a great support service to the athletes by providing a home to come back to and comfort when sporting glory is not always achieved; at times, that is not too dissimilar to politics as well.

I want to once again congratulate all the athletes on their performance at the Commonwealth Games, whether they won medals or not. It is an amazing achievement to be selected as an athlete in an Australian team for any sport, and I wish them all the best in their endeavours. As the member for Reynell touched on in her contribution, I also had the opportunity to spend a day or two at the Commonwealth Games, particularly watching the swimming. The absolute pride of the Australian competitors participating, and also of course that of those from around the commonwealth, was just immense. It is to be commended that sport brings out the best in all of us most of the time, and I think that at these commonwealth games we certainly saw that happen.

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (11:05): I commend the member for Colton for moving this motion and wholeheartedly offer my support to the motion. He, of course, knows better than anyone in this room the importance of representing your country and state with dignity, and we were certainly lucky to have a wonderful group of athletes at the most recent Commonwealth Games who did just that.

I rise briefly to acknowledge a couple of athletes with connections to the electorate of Narrunga who participated in the recent Commonwealth Games. Personally, I took great pleasure in watching the Commonwealth Games and thought that it was a well-televised event. I congratulate the organisers on combining the able-bodied athletes with the parasports athletes. I thought it made for improved viewing and certainly increased recognition of those involved in the parasports. Hopefully, it continues in that vein going forward at all the other meets around the world.

In particular I acknowledge basketballer Steph Talbot and her contribution to the all-conquering women's basketball team.

Mr Murray interjecting:

Mr ELLIS: Well, more importantly, Norwood, member for Davenport—she is from Kadina. There are two basketball teams in Kadina: the Kadina Basketball Club and the Bears Basketball team. As far as I am concerned, Steph grew up playing for the wrong team of those two, that is, the Bears. I vividly recall watching her progress through the ranks and dominating all in front of her, but it was pleasing to see her take the court at the Commonwealth Games and play a significant role in that team's gold medal winning campaign.

Steph is the daughter of the deputy mayor of the Copper Coast Council and a former football coach of mine, Ros and Trevor Talbot. I knowledge their contribution to her ascension to such high achievements on the sporting field. As an aside, Trevor coached the basketball team that defeated

me in the most recent Yorke Valley Basketball Association grand final, so I have a bit of a grudge to bear against Trevor, but I congratulate him on his daughter's achievements, nonetheless.

I had the pleasure of covering Steph in her trials as a basketballer during her time with a team in Poland, whose name I will not endeavour to pronounce, and more recently with the Phoenix Mercury, under Australian coach Sandy Borello, where she played a significant role in their run to the finals in that competition. Thankfully, she did one better at the Commonwealth Games and won the gold medal, but she has played a couple of high-level basketball competitions recently.

I also briefly acknowledge long jumper Henry Frayne. Henry finished second with a jump of 8.33 metres in what was a tremendous effort at the most recent Commonwealth Games. Henry is the son of a well-respected former local dentist in Kadina, Geoff Frayne, and his results are still well followed among the community and often feature in the pages of the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times*.

In concluding, congratulations to all athletes, particularly the South Australian ones, on an excellent show, I very much enjoyed watching it. It was a great event, and we were well represented by the wonderful athletes, staff and officials who accompanied them.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:08): I rise, too, to support this excellent motion moved by the member for Colton on the fantastic exhibition of the Gold Coast Commonwealth Games and certainly acknowledge the excellent efforts of the 60 athletes from South Australia. As other members have put to this house already, combining all abilities—and I will use the word 'abilities'—was such a fantastic thing to watch, as was seeing how people overcome whatever they have to in order to compete in sport and those amazing events.

We have already heard about Jess Trengove, and I watched her as she came to the finish line. I am not sure whether she had another 80 metres left in her, but she came in and got the bronze medal. You see the other athletes right across the board performing to their absolute maximum. I certainly believe that, yes, it is great to get the medals—and I will acknowledge some of those in a moment—but just to be there representing your country (and, obviously, we are acknowledging those from Australia and from the commonwealth) is such a thrill for athletes right across the board.

In regard to the Commonwealth Games, Australia was the dominant nation of the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. We had a total of 198 medals: 80 gold, 59 silver and 59 bronze. England came second, with 136 medals: 45 gold, 45 silver and 46 bronze. I have already talked about how impressive the contribution from this state was, especially when you look at the population ratio to the other states. We certainly do our job as a state competing at this level.

I want to talk about the critical role that the South Australian Sports Institute and the Office for Recreation and Sport play in supporting and partnering with a number of world-class national training centres based here in Adelaide. As a result, Adelaide is the primary training environment in a place that a disproportionate number of Australia's world-class athletes live and train. That is a good thing at a range of levels. Apart from having training facilities that are accessible to all athletes, it brings people here, which also contributes to our economy, and it invites excellence across the board so that people can get on board with whatever sport they choose.

I have looked at what one of my sons did at his school. He went through the process of how they work out, do the tests and see how you are as an athlete. I think he was told he could potentially have been a cyclist or a kayaker. He is not a bad cyclist, but when I saw him kayaking I think he probably made the right decision by not taking it further. I think that was more to do with the fact that he was already congested with basketball and Aussie Rules football commitments. It is quite a process testing thousands of schoolchildren (I think in this case it was 5,000 schoolchildren) and getting down to the 1 per cent who have done all the tests—the beep test, the running test, physical endurance tests—to see where they sit.

We do punch above our weight and it is proven in the results we get at the Commonwealth Games. Certainly, in regard to the Sports Institute, 43 South Australian athletes or graduates were selected for the 2018 Commonwealth Games team. On top of that, out of the other 60 athletes, 17 live and train primarily in Adelaide as part of their relevant National Centre of Excellence programs in partnership with the South Australian Sports Institute and competed at the games.

The South Australian Sports Institute athletes contributed to 18 gold, three silver and six bronze medals in Australia's tally. Those athletes contributed to 23 per cent of Australia's gold medals. In total, this group of athletes collectively brought home 35 medals, including 21 gold, taking into account the multiple athletes in medal-winning teams, such as the three female basketball gold medallists. The women's basketball team has already been mentioned and I really do want to congratulate them on their fantastic performance at the games.

The impact of South Australia on the games was 29 per cent of Australia's gold medal total of 80, and South Australian athletes contributed to 38 of Australia's 198 medals, or 19 per cent. That is a fantastic effort all round. I talked before about how inclusive these games were and, as I said, they were the most inclusive games ever. It is a fantastic approach to sport; instead of having one level of ability first and then other abilities later on, as we have seen in past international meets like the Olympics, I think it is a great way for kids growing up today to see that it does not matter what your ability is, you can compete. You can see the absolute passion that people have. It is just amazing and exemplary to watch how some of these people run, how they can push a wheelchair for a marathon or how they can swim.

We saw South Australian Jesse Aungles win gold in the men's SM8 200 metres individual medley. Several South Australian senior elite athletes achieved multiple medals and broke games and world records at the Commonwealth Games. Obviously Kyle Chalmers, a champion from the electorate of Flinders, achieved an outstanding four gold medals in the 200 metres freestyle, the 4 x 100 metres freestyle relay, the 4 x 200 metres freestyle relay and the 4 x 100 metres medley relay.

Some of these teams set impressive new Commonwealth Games record times on their way to gold. Some of these races were down to the last couple of strokes getting to the edge. But that is all you need; you only need that one-hundredth of a second. Especially in swimming, when you see a dead heat, that is something, because the electric clocks are set so finely. Mind you, I did see a problem at the start of a race. I am trying to remember the race. It was a long distance women's race; I will probably get it wrong, whichever one I quote. There was a fair way between the two—1,500 or 10,000 metres. The timing gear was not operating and I thought to myself, 'Surely someone has a spare set out the back.' Anyway, they got a race going. I cannot imagine how off-putting that would be for athletes who are warmed up and ready to get going and who are told, 'Hang on, no, you can't get going for a moment. We haven't got the timing clocks going.'

We saw the cyclists shine, with Stephanie Morton taking home three gold medals in the team sprint, keirin and individual sprint. We saw Matthew Glaetzer secure two gold medals in the men's keirin in the 1,000 metres time trial. He delivered a games record-setting time. Certainly across individual gold and team gold, South Australian and Australian athletes did such good work.

In concluding, I want to give praise to the families that give up all their time. We heard from the member for Colton that his parents were always watching him on the TV, but then his sponsors got them to London as a surprise. It is great to see that commitment from friends and family to give their support, and if they cannot get to that event, the athletes know that they have that support from home, but also the ones who make that extra commitment and get to those games, if they can, and support their family members or their friends. It was a great effort. Congratulations to all the South Australian athletes and well done.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:18): I rise also to support the motion by the member for Colton. The Commonwealth Games that were held at the Gold Coast starting on 4 April 2018 ran for an unforgettable 11 days. It was an electrifying experience and it will be remembered not only for the many medal-winning exploits but also as a games where all the athletes strived to reach their dreams and performed at their best on the world stage.

The games themselves were a combination of many years of training for not only the athletes themselves but also the coaches and support staff. I would like to recognise that over 6,600 athletes and team officials from 71 nations and territories competed in what was an inclusive games. The opening ceremony itself, on 4 April, culminated in the lighting of the flame. That flame began its journey 388 days earlier via The Queen's Baton Relay. So I wish to touch on a slightly different perspective from what has already been discussed, which is how the Commonwealth Games

touched our electorate in Morphett. Over 3,500 baton bearers carried The Queen's Baton throughout 70 different countries. The Gold Coast is renowned for its beach lifestyle and so is Glenelg, in South Australia, in the electorate of Morphett, so it was fitting that The Queen's Baton passed through Glenelg on its way to the Gold Coast on 21 February.

Glenelg is such a spectacular location to carry The Queen's Baton. To run or walk along the coast with the backdrop of azure-blue waters allowed the baton bearers to carry the spirit of the games with pride. Those baton bearers were selected throughout the local community based on a number of criteria, ranging from those who make a significant contribution to sport, education, art or charities within their community, as well as people who contribute to the fun, friendly, vibrant and inclusive community in which they live.

The Glenelg baton bearers included Rachael Leahcar, who carried the baton accompanied by her seeing eye dog; and Max Richardson and Eddy Cornes. Eddy is the son of Lucy and Kane Cornes and was born with a rare heart condition—his heart is on the wrong side of his body, and he has also lost a kidney. It was a brave effort by Eddy and a highlight of the baton relay in Glenelg. Those baton bearers inspired others with their passion and commitment to sport in our community.

Overall, 60 South Australian athletes, including able-bodied and parasport athletes, competed at the Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast. It was an inclusive games, with an equal number of medals for both men and women athletes. Of the medals on offer at these Commonwealth Games, the South Australian athletes, including athletes from the South Australian Sports Institute, won 27 medals: 18 gold, three silver and six bronze. I congratulate not only those athletes but all the Australian athletes on their performances.

Touching on some of those medals, Glenelg beach is obviously home to beach Volleyball SA. These Commonwealth Games saw the introduction of beach volleyball to the Commonwealth Games. In that sport, we are fortunate to have a men's pair of Chris McHugh and Damien Schumann who have competed at Glenelg beach previously in lead-up events. They won gold against Canada, two sets to one. The last set was a thrilling set. They were behind 9-12 and had to come from behind, so congratulations to them. At the same time, the women's team of Taliqua Clancy and Mariafe Artacho del Solar competed heroically to make the final of the women's beach volleyball contest. While not winning, their achievement to take home silver showed a really brave performance.

In swimming, we had Kyle Chalmers. He attended Immanuel College, which is located in Novar Gardens and is one of the fantastic schools in Morphett. He came away with four gold medals and a silver medal, which is a fantastic achievement. His gold medal in the 200 metres freestyle signifies a move away from winning the 100 metres gold medal in Rio and shows that he really is starting to develop and mature as he develops in the sport. Unfortunately, he won the silver medal in the 100 metres freestyle, but it was a fantastic performance coming off a reduced training load, given the health issues he has had. He was also in the two fantastic relay teams who won gold medals in the 4 x 200 metres freestyle in a games record time of seven minutes and five seconds, and in the 4 x 100 metres medley relay, again in a games record time of three minutes and 31 seconds. Congratulations to Kyle on his performance.

In the pole vault, Kurtis Marschall won the gold medal, but there was also heartache there for local Declan Carruthers, who went to school at the local St Mary's Memorial School in Glenelg. Unfortunately, he had to withdraw because of injury. We wish him well for the future, and no doubt he will bounce back. Knowing his parents, in particular, really does bring home the great work that parents, family and partners do to contribute towards an athlete's success.

As we know, no athlete can reach their goals alone. I think it is good to really reinforce the motion moved by the member for Colton, which recognises the many family members and partners of our South Australian athletes. They drive these athletes, when they are children, to training six or seven days a week and they support them financially, not only when they are young but quite often as they move through their sport.

These athletes have to sacrifice and they cannot work full time, so their family is always there for them. I offer a heartfelt thank you to the families for helping these athletes—not only Australian

athletes but also South Australian athletes—to contribute to these fantastic games that will be remembered by all as an inclusive games.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:25): I want to thank all members for their support, particularly those who have spoken this morning in support of this motion. In particular, I want to touch on something that the member for Reynell and other members, including the member for Morphett, raised about the legacy of the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games and the participation of our South Australian athletes. The inclusiveness that these games demonstrated is something we need to highlight, both from a perspective of inclusivity around parasport events and in terms of the even distribution of medal events between male and female athletes.

We need to appreciate the point that we have now reached where it is now readily accepted that the Commonwealth Games, Olympic Games and Paralympic Games—but in this instance, of course, the Commonwealth Games—are happy to have a distribution of events that covers this spectrum. Both from my personal perspective and that of others who have been involved in the journey of the Paralympic Games and the Paralympic movement here in Australia over the last 10 years, it is a significant milestone that it would be remiss of us not to acknowledge. We have reached a point where the Australian public is very supportive and, in fact, very happy to watch and appreciate the efforts of all athletes who competed so ably at the Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast.

Again, we want to acknowledge the 60 South Australian athletes for their contributions, hard work, effort and many years of training that brought them to the point where they could represent our state and our country. We recognise the 18 gold medals that were won and the numerous other medals. As an athlete, you always say that you win a silver medal and you win a bronze medal—it is certainly never a disappointment and it is something that every athlete should be proud of. In hindsight, and many years down the track, I am sure every athlete will appreciate what they were able to achieve at these games.

It is fantastic that many members in this house also appreciated the contribution that our South Australian families, friends, supporters and coaches made to these performances. They are, at the end of the day, the people who sacrifice the most to have our athletes be in a position where they can achieve. Again, I thank the members for their support of this motion, and I appreciate the opportunity to put forward this motion in this house.

Motion carried.

INTERNATIONAL MIDWIVES AND NURSES DAYS

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:28): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises International Day of the Midwife held on 5 May annually, with the theme this year being 'Midwives leading the way with quality care';
- (b) recognises International Nurses Day held on 12 May annually, with the theme this year being 'Nurses, a voice to lead: health is a human right'; and
- (c) thanks all midwives and nurses for the important work that they do in caring for our community.

It is my huge honour to move this motion in front of some of the nursing and midwifery leaders of our great state; some of the great educators, researchers and clinicians; and some of my dear friends and mentors. I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Adjunct Associate Professor Elizabeth Dabars AM, the state secretary of my union, the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation (ANMF); Jocelyn Douglass, the president of the ANMF in South Australia; and many branch members and clinicians. I have been a member of the ANMF for 32 years, I believe—that is life membership at most sporting clubs, so I am waiting for it in the post.

I would also like to make special mention of Jennifer Hurley, our new SA Health Chief Nurse and Midwifery Officer. Members may have met Jennifer previously, as she played a big supporting role with us late into the night on the Death with Dignity Bill in her previous role with the ANMF. I congratulate her on her appointment. She will be a great leader for nurses and midwives in South

Australia, and I look forward to working with her on professional practice, workforce and progressive issues more broadly.

Farewell and thank you to Lydia Dennett, who showed incredible leadership both here and nationally in her role. We will miss you Lydia. I acknowledge Professor Carol Grech, head of the nursing and midwifery school at the University of South Australia; Professor Mary Steen, the first professor of midwifery here in South Australia and a real trailblazer; midwife Dr Julie Fleet; registered nurse Dr Rebecca Sharp; Professor Marion Eckert, the director of the Rosemary Bryant AO Research Centre; nurse, academic and clinician Dr Kevin O'Shaughnessy; Associate Professor Rachael Vernon; and Dr Angela Brown.

Incredible clinicians are present in the gallery today, many of them—as members can see, we can draw a crowd—from MedSTAR, RDNS, Flinders Medical Centre, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Women's and Children's Hospital, Children and Family Health Services, and Northgate Mental Health Services. If I have missed any body in particular, any group, I humbly apologise.

We are nurses and midwives. I am so proud to be a nurse, a nurse in parliament, and I am proud to be a voice for nurses and for midwives in parliament. I understand the challenges of delivering quality health care in a modern healthcare world. I have lived it.

International Day of the Midwife has been celebrated since 1992 as a way of focusing on and celebrating the role of midwives. Each year, a theme provides the motivating call to action to all midwives to get involved, to focus, to celebrate and to champion the great work they do. This year, the theme is 'Midwives leading the way with quality care'. This theme speaks for itself.

Midwives play such a vital role preparing women for pregnancy, ensuring that women and their precious newborns navigate pregnancy and childbirth safely, respectfully and powerfully. They empower the partners of these women. Midwives advocate for and deliver, in practical terms, well-resourced maternal and neonatal care that then sets the baseline for lifelong optimal health and wellbeing well after the childbirth experience. Midwives provide care in the lightest and darkest moments of life. Midwives provide hope, and they are there when hope is lost.

At all times they deliver care of the highest quality. In fact, midwives set the benchmark for professional autonomous practice. I have long admired the clinician-led pathways that midwives deliver and the respect that the medical profession has for those. Midwives have led and implemented discharge planning for many years, and this was at the centre of discussion when we, as a government, targeted efficiencies in nurse-led care in medical and surgical units across Transforming Health. Midwives do indeed lead the way.

We hold International Nurses Day annually on the birthday of Florence Nightingale, the lady with the lamp. She lived a fine innings, passing away at the ripe old age of 90 in 1910. Every year we have a theme, and this year our nurses' theme is 'Nurses, a voice to lead: health is a human right'. There are some incredibly important components of health as a human right but, sadly, I feel that as a modern and civilised society we truly fail on some of these. I refer to some matters of choice relating to sexual health and reproductive rights.

Our community has a right to make these choices free from interference. I hope that during my life as an MP sooner rather than later we are strong enough to remove abortion from the criminal code. It is an absolute disgrace that abortion, as a legal, clinical procedure, is regulated under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. There are still women and their partners subjected to protests as they seek care and support at one of the most difficult times of their lives. This must change.

Also, far too many South Australians die in hospital. We must advocate for and ensure that palliative care sees that more South Australians have the choice to die with dignity at home in the way they choose. Our entire community has a right to access the best possible affordable care. If affordable is free for that person, then so be it. The principles of health care, in my mind, are accountability, equality, equity, access, patient-centred, safe and timely—just as a starting point. These principles are at the heart of any contribution that I make in this place. These principles must be at the heart of contributions from the leaders in our community.

It is a well-known saying that, 'You can't be what you can't see.' I have heard that more than once recently in this place. I have been able to see great nurse leaders, great midwife leaders here

in parliament. For the past three midwife and nurses days—and it could be four actually, just thinking about it—Annabel Digance and I have been able to share the honour of celebrating both International Day of the Midwife and International Nurses Day. We have worked together to host these days and ensured that our colleagues in this place do not forget how important you all are to health and wellbeing in our community.

I would like to thank Annabel for the great work she was able to do in the past four years as the member for Elder. Gayle's Law passed parliament last year—in the name of Gayle Woodford—and because of this single-nurse postings in remote areas will be abolished and call-outs for assistance will require two health practitioners.

I also sat on a select committee on e-cigarettes that was triggered by Annabel. In fact, Mr Speaker, you were on that committee also, as was the member for Kaurana. I hope to see the introduction of legislation soon to regulate e-cigarettes because of those recommendations. I know that the shadow minister for health and wellbeing (member for Kaurana) has written to the minister in the other place asking for legislation to be reintroduced as soon as possible. The sale, supply, advertising and exposure of the vapour to children and young people are key aspects to this. These are just two of the pieces of well-documented work undertaken by Annabel Digance, and I was able to play just a small role in those.

The Hon. Gail Gago has also bid farewell as a parliamentarian after 16 years of amazing service. I first met Gail when she was the secretary of the then Australian Nursing Federation—prior to the changes in the 1990s—during a period of great change in nursing, as we fought very hard to be recognised as a profession. Nurse training was transitioning from hospital-based to fully university-based and it was the last time that our state had a Liberal government. That was a very long time ago. We are in a period of change now as well, aren't we?

Gail was the first female acting premier of South Australia and the first female leader of the government in the Legislative Council. I cannot recall how many portfolio responsibilities Gail held during her time as a minister, but to say it was dozens would not be an exaggeration. I will reel some off. Gail was the minister for mental health and substance abuse, regional development, public sector, forests, tourism, consumer affairs, gambling, agriculture, food and fisheries, local government, higher education, science and information technology and business services. She will go down as one of the most amazing ministers for the status of women that this state will ever see. I am glad she did not do all those jobs at the same time. Even you, Mr Speaker, would struggle, I believe.

Gail has left her mark on the parliamentary Labor Party. She has especially been a role model for women, parliamentarians and nurses—an incredible woman. Annabel and/or Gail and I had many conversations in here about the challenges faced by nurses and midwives due to health reforms. We advocated on behalf of the profession to ensure the impacts on nursing workforce became part of the daily language and considerations of the minister for health as Transforming Health was implemented. We asked questions related to the evidence that decisions were being based on and jumped many steps ahead with our questions, much to the frustration, I am sure, of people tasked with the implementation and, of course, poor minister Snelling.

I know that we all played our part in changing the direction of many aspects of the reforms in our sector. Together, we listened to and forensically dissected evidence. We put the case to the minister to question reasoning for various recommendations. We knew that we had to be able to answer the questions of our community. As nurses and midwives, we had the skills to be able to do this. I will desperately miss the company and the camaraderie of both Annabel and Gail, but I will do my best to continue to advocate strongly for nurses, midwives and consumers on their behalf. I commit to working in a bipartisan way with the opposition to ensure that that voice continues.

I would like to mention the recent election to federal parliament, in the seat of Batman in Victoria, of our colleague Ged Kearney. Ged worked as a registered nurse, a trade unionist with the Australian Nursing Federation in Victoria and federally before being elected as the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions. We desperately need nursing representation in all parliaments and at all levels of government. There is a serious under-representation of nurses and other caring roles.

In Australia, nearly 2 per cent, or one in 50 workers, are nurses—approximately 220,000 nurses. There is just a handful of nurses in parliament. So, if I can run a pitch, I encourage you all to get involved. Put your hands up at whatever level of government you can. Ask your local members and councillors how you can play a role in change. There are local government elections later this year. There is a Mayo by-election. There is a whole range of opportunities to get involved and to engage. You can be what you can see. Let your colleagues see what they can be. Be it and lead the way. With that, I commend this motion to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:41): I rise to support this motion by the member for Hurtle Vale. I certainly want to acknowledge the great work that nurses and midwives do in our community. I will note the motion:

That this house—

- (a) recognises International Day of the Midwife held on 5 May annually, with the theme this year being 'Midwives leading the way with quality care';
- (b) recognises International Nurses Day held on 12 May annually, with the theme this year being 'Nurses, a voice to lead: health is a human right'; and
- (c) thanks all midwives and nurses for the important work that they do caring for our community.

We do need to recognise International Nurses Day and International Day of the Midwife. It is an opportunity for all of us to pause and reflect on the important role that nurses and midwives have in healthcare settings in South Australia and across the world.

Nurses and midwives are there when life begins and there when it ends. There are few professions that have that privilege but also carry with them such immense responsibility. Celebrated on 5 May, the global theme for this year's International Day of the Midwife is 'Midwives leading the way with quality care'. This theme signifies the vital role that midwives play to ensure that women and babies safely navigate pregnancy and birth and recognises that these early interactions can lay the foundation for continued health and wellbeing beyond childbirth.

International Nurses Day is celebrated on 12 May, the anniversary of Florence Nightingale's birth. This year it focuses on the theme 'Nurses, a voice to lead: health is a human right'. Florence Nightingale was instrumental in changing society's approach to and the view of nursing and midwifery. She was a humanitarian who dedicated her life's work to benefit others, but she also understood and fought for the valuable contribution that nurses and midwives can and should make in healthcare settings.

With this year's International Nurses Day theme in mind, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the Hon. Stephen Wade, awarded the inaugural humanitarian awards at the Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards on 11 May 2018. These awards recognise individuals in local health settings who go above and beyond the call of duty to provide outstanding care to their patients, just as the lady with the lamp did over 150 years ago.

While it is very important to celebrate these individual achievements, International Nurses Day and International Day of the Midwife provide us with an important opportunity to acknowledge the collective contributions of the state's nurses and midwives, those in aged or community care, those in disability or mental health, those in acute or primary care, and so on. There is barely healthcare intervention in South Australia that a nurse or midwife does not have a key role in, whether it is guiding a newborn into the world, delivering a child's vaccination (which, I can tell you, from watching one of my children, was a noisy experience), helping rehabilitate a motor accident victim or caring for someone at the end of their life, to name but a few.

The government has committed to assist in building the capacity and capability of nursing and midwifery through the Rural Health Workforce Strategy. This commitment aligns with the South Australian Health Strategic Plan 2017-20 in ensuring a suitably qualified nursing and midwifery workforce is available to deliver evidence-based, high-quality nursing and midwifery services across the care continuum that is safe and reliable, integrates services and holds the patient and their family at the centre of service design and delivery, importantly for the people living in the most isolated and remote areas of South Australia.

I certainly want to acknowledge all nurses—triage nurses and nurse practitioners—who do that job in rural South Australia, especially in those difficult situations, when we do not always have a doctor on site and we have the SAVES initiative in place, when a doctor looks through a remote camera at what could be a car accident victim or something. I want to acknowledge the extended role they play and the extended training they take to protect those of us in regional areas and provide absolutely valuable, quality health care. In saying that, we are absolutely committed on this side of the house to supporting and valuing the contribution of nurses and midwives in this state.

To South Australia's nurses and midwives, not just to those who are currently practising but to those who have carried the professions forward over generations—thank you. On behalf of this side of the house, the government and all South Australians, thank you for your hard work, your compassion and your commitment to making a difference in the lives of the South Australian community. Thank you, all.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:47): I particularly thank the member for Hurtle Vale for introducing this very important motion to the house. I thank her for her work in this parliament, representing nurses and midwives, but also for her work as a nurse in her previous life before entering this place, particularly at Flinders Medical Centre in the retrieval service and at other hospitals across the state. It is excellent that our state has the benefit of the member for Hurtle Vale's experience as a nurse in this house.

I acknowledge a number of previous members of parliament who were nurses, in particular the previous members for Elder, Annabel Digance, and the Hon. Gail Gago in the other place. Both gave excellent service to this parliament, particularly with their background as nurses, understanding the pressures and the care that nurses provide in our healthcare system. It was valuable and important for this parliament. Like the member for Hurtle Vale, I hope that we see more nurses in the parliament in the future as well.

I also acknowledge, like other members, that we have just had the International Day of the Midwife and International Nurses Day. This is my first year celebrating those days as the shadow minister and Labor's spokesperson in this area, so it is of renewed importance to me to honour those days. We on this side of the house particularly mark those days to say thank you to all the nurses and midwives across South Australia, who play such an important role day in and day out, right around the clock, in all different healthcare settings.

I acknowledge that we have a very large number of nurses and midwives present in the chamber today. It is fantastic that we are able to welcome you into parliament. This is your parliament, not our parliament, and we are here to say thank you to you for all the hard work that you do in our state.

I will single out a couple of people, in particular, Associate Professor Elizabeth Debars, the CEO of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation in South Australia. I have known Elizabeth for a bit over a decade now and have worked with her. It is going to be a pleasure to continue to work with her now in the health portfolio. I also acknowledge that we have the Chief Nursing and Midwifery Officer, Jennifer Hurley, present as well. Congratulations to her on taking up that important role in our healthcare system. Representing nurses and midwives in that professional context within SA Health as a clinical leader is very important and I am sure that you will do an excellent job performing that role.

I note in acknowledging Elizabeth the importance of the ANMF in representing nurses in South Australia. Unfortunately, we do hear a lot of knocking of unions in Australia, and probably around the world, but in the ANMF you have a representative organisation of nurses and midwives across the state and across the country that provides an invaluable service in standing up for nurses and midwives, protecting their pay and conditions, advancing the causes of nurses in our healthcare system and advancing the causes of patients by extension to make sure that we have a better focused system on delivering good outcomes for patients.

I congratulate the ANMF on all the good work that they do. I acknowledge that on Friday we have the opening of their new education centre, which I would be honoured to attend, along with a number of members on this side of the house as well. It goes to show what a great role they provide in education across the healthcare sector in South Australia as well. We acknowledge and appreciate

all of the nurses and midwives who provide that vital service in hospitals, aged care and primary care.

It is timely that we also recently had the Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards, given by SA Health, announced on Friday. I would like to extend my congratulations to all of the award recipients:

- Roslyn Trott, Mary Buckskin Excellence in Practice—Aboriginal Nurse/Midwife;
- Kylie Booth, Excellence in Practice—Enrolled Nurse;
- Tracey Nicholls, Excellence in Practice—Registered Nurse;
- Jennifer Wood, Excellence in Practice—Registered Midwife;
- Justin Prendergast, Excellence in Leadership—Registered Nurse/Registered Midwife;
- Jenny Gardner, Excellence in Innovation in Education—Registered Nurse/Registered Midwife;
- Dr Lindy King, Excellence in Innovation in Clinical Research—Registered Nurse/Registered Midwife; and
- New Royal Adelaide Hospital Intensive Care Clinical Move Team, Excellence in Person-Centred Care—Team.

Congratulations to all of those award winners. I am sure they are just a handful of the standout examples of nurses and midwives who go beyond the call in terms of providing excellent care, as well as excellent leadership, in our state. I think it is very important that we recognise the excellent training and abilities that nurses and midwives have.

Florence Nightingale's birthday commemorates the beginning of International Nurses Day. Of course, there is a difference between then and now in the nursing profession. Nurses now go through an incredible amount of training, university education and on-the-job training to become a nurse. They play a very important and highly skilled role in our hospitals and in aged care and primary health care as well. It is something that we, on this side of the house, were very keen to champion in the 16 years that we were in government.

We want to make sure that we keep up in terms of the clinical roles that nurses can play to make sure that it is in step with the abilities that they have. The introduction of roles like nurse practitioners I think has been particularly important in making sure that nurses are playing the best role they possibly can and using all of the great abilities that they have.

As I said, nurses are also a fantastic voice for patients. The care that they provide in all settings of our healthcare system in standing up for patients and representing patients is vitally important. I certainly will be very keen in my role now to listen to as many nurses as I can who are on the front line of our healthcare system, to hear from them how we can best improve health care and deliver good outcomes for people.

I acknowledge as well that the ANMF and nurses around Australia have been undertaking a very important campaign around aged care and making sure that we get appropriate numbers of nurses into aged care to look after people. Particularly when we have people with a very high number and a wide variety of complex needs in aged-care settings, we need to make sure that there is an appropriate number of nurses there and that we are putting those residents of aged-care settings before profits of aged-care providers. That is something that certainly has our support. I know that the member for Hurtle Vale was at the rally on the weekend, and hopefully we will see more and more support for that campaign across the country.

I think it is also important to acknowledge the role that nurses play in primary health care. I remember when I first got involved in working in SA Health for a previous health minister about 13 years ago, one of the programs we introduced was a trial of practice nurses in GP clinics across the state. A lot of doctors back then were sceptical about having nurses in their GP clinics. Now we see the amazing role that nurses play in general practice across the state, as well as in a whole range of other primary healthcare settings. In particular, close to my heart is the role that nurses and

midwives play in the CaFHS across the state. When you have a little two year old, you rely on the support that you get from those services through those tricky early years.

I think it is also very telling that International Nurses Day this year is devoted to health as a human right. That is something that is very core to our principles in the Labor Party, that health should not be about what your bank balance is or where your parents went to school. It is a human right. Every South Australian deserves excellent health care. I know that that is something that nurses in South Australia fundamentally believe as well, and I look forward to working with nurses across the state over the next four years to make sure that we develop policies to help improve the care for South Australians across the state. Congratulations to all nurses and midwives.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:57): I rise today to speak in support of this motion in recognition of the invaluable work performed by midwives, particularly in our rural and regional areas and those who work in my electorate of Mount Gambier. The Mount Gambier hospital is home to three labour wards, with 20 beds and approximately 550 births per year. As one of only two level 4 maternity hospitals in regional South Australia, the Mount Gambier hospital can provide services to women and babies with more complex care needs. There are some 302 nursing staff employed at the Mount Gambier hospital. Of those, 28 are dual registration nurse midwives and direct entry midwives. Those midwives range in experience from the newly graduated to those who have had in excess of 45 years' experience.

Midwives in regional areas provide fantastic support to mothers and families, and their services extend well beyond those performed during their hospital stay. The pre and postnatal care provided by midwives is integral to ensuring that the babies born at the Mount Gambier hospital are given the best possible start to life. The provision of domiciliary care by midwives is vital to ensuring that babies continue to thrive once they leave the hospital. Domiciliary care services in Mount Gambier run six days a week from the ward and ensure continuity of care for mothers and babies throughout the Mount Gambier electorate.

On Friday 11 May, the Excellence in Nursing and Midwifery Awards were held. I was delighted that a close personal friend of mine, Rachael Yates, a midwife from Mount Gambier, was nominated for the Excellence in Practice—Registered Midwife Award. Rachael is doing a fantastic job connecting midwives throughout the state through forums, promoting best practice in midwifery. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate not only Rachael but the previous Labor government on instigating this program, connecting midwives around South Australia from regional areas through this service.

I congratulate Rachael on her nomination and recognise the fantastic work she does in midwifery, both in the South-East and across the state. It is vitally important that we continue to recruit and retain midwives in our regional areas and then connect them so that best practice is being practised throughout the state of South Australia in remote and regional areas.

In Mount Gambier, we are very lucky to have the University of South Australia offering a Bachelor of Midwifery. It is fantastic that local people have the opportunity to undertake nursing and midwifery studies in our area. It is one of the keys to ensuring that young people stay in our regions and are offered training and employment opportunities in this fantastic field. However, there is always more to be done, and I look forward to the government following through with its pre-election commitment to ensuring that we recruit and retain more health professionals to address skill gaps in our country areas. With that, I commend the motion to the house.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:01): I rise to support this motion. My heartfelt thanks go to the member for Hurtle Vale for bringing this motion and her experience to the house to recognise the fantastic midwives and nurses we have in South Australia. I also recognise International Day of the Midwife, held on 5 May annually, with this year's important theme being 'Midwives leading the way with quality care.' I recognise International Nurses Day on 12 May annually with the theme of 'Nurses, a voice to lead: health is a human right.' Thank you to all the nurses in the gallery today and in our community. You play a vital role. Thank you.

When I was doorknocking for the state election campaign, I came across many nurses and midwives in my local community, being so close to the Lyell McEwin and the Modbury hospitals. One of the things that really stood out to me was how much time the nurses and midwives took to provide

me their perspective on their role in the community but also the amount of time they spent giving me feedback on how support of them and our community could be enhanced.

One of the areas that I received feedback on and learnt a lot more about was the need for more support for bariatric patients and support. The midwives told me that Lyell McEwin Hospital is a key hospital where patients are sent, and the numbers are increasing. As the numbers increase so does our need for the right resource levels and equipment to ensure the risk of injury to patients and staff is minimised.

We must listen to our midwives. They have important ideas born from their experience, and I believe they will lead the way to a better health system. Yesterday, as I said in my maiden speech, some situations that women bring a voice to also demonstrate our unique experiences. I will briefly say that being a woman and having delivered two children, I also attest to the vital role of midwives. Their care and skill makes all the difference in that situation, and it absolutely must be acknowledged.

The other area that was brought to my attention, as I doorknocked and listened to my community, was around the risks that can be posed sometimes when patients might have a history of violence or be coming out of the prison system and the special care that is taken to prepare for those situations. The third area that was raised, which I bring to this house to be acknowledged, centres around there being enough resources and the right equipment to help nurses do their job well. This has been brought to my attention by nurses and midwives because they care so deeply about our community and want to see the best healthcare outcomes.

Briefly, I conclude by saying thank you so much for bringing this motion, and I thank all the nurses for all the work they do to support people in our community. They deserve to be acknowledged.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (12:05): I wish to also support the motion put forward by the member for Hurtle Vale and appreciate the contribution that she has made to our great state through her background and previous work. It is very important for us to take the time to recognise both International Day of the Midwife, held on 5 May, and also International Nurses Day, held on 12 May. The work done by our nurses is sometimes overlooked and sometimes underappreciated. That is something that I think many in our society wish to hopefully turn around. I note what has previously been said about the introduction of nursing awards and I highlight that that is an incredibly useful tool in bringing forward those who have gone above and beyond and contributed to our society. It is fantastic to recognise those people who have done such a fantastic job.

I wholeheartedly support this motion and wish to thank nurses for everything that they do, on behalf of myself, the government of South Australia and, I am sure, every member of the community who (a) comes into contact with their services, or (b) has had family, friends and others who have been in a place where they have needed the care of nurses. It is a profession that is difficult at times. I certainly understand that probably more than most. I probably spend more time with nurses than most in this house, given that my wife is a clinical nurse. My mother-in-law also has a nursing background, so I certainly do not underappreciate the contribution that nurses make to our community.

I am also very lucky in the western suburbs to have a fantastic hospital that delivers services locally, namely, the Western Hospital in Henley Beach. For so long, it has been a valued community hospital that has delivered services for the western suburbs of South Australia and, being centred in Henley Beach, with a practice around that, it is something that our local community values above many other things. We certainly appreciate the nurses who work at the Western Hospital.

Given the fact that I do have a nurse at home, I think I probably understand a little bit more than most about the amazing traits that our nurses have. They are caring, they are resilient and they rarely complain about situations that they are put in to. I hope you do not mind me being slightly cheeky, but they also have a unique sense of humour that I think is always important when dealing with the situations that they are put in, and I think that is something that we all appreciate as well.

I do not want to harp on this but, like the member for King, throughout my doorknocking during the election campaign I came across a number of nurses and had some quite detailed and long conversations with them regarding how they felt about their occupation, how they were enjoying their work and how they were getting on with the job that they had in front of them. I do not wish to

express any more than the disappointment that many of them expressed to me about the lack of consultation and the lack of input that they had in the design of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital down the road from this place.

They identified things like a lack of security and design issues with lights, doors and other functional issues. Our nurses are at the coalface of service and care delivery, and their wealth of knowledge around the practical delivery of those services goes beyond those who may have had input into that scenario. I want to at least acknowledge the disappointment that was expressed to me by many about the lack of participation through that process.

I also want to acknowledge the continual professional development that is part of being a nurse. I think something that is often overlooked is the continual professional development and search for improvement and best practice that is undertaken in all clinical situations by nurses, such as looking for the best of aseptic techniques and applying those through care scenarios. Whatever the number of portfolio commitments that nurses have, it is a fantastic thing to see that continual search for best practice in their field. I think many often overlook the fact that nurses continue to strive towards delivering the best care for those in our community who need it.

I want to close by again recognising everything you do for our community, for the people of South Australia, and the contribution you make to those moments in our lives when we may not necessarily be at our highest point. I think that, emotionally, the skills of nurses to deal with the ups and downs, the stress, can never be underrated. We applaud you for your contribution to South Australia.

Ms HABIB (Elder) (12:11): I am pleased to rise in support of this motion recognising the immense contribution that midwives and nurses make. In fact, my mum is a registered nurse and still works today as a nurse in Alice Springs at the Central Australian Aboriginal Congress. By the very nature of the profession, midwives and nurses are who we rely on during some of the most significant times in our lives, whether that is giving birth or during times of sickness. It is the midwives, nurses and other health professionals who we turn to and rely on. I am sure that many people would agree with me that, when we think back to some of those most significant moments, some of those really scary moments in our lives, it is the nurses and midwives who we remember as part of those times.

In fact, I recall that when I was 14 I had a spinal fusion. It was quite high-risk surgery. It went for five hours, during which they had to wake me up and make sure I could still wiggle my toes so I was not paralysed. Following the surgery, I spent five days unable to move, so I was reliant on nurses to come and turn me in bed so that I did not get bedsores. Many years later, I still remember those nurses and I remember their kindness. I think everybody would agree with me that we do love our nurses and we do love our midwives and for very good reasons.

I would also like to reflect briefly on the theme for International Nurses Day this year, held on 12 May: 'Nurses, a voice to lead: health is a human right'. The human right to health means that everyone has the right to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, which includes access to all medical services, sanitation, adequate food, decent housing, healthy working conditions and a clean environment. The human right to health care means that hospitals, clinics, medicines and doctors' services must be accessible, available, acceptable and of good quality for everyone on an equitable basis where and when needed.

I am proud that the Marshall Liberal government is making improvements to our healthcare system in South Australia reflecting those standards. I recall that during the campaign when I was out doorknocking so many people spoke to me about the closure of the Repat hospital. So many people were impacted. Everybody had a positive story to tell about the nurses at the Repat hospital.

I remember one gentleman saying to me that he now had to visit Noarlunga Hospital to receive the treatment he was required to receive, but it was too far for him to get to from his home. It was a \$50 cab ride and, as a pensioner, he just could not afford it. He was choosing not to go to his appointments at Noarlunga Hospital. So when I think about health care and the human right to health, meaning that it is accessible, it is so important that we see the Repat remain a genuine healthcare site.

In closing, in absolute support of this motion, I say on behalf of the whole Liberal team and the community, thank you. Thank you to all the nurses and all the midwives in our state for the important work that they do, caring for our community. Thank you for making our lives better.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:15): I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Hurtle Vale, recognising the International Day of the Midwife and International Nurses Day, and in doing so I would like to thank the nurses and midwives, who throughout my life and the life of my family have played a significant role.

Only a couple of weeks ago I was at Modbury Hospital with my dad. He was moved to Lyell McEwin. When we left there, I was reminded of a quote I had read about nurses that said patients may forget your name, but they will never forget how you made them feel. In this particular case that was certainly relevant to my dad. So to the nurses and the midwives across Australia today, including the ones in the chamber here, and also to the Nursing and Midwifery Federation, the nurses' union, which plays such a significant role, thank you.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12:15): I would like to thank all members—the members for Hammond, Mount Gambier, Torrens, Colton and Elder—for their thoughtful contributions on the motion. I would like to sincerely thank and acknowledge the shadow minister for health and wellbeing, (member for Kaurana) Chris Picton. Some of you may be aware and others may not be that the shadow minister, as he alluded to, has worked within health roles for a number of years. He was a key driver for the campaign around plain tobacco packaging when he worked for the then federal health minister, Nicola Roxon.

The shadow minister is a very determined, very passionate member in this place and in our community around health and wellbeing. I have had the great pleasure of working with him on some local health campaigns. Although he is not a nurse, he will champion health care and wellbeing and ensure that there is access and equality for members of our community.

I acknowledge again the presence of many members of Australia's biggest union, the ANMF, which does an amazing job not just for healthcare workers but as a voice for consumers of health care within our community and which passionately contributes to the campaigns. As mentioned, recently there was the rally on the weekend, on International Nurses Day, at Glenelg. Many of the nurses and midwives presently in the gallery were actually there, campaigning for decent, fair ratios for carers in aged care. It is impossible to deliver decent care, safe care and rewarding care on the numbers that they are given. I was there with the federal member for Hindmarsh, Steve Georganas, who sends his apologies for not being able to be here today; I want to acknowledge that as well.

I also want to echo the comments of many around the Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards. I know personally that some of the people here today who were part of that. I know that Natalie Hincksman is in the gallery. She was a member of that intensive care transfer team—she currently works for MedSTAR—that was recognised. Thank you, Nat, for the incredible work you do. I will not bring up the first retrieval you ever did that I was there with you on, but, anyway, we can have a laugh about that back up around the sandwiches maybe.

Thank you very much again. I was not there at the awards this year. I am very sad that I did not get a gig this year, but I congratulate all the award winners, and I know the shadow minister for health and wellbeing will be personally congratulating all recipients. I will acknowledge the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the Hon. Stephen Wade, from the other place, who will be co-hosting the thank you event, along with myself and the shadow minister, in the balcony room in a minute, and who will be sharing the cost of that, too. So thank you for that.

Members interjecting:

Ms COOK: Thank you—he is a minister; he does have a bigger budget than I do. With that, I thank all of you for your contributions. I thank everybody—my friends and colleagues, my mentors—for the work you do, the contribution you make every day for health and wellbeing in our community, and I commend the motion.

Motion carried.

INTERNATIONAL FIREFIGHTERS' DAY

Ms HABIB (Elder) (12:20): On behalf of Hon. C.L. Wingard, I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises International Firefighters' Day is held on 4 May 2018;
- (b) acknowledges that firefighters dedicate their lives to the protection of others and their property, risking the ultimate sacrifice of their lives;
- (c) remembers the past firefighters who have died while serving our community or dedicated their lives to protecting the safety of others; and
- (d) shows its support and appreciation for firefighters who work hard every day to protect their community.

It is my honour to move this motion on behalf of the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Perhaps you can tell us why the minister is not here himself.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Continue, member for Elder.

Ms HABIB: It is my honour to move this motion on behalf of the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. International Firefighters' Day falls on 4 May each year, coinciding with St Florian's Day. St Florian is the patron saint of all firefighters and was linked to firefighting in the Roman Empire. International Firefighters' Day provides the community with an opportunity to honour the service and sacrifice of all firefighters, past and present. Firefighters who have lost their lives in the line of duty are also remembered.

Firefighting is inherently dangerous, with firefighters routinely venturing into emergency scenes to prevent and minimise injury, life and property loss. Firefighters protect homes, businesses, assets, critical infrastructure, the environment, the economy and, most importantly, lives. International Firefighters' Day highlights the values firefighters uphold in the community, including service, perseverance, empathy, selflessness and an unwavering commitment to help others less fortunate.

While St Florian's Day has been marked in Europe for many years, the development of International Firefighters' Day was prompted by the tragic loss of firefighters in the Lynton bushfire in Victoria in 1998. In South Australia, 10 metropolitan firefighters lost their lives in the line of duty between 1862 and 1977, while 15 country firefighters have lost their lives. International Firefighters' Day provides an opportunity for the community to pause, reflect and say thank you.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (12:23): I also wish to say a few words to mark International Firefighters' Day and commend the minister for moving this motion and acknowledge his hard work in this area and the government's support of firefighters, both MFS and CFS. One thing that I love about the support of those on this side of the house is how we do appreciate that the MFS and the CFS are quite different but really important organisations. I hope it is a lesson learnt, especially since, when the member for Light was the minister for emergency services, he tried to merge those two organisations, much to the disappointment and chagrin of, especially, Country Fire Service operators and volunteers.

As we have seen out of Victoria recently as well, the socialist Andrews government has tried to enforce a merger on hardworking volunteers. That is probably what we expect from the Labor Party and is no doubt what a future Labor party wants to do if the member for Light is ever the minister again. It is really important to acknowledge the hard work of firefighters, and those on this side of the house appreciate their dedication, as do those on the other side of the house as well. We also acknowledge the important role that volunteers play, especially within the CFS, in general and within my community.

As the member for Elder touched upon in her contribution, International Firefighters' Day began after the tragic death in 1998 of five Country Fire Association (CFA) volunteers in Linton, Victoria. Here as well, we have seen firefighters really put their lives on the line to look after South Australians, through Ash Wednesday, Black Tuesday and the Pinery Fire in particular. Of

course, all firefighters do this on a daily basis as they go about their work looking after us, whether it be a fire that they put themselves in front of, chemical fires, which are particularly hazardous, or the general impact that firefighting has on life and limb.

As I said earlier, we also acknowledge all of our CFS volunteers because they put their body voluntarily on the line. That is something which is so important. It should never be taken for granted by the community and, indeed, the community does not take it for granted. Each day our personnel put their lives on the line to save lives and protect property, preventing and minimising physical and economic loss to a community.

In my electorate of Waite, and throughout the Mitcham Hills, we are truly blessed to have a CFS that is so dedicated to an area which is actually quite bushfire prone due to the Belair National Park and many of the open reserves and spaces as we head up into Heysen as well, with the groups up through the member for Heysen's electorate. My electorate, which falls into CFS Region 1, includes more than 3,000 firefighters and 83 brigades throughout the Mount Lofty area. In my community, as I said before, we have the Sturt CFS group. Dale Thompson is the magnificent group captain and leads a most fantastic group of volunteers and the brigades that make up the Belair, Blackwood, Coromandel Valley, Cherry Gardens and Eden Hills brigades.

About 180 volunteers give up their time and respond to so many emergencies. It is not just firefighting that they respond to; it is car accidents, it is rollovers, it is road clearing. They get calls at 2 o'clock in the morning and 2 o'clock in the afternoon and they make themselves available on behalf of the community. So I would like to really acknowledge my community volunteers who go above and beyond. Sturt group and those volunteer firefighters donate over 1,000 hours of their time to the CFS annually. They go all over the state, and were also recently involved in the Victorian fires.

One thing that is so important about the CFS in my area is how it is much loved by the community. Most businesses in my electorate have a CFS donation box on their front counter. My electorate office also has a CFS donation box on the front counter, and almost every time someone comes into my electorate office and gets a JP service or uses the resources they put \$1 or \$5 into the tin because they know how important it is for the CFS to be well funded in South Australia and particularly in my area. While it is a primarily urban area, it does rely on CFS volunteers.

The Sturt CFS group has 12 fire appliances, including the air support craft at Cherry Gardens and the CAFS tanker as well, which was a huge fundraising effort that the community got behind. In fact, it was only because—and the member for Light will correct me if I am wrong—the minister and the government at the time did not want to give any money. The then Labor government did not want to give any money for the CAFS tanker at Cherry Gardens.

It took a \$200,000 commitment from the local community plus a by-election pledge in 2015 that a future Liberal government would provide the rest of the funding for a CAFS tanker for the government to finally—and there is the member for Light shaking his head, but it is true. For so long, they did not want to provide funding to my CFS group but that is the attitude of the Labor Party. It is absolutely disgraceful and the then shadow minister, the member for Schubert, certainly knows it all too well.

As I mentioned in my maiden speech, it is incumbent on all of us to ensure that the CFS and SES are always well funded, respected and supported. That is why I look forward to working with the new Minister for Emergency Services and this Liberal government and ensuring that our CFS, as well as the MFS and all our volunteer groups, fire stations and communities, are well supported and maintained. That is why at the election—and I was with the then shadow minister at the Belair CFS station—we announced our \$5 million commitment to upgrading fire stations, because we on this side of the house know it is important that our firefighting stations, whether they be in Belair, Balaklava or Booleroo Centre, are well resourced and well funded. I am proud to say that this side of the house will always look after the CFS and our volunteers.

Mr BOYER (Wright) (12:30): I rise to speak on this motion and support it as well. In the north-east, we are very well serviced by two MFS stations—one on the boundary of the seat of Wright, just into Surrey Downs, and the other one a very new Salisbury command station on the corner of The Grove Way and Main North Road in Salisbury Heights. The Salisbury command station is a very impressive structure. It was co-located with the Salisbury SES, of which I am a member. In

fact, tonight is training and I was hoping the house might rise in time for me to get out there but, alas, I will be here instead.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Have you got permission?

Mr BOYER: I do not. I should seek permission, though. I am sure it would be granted. As long as I do not take doughnuts, I am sure I could go along and attend training. I was pleased to join the member for Cheltenham in December 2016 to open that new facility, where the SES is co-located with the Salisbury MFS. Both these stations were delivered by the previous Labor government, largely thanks to the efforts of the previous member for Wright, who commissioned the Salisbury station as minister for emergency services and selected the site of the Golden Grove station. In total, the Labor government opened seven new metropolitan fire stations and a new aerial firefighting base in Brukunga.

As a previous chief of staff to the minister for emergency services, I was also fortunate to visit many MFS stations around the state and meet the brave firefighters who work in those stations. I would like to add that it was during this period that the previous Labor agreement introduced the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (Firefighters) Amendment Act, which enshrined in legislation a presumption that a range of cancers suffered by MFS and CFS firefighters were sustained through that role, therefore qualifying them for workers compensation. Of course, this is an opportunity not only to thank our current fireys but also to remember those who did not make it home.

All workers and volunteers who leave home for a shift should expect to return home safely. Unfortunately, this is not always the case, and International Firefighters' Day is about pausing to remember those who fell in the line of duty. It should be remembered, too, that our fireys do much more than just attend fires. They also attend motor vehicle accidents and witness the horrifying carnage on our roads, often using the jaws of life to cut people from the wreckage, sometimes being the ones holding the hands of victims as they pass away.

The toll this takes on MFS officers is very difficult to quantify, and many of the fireys I have spoken to comment that the effects are still felt many years after the incident. They also conduct some fantastic awareness programs like RAP (Road Awareness Program), and recently the Golden Grove station attended my daughter's childcare facility to teach the kids there the basics of fire safety and let them have a play on the truck.

Having a stand-alone day of thanks for our firefighters, both CFS and MFS, also allows everyone in our community to take the opportunity to thank them for everything they do on a daily basis to keep us all safe. That is exactly what I set out to do on 4 May recently. On that day, now forever known as the birthplace of 'doughnutgate', I rang my local station, spoke to the crew rostered on and asked if I could drop by and personally thank them by delivering a tray of doughnuts. I was advised that they would greatly appreciate it, but if they did not answer the doorbell it meant they would be out on a job and I should simply come back later. And that is precisely what took place.

The crew were in Wynn Vale putting out a bin fire when I first went there, so I went back a couple of hours later, just as the crew had returned, and I sat down with a box of Krispy Kreme doughnuts. We shared the doughnuts, discussed the importance of International Firefighters' Day and the great safety record that we have in South Australia and I thanked the crew members for all their work. They were very appreciative of the gesture. That is why it was so disappointing to receive a stern rebuke from the minister's office more than a week later for my attendance there.

I cannot for the life of me understand how those opposite could think that a local member of parliament, dropping by to personally thank firefighters on a day that is set aside to do exactly that, is somehow inappropriate and disrespectful to both the MFS and the minister.

It is important that we remember that the real motivation for International Firefighters' Day is to remember those who died in the line of duty. Most of us take for granted that we will return home from work safely. Our MFS and CFS firefighters do not have this luxury. Let us spare a thought, too, for their families who wait anxiously at home for their safe return.

I strongly encourage members of parliament to take the time to visit their MFS and CFS stations, and to thank them for their service to our community. I can assure you that doughnuts are just fine by our fireys.

Mr BROCK (Frome) (12:35): I rise to support this motion put forward by the minister. Our communities, particularly in the regional areas of South Australia, benefit from the services of full-time and volunteer firefighters. Permanent firefighters who are members of the South Australian fire service, along with many other members, provide their services across all regional South Australia through the CFS organisations. These people are always there whenever there is a need for their services. They risk their lives to protect the lives of others; and they protect their properties and the properties of others. These services are not only offered during normal working hours but at any time of the day and throughout the year, 365 days a year.

International Firefighters' Day is a small way to pay tribute to those who may have lost their lives or suffered some form of injury, and to pay tribute to the great sacrifice they make during the course of their actions. However, the beginning of International Firefighters' Day was born from a tragic event that took place in the Linton community, Victoria, in 1998, when crews were called to fight a large wildfire, which brought numerous units across, including volunteer firefighters from the Geelong West Fire Brigade.

During the fire, five water tankers required refilling. It was during one of these occasions that there was a very sudden and violent wind change. As the change eventuated, it cut off the tanker that was refilling with water, tragically resulting in the truck being engulfed in flames and killing all five firefighters in that vehicle. After that dreadful incident, a volunteer lieutenant and firefighter, J.J. Edmondson, started the journey to what is now known as International Firefighters' Day.

This event, along with letters of support and the fellowship that flowed from the tragedy spurred J.J. to set a new year's resolution for 1999, namely, to organise an internationally recognised symbol of support and respect for all firefighters and a date on which this could be coordinated worldwide. For many weeks, J.J. coordinated email discussions with national and international communities, seeking comments and suggestions for an appropriate date and symbol. The response was overwhelmingly positive, with great support for the chosen date and the symbol of ribbons.

As mentioned earlier, firefighters in most European countries celebrate their day on 4 May as a day of fire service, as well as St Florian's Day. St Florian's Day is known worldwide and has been traditionally celebrated for 150 years in Europe. Often communities remember human sacrifice through observing a minute's silence. For International Firefighters' Day in 2002, an inaugural sound-off was conducted to reflect on the commitment and sacrifices of firefighters worldwide in a truly poignant manner for emergency service workers. Due to the amazing support of the sound-off in 2002, there is now an annual sound-off on the first Sunday of every May.

One of the most significant symbols of International Firefighters' Day is the red and blue ribbon. This ribbon is cut precisely five centimetres long and one centimetre wide, with the two separate colours co-joined at the top. J.J. Edmondson chose red and blue because red represents the element of fire and blue represents the element of water. Coincidentally, red and blue are also the colours recognised worldwide to signify emergency services. Therefore, red and blue was the best choice of colour to recognise the international holiday. The ribbon is traditionally worn on the lapel (otherwise known as the fold of fabric on a shirt), but is not limited to that spot. The red and blue ribbon is a simple yet effective way to show support for International Firefighters' Day.

While there have been many incidents across the nation that can be mentioned, I would like to mention a couple that recently occurred in close proximity to me, namely, the Bangor and Pinery fires, and not forgetting Black Wednesday and other incidents across the whole of the state. During these incidents, the volunteers not only risked their own lives but, on many occasions, helped to protect their own properties and those of their friends. As was mentioned earlier, firefighters have to contend not only with naturally caused fires but also with those fires that are deliberately lit. This is a tragedy. Whoever sets these fires may think it is a joke or that they are being funny, but I can assure people that that is far from being the case.

This loss by many people causes not only financial loss but, very importantly, on many occasions the loss of great memorabilia that may be the only remembrance of a loved one. Again, I

have had personal experience where a fire has gone through and people have lost the only photos they may have had of a deceased family member or friend.

Firefighters also have to attend issues unrelated to fires. They also attend road accidents with CFS volunteers and other emergency services. I can speak personally about an incident in which my late wife was killed, just 10 days before Christmas some years ago. People ran out to the accident and, even to this day, 25 years later, those people still vividly remember that day. Even after 25 years, people still talk about it and have vivid and tragic memories of that particular day. That incident affected not only my own family but also the volunteers from the SES, the ambos, St John's, the fireys and others. We have to remember that the volunteers and firefighters not only attend fires and accidents but also have these tragic memories for many years, and it can really affect their mental health. As I said, there have been many occasions where a firefighter has gone to a motor vehicle accident only to find out that it involves a close friend or, even worse, a family member.

Another sector of the community that needs to be greatly acknowledged is the numerous small business operators who have volunteers working for them. When the bells and the sirens sound, there is a requirement that these people attend an accident or a fire, and they go out there immediately. They do not hesitate. They do not say, 'I'm still working.' They do not consider that. They get into their vehicles, they get onto the fire units and they go out there immediately. This can often be a great disruption to the operation of a business, especially when the volunteer may continue to get paid by that business. I think this is something the general public does not understand in metropolitan areas where we have full-time firefighters. However, in the country, volunteers may suffer a financial loss. Alternatively, businesses may continue to pay them even though it is a financial loss for them.

We need to remember and congratulate those who have served previously and show gratitude to all those who have given their time and risked their lives to protect the rest of us and our communities. Again, I commend all the CFS volunteers across the electorate of Frome, the MFS full-time people stationed at Port Pirie and all the other volunteers who serve. I offer my heartfelt thanks to them for volunteering their services. I congratulate them and give them my 100 per cent support throughout the year. I commend this motion to the house.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of the former member for the electorates of Stuart and Eyre, and former Speaker of the House of Assembly, the Hon. Graham Gunn.

Motions

INTERNATIONAL FIREFIGHTERS' DAY

Debate resumed.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:43): I rise to speak in support of this motion and to add my thanks, on behalf of my community, to the people who work in firefighting and the emergency services. For people who may be interested, St Florian was a Roman soldier who was killed for his Christian beliefs. He was set afire and then thrown into water, so both water and fire are associated with St Florian. I would like to acknowledge the work undertaken for community safety by not only our firefighters in the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Service but also those people who work in the SES. The reality is that on the ground those organisations work together on a regular basis, and they work very well together.

Unfortunately, as a result of the boundary changes I have only one CFS brigade left in my electorate, and that is the Dalkeith CFS. From my point of view the Dalkeith CFS is the most important CFS brigade in the whole state; it is less than two minutes away from my home, so should I ever need it they will be there. Of course, the Metropolitan Fire Service is also not very far away. In terms of my electorate we are served by the Dalkeith brigade of the CFS and we also have the Gawler brigade of the MFS. We are also served by two SES units, Edinburgh and also Kapunda, which cover

that area. They all do a wonderful job, and I would like to acknowledge and thank them for the work they do with me in my electorate.

Twice a year, we have community safety days and the three services work with me to inform and educate the community about fire safety. We have two fire safety days, and the one pre-winter is to make sure people understand fires associated with houses. Electric blankets, heaters in the house, etc., can, unfortunately, end up as fires and people do die. The reality is that more people die from a fire in the home than die in bushfires. That is a sad fact of life, and it often happens with elderly people, who are the some of the most vulnerable in our community. Just prior to summer we also have a community safety day to warn people of bushfire risk.

Along with those groups is the State Emergency Service. In winter, they educate people about flooding and about preparation for storms. As has already been mentioned, all three services deal not only with fire and other crises but also with road accidents; in fact, a growing amount of work is done by my brigades with road crashes. Indeed, if I am right, at last count the Dalkeith CFS was the busiest CFS brigade in the state. It is a very active brigade there on the corner of Coventry and Dalkeith Roads, and I am proud to say that they have made me an honorary member of the brigade.

I really do value my relationship with the Dalkeith CFS, the Gawler brigade and both the Edinburgh and Kapunda CFS units. We should also acknowledge the other emergency services—the ambulance and the police—whose members put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe. Together, these services do a wonderful job in making sure there is minimum loss of life and property in our community, and it is appropriate for us to acknowledge them today.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (12:47): I rise to support the motion. It is known in our state that we can expect serious fires in six or seven years out of every 10, and the majority of those fires will be in rural and regional South Australia, including in the Hills. The danger of fire is deep in the psyche of my community; we know and understand how dangerous fire can be and how quickly it can spread through the Hills.

It has been a privilege to visit many CFS stations and volunteers in my district. The professionalism and dedication of local CFS volunteers cannot be overstated. Also within my electorate is the CFS training centre at Brukunga and the CFS air operations airstrip. Put simply, the Hills depend on the CFS. The relationship between CFS volunteers and my community is a long one. Local brigades were often sponsored by councils, and men and women in the district would be called together in times of emergency using whatever resources could be requisitioned.

Before 1939, in Mount Barker the district council had only 30 knapsacks and leather-faced beaters for community firefighting. After January 1939, when a devastating bushfire burned through from Stirling to Strathalbyn, incinerating nearly everything in its path, a brigade was formed. Brigades were in the course of being formed elsewhere, or already had been formed.

During history month, I had the opportunity to examine the Nairne CFS history collection. It was a moving experience. Their dedication to assisting our community over many years must be recorded here, as must the exceptional dedication of the Carey Gully CFS, the Brukunga CFS, the Oakbank/Balhannah CFS and the Hahndorf CFS. I have also had the opportunity to meet with the Onkaparinga Group, as a whole, at the Onkaparinga Group base in Woodside. I acknowledge and thank their members for their extraordinary service and their willingness to share their knowledge and experience with me.

It can sometimes be forgotten that the CFS not only fight fires, as other members have today reminded the house. They are also tasked with, amongst other things, assisting in significant road accidents. Mr Deputy Speaker, as you know, road trauma is all too common in the Hills and especially at night or during wet and treacherous conditions—but not only in those conditions. The skills that CFS members have developed within my electorate have saved many, many lives. In closing, I briefly reflect on the Ash Wednesday fires and on what Barbra Leslie, from Mylor, told *The Advertiser* in February 2013:

It was a Red Alert day at the end of a hot, dry spell that had scorched the ground tinder dry. Temperatures hit 43C and the squally northeasterly winds were gusting at 75 km/h...

At her home in Mylor, [Ms] Leslie knew a bushfire was coming. 'It's in the air. The birds tell you, you can smell the dryness before the fire even starts...All it takes is a bit of broken glass. The littlest thing can start one.'

Mr Deputy Speaker, I mentioned that the fear and the risk of fire is deep in the psyche of my community. As I think you may be aware, the parents of my partner, Jen, had a property at Mylor. That is partly why I reflect on the experience of Mylor. Jen's father was a member of the CFS and the CFS saved Jen's parents' house during the Ash Wednesday fires. On that same day, in only a few short hours, 28 people died, 14 of whom, I understand, were from the Hills. Three CFS volunteers also lost their lives and more than 300 homes were destroyed. We are, therefore, personally grateful as a family to the CFS, but our gratitude is no more or less than the fulsome gratitude that we all feel throughout the Hills for the CFS and for all firefighters.

On the really tough days, on the really tough fire-danger days, and on other days, on wet and dangerous roads, the lives of CFS volunteers are genuinely at risk, and they place their lives at risk so that they can protect ours. There can be no greater contribution to our community than to consciously make the decision to put yourself in the path of danger to assist or care for others.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:52): I, too, rise to support the motion. As my colleague the member for Kavel has, I also take the opportunity to focus on the volunteer service of CFS firefighters. I am very conscious that I spoke in this place yesterday in my Address in Reply about community and volunteers. There is no better lived example of the value to community than the contribution of our volunteer firefighters. That is also no more apparent than in the Adelaide Hills, where Heysen is situated.

There are many CFS brigades within Heysen, and I take the opportunity to mention briefly three of them to illustrate the range and nature of the work that the volunteers do. At one end of the scale we have the Stirling CFS brigade responding to a very large number of call-outs in the course of any year. They are really on the edge of what one might expect of a professional MFS unit. The services they provide are critical both in relation to their response to what one first thinks of—grass fires and bushfires and so on—but also, particularly given their proximity to the South Eastern Freeway, their response to car accidents and incidents on the freeway that so often occur.

To illustrate the scope and scale of the work that the Stirling CFS brigade has done in recent times, I will reference history. In 1995-96, the Stirling CFS brigade responded to 163 call-outs. Fast-forwarding to 2015-16, the number was still in that order with 227 call-outs, and in the 2016-17 year the brigade responded to 388 call-outs. That is a 141 per cent increase in just that year and illustrates the trajectory. On a recent visit to the Stirling CFS brigade, I saw a whiteboard maintained there indicating the numbers each year. If that was expressed in a line, you would see it rapidly accelerating. So the Stirling CFS brigade and its volunteers are increasingly called out in a wide variety of circumstances.

I also note that just yesterday we came to the end of what was an extended fire season this year, given the very dry conditions that the Hills in particular have experienced ever since Christmas. It is a reminder that we live in circumstances, particularly in the Hills, where we need to be ever watchful of the fire risk and never more so than in a particularly dry year such as this one with the extended fire danger season.

The other two brigades that I would like to mention briefly in the time available are the Blewitt Springs Country Fire Service brigade and the Bridgewater CFS brigade. The Blewitt Springs brigade is at the centre of the community of Blewitt Springs. Noel and Luci Sibley, who are stalwarts of that brigade, exemplify the spirit of volunteerism and how the CFS, in the circumstance of a very small community, can really be at the centre of community life. I had the pleasure of joining Noel and Luci last Christmas at the CFS shed which was temporarily turned into a dinner venue, and I daresay just about all of the Blewitt Springs community was present on that occasion. It was a tremendous example of how the fabric of the community is reinforced by the CFS as a focal point.

I will mention very briefly in the time remaining the Bridgewater CFS brigade, my local brigade. There is a hero of that brigade by the name of Charlie Rosewarne, a much-celebrated pioneer of the CFS. Much more ought be said about Charlie Rosewarne and when I have an opportunity to do so, I will. All of them are supported by all of us and, as we recognise them on this occasion, it is a tremendous opportunity to recognise their service.

Ms HABIB (Elder) (12:59): Thank you to all the members who have contributed to the motion. On behalf of the government, I would like to acknowledge the incredible work of firefighters

across our state. We applaud their courageous effort and show our appreciation to all firefighters past and present. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Mr RAU (Enfield) (14:00): I rise on a matter of privilege. Last week, the Minister for Police gave an undertaking to the house to table notes taken by his unnamed senior staffer at a southern suburbs forum. On Wednesday 9 May, the Minister for Police informed the house, and I quote:

My staff member will have taken notes, and we have discussed those notes. Have I seen a handwritten copy of those notes? No, but I am happy to give those to the house, provide them to the house, as is needed or wanted.

The Minister for Police then reiterated this undertaking to the house, and I quote:

Yes, I am happy to look at those notes and return them to the house as deemed fit.

Having given a clear undertaking to the house yesterday when asked by me to table the documents, the Minister for Police gave the following reply, and I quote:

...he—

meaning me, the member for Enfield—

has every manner to go about receiving them and he knows how to do that through FOI, I think.

The Minister for Police further stated to the house, and I quote:

...it is right there for the member to apply for through the act...as he knows full well, unless he is being too lazy to do so.

Then, a further quote:

... he is free to apply for that as he sees fit. Don't be lazy. It's an FOI.

As I said earlier, that Minister for Police has an obligation and a duty to the house to act in good faith. He offered to provide material to the house and has now refused. I request you, Mr Speaker, to consider this as a matter of privilege.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Enfield. What I will do on this occasion is ask the member for Enfield to please provide all relevant documents to me as soon as reasonably possible. I will defer my decision, and I will report back to the house at the first available opportunity and whether I consider the matter to be a prima facie form of a matter of privilege.

Ministerial Statement

VISITING DELEGATION FROM BRITTANY

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am pleased to report to the house that a delegation from the region of Brittany is in Adelaide this week for a series of meetings to strengthen and progress the South Australia-Brittany sister-region relationship. This is the first large delegation to visit South Australia since this relationship was established in September 2017. I would like to acknowledge the member for Cheltenham for entering into this sister-region relationship.

The visit is focusing on developing closer, mutually beneficial economic ties with Brittany through strategic projects and increased trade and investment. The state government is committed to the continued investment in our relationship with Brittany and France. This investment is crucial if we are to maximise the economic benefits emerging from South Australia's role as the home to the national defence industry, which is underpinned by an \$89 billion continuous shipbuilding program.

Brittany is an important hub of French industry, commerce and research and development, with many major French multinationals, including naval group, Dassault Systemes and Neoen, basing their operational and research centres there. Following my recent constructive meetings with President Macron and the French Foreign Minister, Le Drian, I am delighted to welcome more of our French friends to South Australia.

Ms Forough Salami-Dadkhah, the Vice-President for International and European Affairs, is leading the delegation, and it was a pleasure to meet with her, along with vice presidents Bernard Pouliquen and Ms Anne Gallo on Monday. This week, the delegation is visiting the Tonsley Innovation District, the Waite Institute and South Australia's leading cultural and educational institutions. They are also meeting with members of the cabinet and representatives of Business SA.

South Australia's growing cybersecurity sector and compatibility with Brittany's concentration of high-tech, cyber and associated industries mean that there are numerous opportunities for firms from Brittany in the defence supply chain and cyber sectors. We have already seen fantastic results in the education and research sectors, including the University of Adelaide and the National Institute of Advanced Technologies of Brittany (ENSTA Bretagne), which recently announced a new dual master's degree in marine engineering.

Flinders University and ENSTA Bretagne have partnered with French company Thales Group on exchanges and joint research in advanced solar and naval robotics technology. Several tertiary scholarship programs have also been put in place to foster and facilitate exchanges that support the successful local delivery of the Future Submarines program.

I thank the delegation for strongly supporting French Days on Campus. This event is taking place this week and will see representatives from French tertiary institutions visit Adelaide University, Flinders and the University of South Australia to promote study in France. The South Australian-Brittany sister-region relationship is still in its infancy, and I am committed, as is my counterpart, the President of Brittany, to continuing to develop key projects that will strengthen our bond and bring continued economic prosperity to both of our regions.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:07): I bring up the first report of the committee.

Report received.

Question Time

POLICE COMMISSIONER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier have the full total and unconditional confidence in the police commissioner?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08): Absolutely.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, a new question.

The SPEAKER: A new question from the leader.

POLICE COMMISSIONER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Minister for Police. Given that the Premier has indicated his full confidence in the police commissioner, why is it necessary for the government to appoint a retired judge or senior lawyer to undertake a review of all aspects of police work?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:08): I thank the member for his question. This is a policy we took to the election. We took a suite of policies to the election that the South Australian people voted for. I have had a number of meetings with the police

commissioner and talked through areas that he thinks can be improved, things we can work on, things we can explore, and that is what we are going to do with this policy.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary from the leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, it's a new question.

POLICE COMMISSIONER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Minister for Police. Does the minister support all operational decisions that have been made by the police commissioner?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Laughter is out of order. Members on my right will remain silent while the minister answers the question.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is called to order. All will remain quiet while the minister answers the question. Minister, you have the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:09): I thank the opposition leader for his question. I have regular meetings with the police commissioner. We talk through a whole matter of issues. I don't know that we've got to every one that is on his agenda just yet after just a handful of weeks, but we talk about a whole heap of matters, including our policies, and I stress those policies are there and readily available for all the community to see and we will be delivering on those policies.

The SPEAKER: Last supplementary, leader.

POLICE COMMISSIONER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): A supplementary question: minister, are there any operational decisions that this police commissioner has made recently that the minister does not support?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: the leader has just asked the same question twice in a row. He doesn't get to do that.

The SPEAKER: I will hear the answer. Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members will not interject. The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call. Minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:10): Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I said in my previous answer to a very similar question, I have conversations with the police commissioner all the time. We talk about different matters of operation and policy. We have a very open dialogue and we talk through all these issues. It is a very, very professional relationship—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and we look forward to working with the commissioner into the future to deliver again on all of our policies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order! The member for Waite.

HYDROTHERAPY SERVICES

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:10): Thank you very much, sir. My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier please update the house on his recent visit to the Repat site and on the government's plans for hydrotherapy services in southern Adelaide?

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be heard in silence. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10): Thank you very much. I thank the member for Waite for his question. The Repat is a very important precinct in his area, and I thank him for his interest in the Repat. Like the member for Waite, I am very interested in the Repat, as are most South Australians. They saw it as a very valuable precinct. It was one that the former government said it would never, ever sell—never, ever.

That was before there was a change in premier, apparently, and they moved away from that original position. They didn't make that clear before the election, when I note that the previous member for Waite was doing poster shots out the front saying, 'The Repat is very important to us.' Well, the Repat is really important to us, and we are actually doing the work that is necessary to turn this back into a genuine health precinct after those opposite did everything they could to destroy the value of that piece of land in the electorate of Elder.

Can I say that, on Sunday morning, I had the great opportunity to meet with some of the key personnel who work in the southern system, in particular Sue O'Neill, who is the newly appointed Chief Executive of the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network; Mr David Morris, the Chief Operating Officer; and Dr Di Lawrence, who is the Acting Executive Director of Medical Services. I thank those members of the Public Service who took the time out—on Mother's Day, I point out—to actually provide a comprehensive briefing for me and Stephen Wade, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in South Australia.

This is a fantastic site. It beggars belief that those opposite actually wanted to close it down. The southern suburbs is an area where there is a growing population and an ageing population. We believe that there needs to be improved services available to meet community expectations, and that is why we will be doing everything we possibly can to reinstitute health services on that site. One of the things we have already done and we have taken action on is to provide access to the public for the services of the pool that was on that site, the hydrotherapy pool. Services or access to that pool will start from the end of this month, and it will be scaled up in the months following that.

I must say that I really enjoyed meeting with Gemma Taylor and Leslie Diwitt Jones from the YWCA. They have been running a program called the Encore program, which provides people who have suffered from breast cancer to actually take part in hydrotherapy activities. They had previously been undertaking those activities at the pool that was at the Flinders Medical Centre, and as those opposite, and in fact every person in this parliament should be aware, there were two pools: one at the Repat and one at Flinders Medical Centre. They were both closed and a new pool was built at the Flinders Medical Centre. The problem was that it did not actually meet the capacity of the two pools that were operating before.

So Encore was without a pool to provide a safe and secure environment for women who have suffered from breast cancer and who may not want to undertake hydrotherapy at a public pool, and you can imagine the reasons why. My sister is a survivor from breast cancer, and often women, having been through treatment are without hair and maybe also have physical differences from where they were previously, do not want to be in a public environment. That is why it was so important for us to make sure that they do have adequate facilities. We are going to make sure that the Repat hydrotherapy pool is open and available to the Encore group, and other community groups and rehab patients, as soon as possible.

POLICE STATION OPENING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is to the Minister for Police. Does the minister think that the police commissioner made the wrong decision to amend police station operating hours to focus on front-line policing?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:15): As I have answered before in this ongoing saga, this ongoing question, we took a policy to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is called to order.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —the election and outlined our policies very clearly. We made it abundantly clear that we are going to extend the opening hours of three police stations, and that is what the people of South Australia want. They voted for that and they want that. That is our policy, that is what we will be delivering on, and I am having great conversations—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —with the police commissioner about delivering on our policies.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I call to order the Premier, the member for Morialta and the member for Bragg. The leader.

POLICE STATION OPENING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): A supplementary question: if the police minister is not going to instruct the police commissioner, why does he think the police commissioner is going to change his mind on police station operating hours?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister will be heard in silence. Minister, you have the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:16): Again, to reiterate my answer, on this side of the house we are working very closely and cooperatively with our departments and, in my case, the police commissioner. I have thoroughly enjoyed the conversations we have had, the dialogue we have had, about delivering on our policies, and we will deliver on those policies.

POLICE STATION OPENING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): A supplementary question to the minister: can the minister assure the house that the extended police operating hours he has committed to delivering will be serviced by fully sworn police officers?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:16): I do not know why the other side want to keep closing police stations. We want to make our community as safe as possible. We have made our election commitments abundantly clear. I have answered this question hundreds of times, and we will deliver—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —on our election commitments.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the next question, the member for Morialta has continued interjecting, and he is warned for the first time. Member for Elder.

LAND TAX

Ms HABIB (Elder) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the house on the government's plans to reform our state's land tax regime, and how will that support South Australians, especially those who have worked so hard to set themselves up for retirement?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:17): I thank the member for Elder for her question. Unlike those opposite, who want to major in the minors for every single one of their question times so far, we are dealing with the big issues that are important to the people of South Australia. I will tell you one of the things that is really important—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to the people of South Australia, and that is the very high level of taxation that those opposite inflicted upon every single household and every single business in South Australia. Ever since the moment I came into this place, I have stood for lower tax, less intrusion on individuals and businesses by the government of this state. We are already hitting the ground—in fact, we did it from opposition. We did it from opposition because we blocked that car park tax and we actually also very proudly blocked the imposition of that massive state bank tax that the previous treasurer wanted to inflict upon the people of South Australia.

They are addicted to tax and wasteful expenditure. Well, there's a new game in town: lower taxes, a growing economy, more jobs and the ability to keep young people here in our state. I have already outlined to the house our plans to reduce payroll tax come 1 January next year. Those opposite will know that we will be implementing a reduction in stamp duty come 1 July this year. But one thing that I haven't updated to the house already is our plan to lower land tax.

You would know, sir, as would other members of the house, that land tax in South Australia is the highest in the nation. This is a massive handbrake on business activity in this state. It is also a body blow to people who have worked hard, accumulated assets and, each and every year, they basically have the Treasurer's hand in their pocket. We are going to be doing everything we can as soon as we possibly can to reduce the burden on those people.

Can I just say that at the moment South Australia currently has the highest top marginal tax rate of land tax in the nation at a whopping 3.7 per cent annually. This is an incredible imposition on people who have worked hard, accumulated assets and invested in them. I am sure that there are people opposite who have people in their electorates who are very upset with the very high level of land tax that they are paying.

The good news that you can go back and tell all those people in your electorate is that we now have a Liberal government in place in South Australia that wants to lower that burden on them. Can I just tell you what we will be doing? From 1 July 2020, we will be doing two things. First of all, we will be increasing the threshold on which people are paying land tax, from the incredibly low \$353,000 current threshold up to \$450,000—an increase of almost \$100,000, or around 30 per cent.

We will also be doing everything we can to reduce that top marginal rate for holdings. Where that is a value of less than \$5 million, we will be bringing the top rate down from 3.7 per cent to 2.9 per cent. Is this enough? Well, let me tell you, I would like to do more. I would like to do everything I can to ease the burden—the taxation burden and the regulatory burden—on households, families and small business in this state. I recommit myself today, in this chamber, and to you, sir, that every day that I'm in here in this parliament I will be doing everything I can to make this a more attractive place for people to invest, to create businesses, to employ people and to grow our economy and, most importantly, to keep our next generation right here in South Australia.

POLICE COMMISSIONER PROTOCOL

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Police. Has the minister or the Premier met to clarify their position on directing the police

commissioner to implement government policy? Yesterday, at 2.42pm, the Premier told the house, and I quote, 'We will be directing the police commissioner.' Then at 2.55pm, the Minister for Police told the house, and I quote, 'I am not going to instruct the police commissioner.'

The SPEAKER: The Premier.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be heard in silence. The member for West Torrens will not shout before the Premier answers. The Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:22): Thank you very much, sir, and I thank the leader for his question because it gives me an opportunity to perhaps provide some clarity.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, because in August last year, when we released our policy, I said that we would be directing, or in fact I think I used the term 'instructing' (I went back and had a look) the police commissioner to develop a protocol to make sure that our children were not subject to drug sales at school. I think that is a pretty reasonable position to take. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the people of South Australia want that. They don't want their kids going to school—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, let me just say that the people of South Australia don't have such a casual attitude towards drugs in schools as maybe some of those opposite. I don't know why they want to come in here defending the drug pushers who go into our schools trying to sell—

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: this is clearly debate, and it's offensive.

The SPEAKER: I do ask the Premier to return to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And I'm very happy to, sir.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said yesterday, I reiterated the position that we took to the election that we would, if necessary, direct—or 'instruct' I think was the word—the police. That is not necessary. May I just say that we have a very cooperative relationship with SAPOL, and that will continue.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Will the minister update the house on the government's plan to reform natural resources management and the commitment to ease cost-of-living pressures in regard to the NRM levy?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:23): As the member for Stuart mentions, it is another good reform for our state and a reform that will deliver cost-of-living improvements to South Australians.

Natural resources management is something that I know has a significant interest for the member for MacKillop, and it has been a pleasure to be able to work with the NRM board in his region recently and to see the appointment of Fiona Rasheed as the new chair of the NRM board in the South-East. Fiona brings a significant amount of experience to the role, and I believe she will do much to reposition that board to be a highly relevant and reform-focused body for rural affairs in the South-East.

When I became the shadow minister for the environment last year, it became very apparent to me that there were significant problems with natural resources management in the state. The original intent of natural resources management had been lost and that original intent was focused on bringing together soil boards, water catchment boards and pest control boards into an integrated model. That sounds like a really good thing, and in principle it is.

However, through that process, NRM boards became increasingly centralised and members in this house who represent regional communities, in particular, would know the many problems that that created, including a loss of that back to basics, on the ground environmental restoration and repair work that those boards were traditionally known for. That focus delivered economic, as well as environmental, sustainability for our regional landscapes.

That change led to a loss of goodwill and increasing centralisation of decision-making and a breakdown of partnerships between local governments, between NGOs, between people managing the land and between the state government that was administering these programs in a centralised way. It also led to a significant rise in NRM levies, which put a significant cost pressure on households, landowners and business owners particularly, again, in regional communities.

We have seen in the last year, and will in the forthcoming year, a 6 per cent increase in the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM levies. Members would know that that again is a significant cost pressure on South Australian households and businesses. Our response is to create the landscape South Australia act, which we will be bringing into this parliament during the first term of government. We will be repealing the NRM Act and we will be bringing landscapes SA to this parliament, which will have a very significant focus on back to basics, soil quality, water management, pest control, as well as looking at biodiversity and economic sustainability—such important things for our regional landscapes.

We will be looking at increasing community voice on NRM boards. Three NRM board members will be elected from the community, adding confidence that NRM boards are standing up for communities, particularly regional communities, like the communities represented by the member for MacKillop. We will be creating a \$2 million grassroots grant program, and we will be creating three new boards to cover the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges region, taking that decision-making back to communities.

In particular, we will be bringing in a cap on the NRM levy going forward, ceasing the tax grab that this was for households and businesses and putting cost of living at the heart of NRM and also looking at biodiversity, back to basics and economic sustainability, which is so important for our regional communities.

POLICE STATION OPENING HOURS

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister rule out using civilian staff to service extended operating hours at police stations?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:28): Again, to answer that question one more time, we have put our policies out there, we have made our policies abundantly clear on what we are going to do and we will deliver on our policies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order! The leader is called to order. Supplementary, member for Elizabeth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member will be heard in silence.

Mr ODENWALDER: New question.

The SPEAKER: New question, member for Elizabeth.

POLICE STATION OPENING HOURS

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:28): Can the minister then rule out expanding the role of protective security officers and using them to service extended police station operating hours?

An honourable member: It's the same question.

Mr ODENWALDER: It's not the same question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order! Minister.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:28): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I say again: we have made our policies abundantly clear. We will be delivering on our policies. Those on the other side may not like the fact that we are going to deliver on our policies, but they are policies we took to the election and we will deliver on them.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I call to order the member for Port Adelaide. Leader.

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Supplementary: when are you going to deliver these promises?

The SPEAKER: I will not deliver any of those promises, but the minister may. Minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:29): Thank you, Mr Speaker. We have put our time lines out there. We have put our policies out there. We have made it abundantly clear—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and we will deliver on our policies.

The SPEAKER: It is very hard for me to hear the minister's answer when members are interjecting. I respectfully ask that members do not interject, per the standing order. Member for Elizabeth.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Police. Does the minister stand by his previous comments to the house that freedom of information processes waste time for members of parliament and deny information that should be freely and publicly available?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:29): I am very pleased that the member has asked this question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order! Members on my left will be quiet while the Attorney answers the question. The Attorney has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As the member would be very well aware—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —unlike perhaps some of the newer members who haven't had the time here yet to listen to the extensive concerns of the then opposition about the inadequacies of the freedom of information laws and the need for reform, supported by bill after bill after bill in an attempt to reform the law, coupled and supported really by Mr Lander, who did a comprehensive report, having audited the practices under the previous Labor government—

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —the need to have reform—

The SPEAKER: Let's hear the point of order, Attorney, please.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, this is clearly debate—clearly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do respectfully believe that the answer is apropos the question; however, I will listen carefully.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Thank you, sir. The member would recall the significance of this as an issue for the then opposition, supported by Mr Lander, who exposed allegations by public servants that there had been ministerial interference with the process of the production of documents or, in their case, concealment of those documents. I have no doubt that the Minister for Police, along with many other members who were in this parliament at the time, advocated repeatedly the need for the reforms and the inadequate application of the law by the former government. Indeed, members of the other house moved amendments; members of the other place moved bills, and I read of a bill that has been tabled by the Hon. Mark Parnell in another place, again in an attempt to reform this.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: now the Deputy Premier is referring to debates in another house. It is completely out of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Is the Attorney finished?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not quite.

The SPEAKER: Reply to the substance of the question, please.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I welcome the comments of the then member, now Minister for Police, in support of the voice of outrage at the former government's management and conduct outlined in those reports, and those voices of dissent and outrage will continue until the new government actually act on it. I am pleased to advise the house that that is exactly what we are doing. We are reviewing that report of Mr Lander again. We are identifying whether freedom of information law reform needs anything else with the efflux of time.

Of course, if any other members, either in this house or in another place, feel that there are aspects that need extra consideration, like the exposure—and members ought to be well aware of this because members may fall into this trap themselves.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The former government's decision to transfer freedom of information cases in dispute, or an objection to an Ombudsman's review, rendered them exposed to significant legal costs, from which they didn't have the protection under the old District Court appeal process. These are new matters which have clearly identified concerns that have been raised by members of parliament, including all those sitting in opposition now, who may want to avail themselves of that process.

But let me say this: in the meantime, this government will ensure in each of the departments that, in the event that an application for documents or the correction of records—which I remind members is also the purpose of the Freedom of Information Act—those matters will be pursued and they will be followed up and they will not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —have ministerial interference.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We are an open and transparent government already and we intend to continue to lead.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. Before I call the next member, I call to order the member for Lee, and I warn him. I call to order the member for Chaffey. The leader has had a fair crack in the first half an hour, and I warn him for the first time. Member for Davenport.

RATE CAPPING

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Will the minister inform the house why the introduction of a rate cap on council rates is important for households, including those in my electorate?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:34): I thank the member for Davenport for his question and note his ongoing concern in this area. I also note the wonderful maiden speech he gave earlier and I welcome him to this house. The member for Davenport is at the epicentre of this rate capping debate, being someone who is a constituent of the City of Onkaparinga.

I want to lay out a few statistics, and I will attempt to do so in a way that is not confusing—and herein lies exactly why we need to bring in a rate capping scheme here in South Australia. The best statistic I can give is that in the last quarter of last year the average wage increase across Australia was 1.8 per cent. At the same time, over the 2017-18 year the average council rate increase in total rate revenue was 6.01 per cent—three times what wage growth has been. This has been a consistent figure over the course of the last decade, where we have seen a disparity between what councils have been willing and able to increase their rates by and the capacity of households to pay.

In the case of Onkaparinga, which is on the slightly worse end of the scale when it comes to rate increases, over the decade to 2016-17 it had a 74 per cent increase in the council rate budget, going from \$69 million to \$120 million in 2016-17. I note that in 2018 that has been pushed out to \$130 million. These are huge increases. Across South Australia over the decade to 2016-17 the increase in council rate revenue was 79 per cent but over the same period state government taxation has not gone anywhere near that increase, being far closer to inflation.

I also want to deliver a few other statistics. One of the main arguments that councils have been putting out there is, 'Our councils are high-growth areas. Our councils have been growing, and that is why we need this extra rate revenue.' However, delving into that, that is simply not the case. If we look at the increase in the total number of rateable properties over the 2017-18 year, at the same time as rates are growing by 6 per cent growth in the number of rateable properties has increased by only 0.78 per cent. In 2017, with a 3.89 per cent average increase in rates the growth of rateable properties was only 0.73 per cent and in 2016, on a backdrop of increased rates at 4.67 per cent, rateable properties increased by only 0.59 of 1 per cent.

Those figures, well under 1 per cent in the growth end of the rateable property base, are not an answer for why rates are growing at three times the rate of inflation, over three times the rate of wages growth. This is what is unsustainable about the way councils are continuing to further and further punish households and businesses in order to fund their own budgets.

Having given those figures, we on this side of the house have an ambition for growth in the number of rateable properties. We would like to see more private business investment, more private household investment, more houses being built both on our fringes and as infill, and we have taken policies to this last election that will help accelerate that growth. However this has not, over the last decade, been an excuse that councils can logically use for why we have seen rates grow the way they have. It is why those on the other side of this house, especially, as well as those in the other chamber, cannot believe this argument for councils is a reason to vote against the upcoming rate capping legislation

Time expired.

GRANDPARENTS FOR GRANDCHILDREN SA

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the minister met with Grandparents for Grandchildren SA?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:39): I thank the member for her question, and I acknowledge her interest in this area. Since becoming the minister, I have met with dozens and dozens and dozens of stakeholders. I have listed them in the priorities that I see fit.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The minister is answering a question.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: In just eight weeks, I have managed to visit 12 DCP offices. I have been to regional areas.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I have been to residential care—

The SPEAKER: Point of order. The minister will be seated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The point of order will be heard in silence, members on my right. The point of order is about direct relevance?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: Could the minister please address the substance of the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right! The question was very specific. The minister is entitled to apply related argument to an answer to the question, but she must directly reply to the substance of the question. Thank you, minister.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Thank you, Speaker. I think an important thing to note is, if the opposition is going to be listing out every single person that I could have met with, there have been over 150.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Could the minister please address the substance of the question more aptly.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Okay. As I mentioned, I have met with dozens and dozens and dozens of people. As the former minister would know, under the royal commission there was a request that there would be one provider. Prior to this, there was Connecting Foster Carers and Grandparents for Grandchildren, who both looked after different segments of stakeholders.

It went out to tender last year under the former government, as required by the royal commission. It was your tender process—the former government's tender process—and that was announced only last Friday to the stakeholders. It hasn't been released publicly. It was not appropriate for me to meet with two tenderers in a tender process run by your former government. Until a decision was made, and until a decision was made public, it was inappropriate. They are certainly on my high priority list to meet with very soon.

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: Like Gillman all over again.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

GRANDPARENTS FOR GRANDCHILDREN SA

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:41): A supplementary, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: A supplementary.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: She wants to dig deeper.

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

Ms STINSON: —has the Minister for Child Protection received about six requests from Grandparents for Grandchildren to meet with her?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:41): As I stated in my—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! The minister will be heard in silence. Minister.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As I stated in my previous answer, because of the tender process that was entered into by the former government, it was inappropriate, while that process was underway, for me to meet with either of the two people who had put in tenders. I was waiting for the department to make a decision, and for that decision to be made public, before I could meet with either so as not to jeopardise a tender process.

SWIM SAFETY

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Will the minister update the house on the government's Swim and Survive policy and explain how the program will save families money while increasing the safety of young children around water?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:42): I thank the member for Kavel for his question. What an outstanding member he is and what great questions he does ask. I do want to commend him on the work he does in his community. I know, since he was campaigning, he has been incredibly well received. I spent some time up there in his community with him. He truly is loved by the people of his region.

The point he raises is a very good one, and that is about community safety and, in particular, swim safety, which is vitally important for all South Australians. The ability to implement a swim safety program and help with the cost of living that families are feeling right across our state is an absolutely wonderful policy that we are rolling out and very proud to be delivering for South Australia.

I am fortunate enough in my community to have a couple of surf lifesaving clubs—the Brighton Surf Lifesaving Club and the Somerton Surf Life Saving Club—and I share with the environment minister the Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club. In fact, I was at the Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club when we launched and announced this policy. It is a wonderful one to be delivering for our community.

The Marshall government is committed to providing financial support to families to encourage the participation of children aged one to five in water confidence and aquatic safety programs. As we said, this is just great for all communities right across the state. We will do this by providing a \$50 subsidy, again to help with the cost of living, per family for children who participate in one of the surf lifesaving programs for children under five, either Surf Babies or Little Lifesavers. These are two great programs. They are specifically designed for young children and their families.

The programs aim to build the confidence of adults in taking young people to the beach through instruction about hazards, responding to beach-based emergency and supervising children in open water. This confidence is vital for the families to work with the children at a very young age so they are comfortable being at the beach. We have a lot of people that are new to Australia. To have the sorts of programs, in particular for people who haven't grown up around the beach, it is absolutely wonderful.

Surf Babies caters for parents with newborn children to two years old, whilst Little Lifesavers works with children aged three to five years old. The four key areas of learning are:

- Education: sun safety and water education;

- Water: fundamental water skills;
- Beach: coordination and movement skills; and
- First aid: CPR and basic first aid knowledge.

As I said, I was at Seacliff Beach when we launched this program, and to see the families that were there enjoying the beach, enjoying the surf, and to see them out and active with their little toddlers was absolutely outstanding. The commitment was really well received, again, to help with the cost of living because we know the cost-of-living pressures that families are feeling out there—because of the previous government—are excessive. That is not what we stand for. We stand on reducing the cost-of-living pressures on families.

Surf Life Saving South Australia will implement these programs, which will engage children and families at an early age to encourage safety around water. We all want our children to be safe at our beaches but, sadly, during recent years there have been too many swimming tragedies. With South Australia's countless beaches and waterways, it is vital that as much as possible is done to provide young children and their families with water safety education.

That is why we will financially support families who want to send their children to the Surf Life Saving water confidence and safety programs. I know on this side of the house that we are so happy to be delivering policies like this that are well received by the community and that will be beneficial for the community in safety components and also help with the cost of living. This is an outstanding policy and I do commend it to the house.

GRANDPARENTS FOR GRANDCHILDREN SA

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Is the minister aware that her department yesterday met with Grandparents for Grandchildren advising them that they will no longer receive any government funding?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:47): I thank the member for the question because this is a very important organisation whom I've actually met with since the change of government, and they have made it—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, listen up, okay?

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will be heard in silence. The Deputy Premier has a call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As it turns out—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I would like to hear the answer, too.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —this is an organisation which I had had something to do with over the last 10 years or so. The Hon. Nick Xenophon was a member in another place—several times, actually, but wherever he is now—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: In other places.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —other places, yes, exactly—and he was also active in the establishment of support for this organisation and its growth. Over the years, it has convened events, functions, conferences, a number of which I have attended and spoken at. They undertake considerable and worthy work. Some other organisations in relation to the support of people either in foster care or in the care of children generally have developed a service as well. The former government determined that they would undertake a tender process in respect of who would be the principal body.

This organisation advised me at the meeting—apart from all the material that they indicated is to update me as to their progress and what they were doing—that they had further made a submission for the normal budget process to the Minister for Child Protection. I think it was actually to a different department but, in any event, ultimately under her area. In those circumstances, I indicated to them that, while there was an existing tender, it would be unlikely that it would be appropriate that they meet with her at that stage.

It appears that, if they have made further requests for further meeting with that minister or any other minister, then I don't know that. Obviously, the member may know as to further requests, but that is the circumstances of which the standards of which this government will operate and does operate. I know the member is only new to this place, but there have been previous tenders in this that have come to the attention of this house, and auditors-general and the ICAC commissioner, etc.

We are setting a new standard in respect of what we expect of our ministers and ensuring that those standards are met. One of the things that will attract attention is if, in fact, one or more tenderers who are seeking a positive response from the government is to in some way seek favour or preference. That is an issue that is unacceptable for our government and, not only that, we will act in a manner to ensure that we minimise any risk of it.

I think that, in general circumstances, if this organisation has made multiple requests to see a minister who has the responsibility to supervise a tender process, it would be unwise for that meeting to take place during that tender process, and that is a position we maintain.

GRANDPARENTS FOR GRANDCHILDREN SA

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:50): Supplementary: is the minister aware that, without ongoing government funding, quite aside from a tender, this organisation will be forced to close on 2 July?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:50): Point of order: that is a hypothetical question.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for hypothetical or argument?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It's both.

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Badcoe like to just rephrase that question. It does presuppose—

Ms STINSON: Certainly, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It does presuppose an outcome, but if you would like to ask it in a different way you have the opportunity, member for Badcoe.

Ms STINSON: Is the minister aware that this organisation will close its doors on 2 July due to a lack of government funding?

Members interjecting:

Ms STINSON: No, it's not.

The SPEAKER: I will allow the question in this instance. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Let's put the member out of her misery in this regard. Every organisation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —including the departments that serve our state well, will await with interest, no doubt, the publication of the next state budget. A day has been set for that to occur later this year. Arrangements are made in respect of the processes by which an organisation that in any way feels they are going to be prejudiced in respect of waiting, which they have done every other year, can make their application to the Treasurer's office as per the normal process.

SPEED LIMITS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Can the minister inform the house when the government will reverse the reduction in speed limits on the Carpenter Rocks Road and Riddoch Highway in my electorate of Mount Gambier, as promised prior to the 2018 election?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:52): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question. I will note that his question has come along with questions from members of my own side about the other seven roads that had their 110 k speed limit pushed down to 100 km/h.

To take you through a bit of context, which is entirely relevant, last year there were eight roads across South Australia that the former state government chose to have their speed limit reduced from 110 to 100 km/h, from the South-East right through to the Murray Mallee region and across the West Coast. These roads were second-tier roads that essentially weren't part of the National Highway network and sat outside as subsidiary roads.

When the decision was made, there was a lot of outrage from regional communities, who were frustrated because they are the ones who have to spend the extra time on the road driving from point A to point B and were inconvenienced by this decision. I went back and had a look, as then opposition shadow minister for the area, at the statistics around those roads. In each instance, there was one accident per year on each of these roads over the previous five years and none of those incidents had caused a fatal accident.

That is not to say that that is good enough. We should always be looking to do something better, but a lot of the feedback that we got at the time from the locals who knew the accidents that happened suggested that speed was only one factor; in fact, in some of the cases, speed was not a factor. Driver inattention, drugs, alcohol and a whole host of other things can help form part of why road accidents happen. It's why we put out there that we would reverse this decision.

But we also talked about this decision in a different context because what the former government did was they would just reduce the speed limit instead of investing in country roads. It was a very simple argument just to say, 'Well, let's just reduce the speed limit,' and it is a cheap tool, but it is a tool that disadvantages regional South Australia. What we are working through at the moment and what we said always—and that is why I am so proud to be implementing our government's Royalties for Regions scheme—is looking at what needs to be done in order to help improve not just those roads but all roads across country South Australia.

We talked about those two policies together because that is how they go. They do go together. The department is currently working through those options, but we want to do that in a responsible way and in a measured way, understanding that we are talking about hundreds and hundreds of kilometres of road. I don't want this answer to be in any way construed that we are walking away from our commitment. We will be reinstating those speed limits, but after only having come to government eight weeks ago, we want to be apprised of all the information and everything that is necessary to make sure that we do right by regional South Australians.

We will go about that process in a methodical manner, and I look forward to being able to give a more specific answer to the member, as well as regional members on my side about when this promise will be delivered.

QUAD BIKES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Can the minister update the house on quad bike fatalities and injuries and steps, here and around Australia, to make their use safer for adults and children and whether there are any planned age restrictions?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:55): Thank you, member for Florey. I thank you very much for that question. From the outset, can I say that I will take on notice to get a detailed and complete answer to you, but in the broad can I say that quad bikes are a difficult issue. They are difficult

because, whilst they are a vehicle, they are predominantly used on farm, and so there are some complexities around, 'Is this a road safety issue or is this essentially a safe work issue?'

There is work being undertaken by SafeWork SA, and I will undertake to have a chat to the Treasurer in the other place about that. I know that there is work being undertaken by the ACCC around this as well. However, I want to highlight a broader issue, and that is the fact that agricultural deaths are over-represented when it comes to workplace accidents and workplace deaths. In my community, it came home to roost a couple weeks ago, when a 22 year-old man called Stanley Dier died working on his family farm, which is probably about 1½ kilometres from my electorate office. It was devastating for our local community.

Whilst a quad bike was not involved in that instance, I do know that there are dozens and dozens of deaths across Australia with quad bikes, and I know that the rate of injury is far higher than that. However, I do want to be apprised more completely of the situation, and I will undertake to take that question on notice to get a detailed answer. I do note that we in this government have a very open mind when it comes to safety improvements, and I will be talking and working with the relevant minister in the other place to understand what is the best way forward on this very difficult issue.

QUAD BIKES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:57): Supplementary: at the very least, will something be done about wearing protective helmets when using quad bikes?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:57): I will have to take that one on notice.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe.

GRANDPARENTS FOR GRANDCHILDREN SA

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:57): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Will the minister commit to providing funding to Grandparents for Grandchildren until the September budget?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:57): I am not sure whether the member was actually listening to the previous answer but, if she wasn't, I will just perhaps identify this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order! Ten minutes to go.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If any organisation—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: Why did you go out to tender?

The SPEAKER: Premier!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —feels—bearing in mind we are still in May, some of the new members might appreciate that obviously a number of agencies have their funding up until 30 June each year and about this time of the year they get a little bit unsettled. They are not quite sure what is going to be happening with their funding and they seek to have extra provision and the like.

So it is not unusual; it starts around about this time in May. Some feel that their issues or concerns have not been protected sufficiently as we pass 30 June. Even when budgets are published in the months May or June, as is more common when there is not an election—although, of course, the previous Labor government regularly had its budgets later in the year, throughout the 16 years that it was in office, but nevertheless there is a process. If an organisation or an agency or a unit or a department wishes to raise a concern in relation to the security of funding, if it is appropriate, then that is a matter to be presented to the Treasury office.

GRANDPARENTS FOR GRANDCHILDREN SA

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:59): Supplementary: given that Grandparents for Grandchildren has been told that they are not receiving any more funding—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STINSON: —what assistance will the minister provide to them?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:59): I appreciate that the member may want to raise these issues, and they are quite reasonable things to raise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: What is not acceptable is insistence that there is going to be a commitment outside of the budget process. That is not the way that we operate. What needs to be clear—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —is if statements have been made from Treasury—I don't know about that—to this organisation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —then that is a matter that I would invite her to present to me.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In the meantime, I would urge her, if she wishes to assist this organisation, either to have them contact our office or advise them—

Ms Stinson: They have contacted your office six times.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, the member might talk about 'six times', but the reality is that this group has actually had the benefit of a meeting—I thought a very productive and fruitful meeting. I agree with the member: I think they are a worthy organisation who do good work. But they are seeking to secure a different contractual arrangement with the government, and that's now a new government. That is a process that goes through a tender. That is one thing.

In the meantime, they are an organisation that does receive funding from other sources. They are seeking to have some support outside of that, from what the member says, and I assume that is continuing, so I urge her to assist by ensuring that they are referred to the Treasury department.

FISHERIES COST RECOVERY POLICY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the house on the progress of the state government's commitment to review PIRSA's fisheries cost recovery policy?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:01): Thank you to the member for Flinders, probably one of the most popular MPs in the nation right about now. Well done to him on his re-election. I thank him for his interest in seafood and aquaculture. He represents the people of the capital of seafood in Australia.

I am very proud to say that, as part of our election commitment, the state government is initiating the independent review for Primary Industries and Regions South Australia. This is

progressing well as we speak. The policy is about listening to industry and looking at ways that we can reduce cost, reduce red tape and make business more attractive within the seafood industry. Currently, 13 fisheries pay fees into PIRSA based on the cost recovery model. The annual cost paid per licence holder varies between the different sectors: abalone, blue crab, charter boat, Lakes and Coorong fishers, giant crab, prawn, rock lobster and sardines.

The review will take into account the Productivity Commission's 2016 report on marine fisheries and aquaculture, which recommended that cost recovery should be linked as closely as possible to the efficiently incurred costs of essential regulatory services and that all governments should be transparent in disclosing what those costs are. For me, I have had the pleasure of travelling to two of the major fishing sectors in this state. I firstly went down to the Limestone Coast and met with the majority of the fishing sector, then I was hosted by the member for Flinders over on Eyre Peninsula. We looked at a number of the industry groups. We listened to their ideas and their concerns, of which there are many.

The fisheries industry directly employ about 6,000 people, and they have real concerns about how they are dealing with power costs and how they are dealing with the cost of doing business. Most importantly, they are looking at ways that they can enter new markets, grow their businesses and employ more people, and that is what this government is all about. We are about growing business, employing more people and making sure we retain our regional communities, because we all know that regional communities are always under the pump when it comes to retaining that workforce and retaining the skills that are critical particularly to the seafood industry.

Again, South Australian fisheries and aquaculture sectors produced about 76,000 tonnes of seafood in 2016-17, generating a revenue of \$908 million. So we are on the cusp of the billion-dollar seafood industry here in South Australia, and I'm proud to say that this government is there to support the seafood industry. We are there to support jobs within the seafood industry but, just as importantly, we are there to reduce the cost of doing business within the seafood sector.

GRANDPARENTS FOR GRANDCHILDREN SA

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Now that the organisation Grandparents for Grandchildren has been informed of the outcome of the tender, will the minister now finally meet with Grandparents for Grandchildren to ensure its ongoing survival?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:05): I thank the member for her question. I would just like to reiterate that it was the former Labor government that put this out to tender. I have dealt with—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —Grandparents for Grandchildren—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —over many years, and they do an amazing job. They are absolutely a fantastic service.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: It was your tender process that meant—

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated for one second. The member for Badcoe was allowed to ask a question in silence. It is your question time. The clock is ticking. The minister will be heard in silence for her answer. Minister.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It was the former Labor government's tender process that meant that only one person could win. That is the whole point of a tender process. Let's bear in mind the reason we had a tender process: it was because of the Nyland royal

commission, which was a monumental demonstration of the failure—the 16 years of failure of your government, your former government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: We would not have had a tender process—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —had we not had a royal commission due to your failure. Bear in mind, this is not the first.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: We had the Robyn Layton report in 2003—

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: I will hear the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for a second and final time. The Minister for Transport is warned. I will hear the point of order. I imagine it is about direct relevance. The question was about, now that something has happened, whether there would be a meeting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite is called to order and warned a first time—he has been doing it all day. Minister, could you please return to the substance of the question. Thank you, minister.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: We have also had two Mullighan inquiries under the former Labor government.

The SPEAKER: That may be so, minister, but please return to the substance.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: We have had the Debelle inquiry and we have had the Nyland royal commission. The reason for these was because you failed to keep our children safe.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated. Point of order.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For direct relevance?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: For direct relevance, and she's flouting your ruling, sir.

The SPEAKER: Minister, could you please answer the question directly relevant.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Yes, I will be meeting with Grandparents for Grandchildren.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

Mr BROCK (Frome) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister advise the house when regional businesses will be able to apply for any eligible grants through the government's regional growth fund, which was part of your party's election campaign? Also, can the minister advise whether there has been any communication

with regional development associations, which are the government's representatives in the regions, as to the progress and where this grant funding is?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:08): Thank you to the member for that question. What I can say is that this government proudly went to the election with a raft of regional policies to support the regions of South Australia that had been forgotten for 16 long years. What I can say to you, sir, is that this government will establish a regional growth fund that will provide long-term security for job creation—\$150 million over 10 years to support the growth in our regions of South Australia.

Establishing the regional growth fund was a 100-day commitment. That commitment will be upheld. What I can say is the government is working hard towards achieving that 100-day commitment. Again, unlike the former government, South Australian regions were a forgotten species. Sadly, the regions generating 50 per cent of this state's merchandise export economy were sadly left out in the cold. Way too often we heard that there weren't the votes in the regions and it wasn't relevant that we gave them the support that they needed. But this government will be different: we will be supporting the regions of South Australia.

To the member for Frome, I can assure you that the regional growth fund will be rolled out—\$15 million a year for 10 years. That is critical job growth economy. The \$15 million will be administered in due course. That raft of funding will be brought out for the regional sector. It will not be issued to individual businesses. The previous regional fund was always there for company assistance. I want to make sure that this money is there for regional assistance.

Ministerial Statement

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRY

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:10): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to a secret Labor deal for motor vehicle registry made earlier today in another place by the Treasurer.

Grievance Debate

DOWNER, MS G.

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:10): I rise today to talk about an historic period drama. Many people in here would know about *Downton Abbey*, the story of the aristocratic family and their domestic servants. That has disappeared from the small screen, but now we have Downer Abbey.

We have a family who has been around in South Australian politics for over 100 years who wants to treat the federal division of Mayo something like Buckingham Palace, where it is a birthright that if your surname is Downer you get to come in and have it, even if you are living in Melbourne, in a nice big house in Prahran, a very posh Melbourne suburb, apparently. It works out alright if your family owns a summer palace at Carrickalinga, Adelaide's equivalent to the Hamptons of New York. It is where all the people from the eastern suburbs hang out over the summer. They do not mix with any people from Mayo. They just mix with their friends from the eastern suburbs, play a bit of golf and things like that.

Last Friday, I was in the Normanville Foodland in one of the shopping centres and I ran into an *Advertiser* photographer, Matty Turner, a good mate of mine. We worked together at the *News* back in the early 1980s. I asked, 'What are you up to down here in Normanville?' He said, 'I'm waiting for Georgina Downer. She said to meet me here at 3.30.' So he gets down there at 3.30 and then she rings and says, 'I will be there at five.' That is just the sort of disrespect that you show people, that time does not matter for the people you have to meet.

As a voter in the federal electorate of Mayo, like so many people down there I am absolutely offended at the Liberal Party's preselection of someone who could not wait to get out of South Australia. As soon as they finished high school, they scampered across the border to Victoria. They have been asked time and time again, 'Are you going to come back?' 'No, I'm not going to come back.' Georgina Downer has run twice for preselection in Victoria. Twice she has been rejected. Since 2015, she has been a member of the Liberal Party state division in Victoria.

One thing that is on the record in *The Australian Financial Review* that really concerns me are the words that have been attributed to Georgina Downer, and she needs to come out and say whether or not she said these words. In 2016, when there was speculation that Georgina Downer might move back to Adelaide and run for the seat of Mayo, the Rear Window section in the *Financial Review* did a piece, entitled, 'A Downer to rise again in Mayo?' The authors said:

We asked the woman herself and she laughed it off, reminding us that she hadn't lived in the serial killing capital of the world since before Snowtown was on the map, and is comfortably ensconced with her family in Melbourne. Still, we bet it crossed her mind...

We have looked through the *Financial Review* and we cannot find any retraction. If someone attributed those sorts of quotes to me, I would be pretty upset and I would be trying to get a retraction. We need to find out from Georgina Downer whether she said those words. I have just spent the past five years as tourism minister promoting this wonderful state, and there are so many fantastic attributes that we can talk about here in South Australia, and to talk about Adelaide being the serial killing capital of the world is an absolute disgrace.

Do you know who says those sorts of things? Victorians say those sorts of things—and where is Georgina Downer from? Victoria. She has lived in Victoria for the best part of the past 20 years. She has come down to Carrickalinga now, moved into the family's summer palace and is trying to pass herself off as a local. She is not even on the electoral roll yet. The people of Mayo I have been speaking to over the past few weeks, as speculation swirled around that someone was coming from Victoria to try to represent them, are absolutely outraged at this.

They remember the last time that they voted for a Downer: he quit within six months. He had the sulks because he was not in government any more, and he thrust upon them one of the most unpopular politicians in South Australian history, Jamie Briggs, who was an absolute disgrace to the people he went out and met in the area. People still talk about how rude Jamie Briggs was and how little he did for the area.

I want to say well done to Rebekha Sharkie, who has done an amazing job up there. I have worked with her to get millions of dollars for Mount Barker. We got a new playground for Myponga.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

Mr BIGNELL: What the people of Mayo need is someone who is a local from up in that area. Rebekha Sharkie has done an amazing job and she will be getting my second preference vote after the Labor candidate gets my first preference, but I will be putting this Victorian interloper last.

Time expired.

NATIONAL FAMILIES WEEK

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:15): I rise today to speak on National Families Week, which is celebrated from 15 to 21 May. National Families Week coincides with the United Nations International Day of Families on 15 May, which was yesterday. This day is observed by the United Nations to mark the importance that the international community places on families as the most fundamental units of society, as well as to show concern about their situations in many parts of the world.

All Australians, including community organisations, schools, councils, companies and individuals, are invited to participate in National Families Week each year. The enduring theme is 'Stronger families, stronger communities'. This theme continues to highlight the important role families play as the central building block of our communities and delivers the message that community wellbeing is enhanced by family wellbeing. The CEO of Families Australia, ambassador Dr Brian Babington, had this to say of families:

They take many forms, yet all are the same in needing nourishment. Whatever form they take, families are our most time-honoured settings for receiving, giving and nurturing love, understanding and support.

In the child protection sector, our state relies heavily on relatives, friends, professionals and volunteers to open their homes to create loving environments for children who need a safe place to live and be loved because they are no longer able to stay with their birth parents. I continue to be in

awe of kinship carers, foster carers and family members who go that extra mile to care for our children, the children of South Australia.

They say it takes a village to raise a child, so I ask for your help. We know, from research, the importance of a stable and permanent placement for children. Generally, no matter the circumstances that children live in, they will always bond and prefer to be with their own birth parents. Where this is not possible, we know that other family members is the preferred option and, if that is not possible, that foster care, in-home care or family-based care is the next most desirable care.

Unfortunately, too many of our children and young people in care are in residential or commercial care in South Australia with eight-hour shift workers. The national average is 7 per cent, with South Australia languishing behind with 15 per cent of children in this least favourable type of care setting, sitting at almost 500 children. Unfortunately, I am told that some children may never be suitable for family-based care; however, these figures must be reduced as soon as possible. I will do everything that I can to see those figures drop with great urgency.

As recognised by the Nyland royal commission, more must be done to stem the flow of children coming into care. We must support parents who are struggling. We must help them develop their skills and give them every possibility of success. The Early Intervention Research Directorate was set up as a result of the royal commission. They recently completed a study of all the early intervention and prevention programs that have been provided by the state government or funded by state government across all the different segments of government, including child protection, education, health and any area that was involved.

Unfortunately, it was found from that research that only about 40 per cent of those programs were actually giving the results that were expected. I am waiting to get that final research on which programs are working and which ones are not, and whether they can be further developed and improved so that they can have better outcomes. We do have limited money, and it is important that we spend our money where we get results. We must stem the flow of children coming into care.

I am very keen for the directorate to do further studies and research on all programs because throughout my travels, particularly to regional areas, I have found that there are wonderful programs for early intervention and support for families in many country towns and regional areas and throughout metropolitan Adelaide. Some are funded straight from the non-government sector, some are federally funded, some might be council programs or be run directly through childcare centres. There are so many amazing programs, but I have noticed that it is very disjointed; it is not coordinated.

We need more families to help in foster care, and I encourage all members to consider foster care and also consider helping their own families.

HACKHAM WEST COMMUNITY CENTRE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:20): I rise in support of the Hackham West Community Centre, a vibrant, inclusive community hub run by deeply passionate and kind staff and volunteers. It is a centre that is truly at the heart of Hackham West, and I am constantly inspired by the dedication and the passion of the volunteers who keep that heart beating and create a place where everyone is welcome. The centre provides important vital opportunities for connection, including through adult learning, play groups, support groups, community lunches and breakfasts, NAIDOC Week gatherings and health and fitness programs. It is a centre to which the whole of the Hackham West community belongs.

The centre recently applied for funding to expand its current four mornings a week breakfast club and one afternoon session a week program for kids to a full five-day a week mornings and afternoons, wraparound out-of-school hours care program, a program that will contribute to some excellent outcomes for kids, their families and caregivers. Centre volunteers, staff, the Hackham West community at large and I are deeply disappointed that the full funding requested was not granted.

I urge the federal Minister for Education and Training, the Hon. Senator Simon Birmingham, to reconsider this decision, to get behind a centre supporting so many in our southern community, and to embrace a program that aims to ensure our youngest community members are engaged,

safe, learning and nurtured. I also urge those opposite to call on Senator Birmingham to back our youngest community members in the South and their families.

Hackham West is a place characterised by people who reach out to lend a hand to one another, people who are kind, creative and strong and who want to work together in the best interests of every single member of their community. Like many other areas, it is an area in which some people face disadvantage and struggle through a few challenges. It is an area which, if we are genuinely about creating equality of opportunity in South Australia, would be enhanced through positive assistance in the form of support for a service focused on the wellbeing of our kids.

Hackham West R-7 School, which sits adjacent to the centre, is a remarkable school. It is a school that works closely with the centre to ensure that any children who are developmentally vulnerable are provided with the best possible support at school and in our community. This school and this centre understand that schools, community organisations, community members, children and all stakeholders in a community working together in support of our kids gives them the best chance of thriving in all areas of their lives.

The current limited but very successful out-of-school hours care program at Hackham West Community Centre engages with around 15 children. The Hackham West Community Centre's transition to a full morning and afternoon out-of-school hours care program will engage with up to 40 children, will sit as part of a whole of community effort to give our local children the best possible support and access to opportunities, and will build capacity within the community.

An out-of-school hours care program will allow families in the community to make the Hackham West R-7 School their first choice. As it stands, the lack of an out-of-school hours care program is a significant hurdle to this, and many families are compelled to seek out alternative schools that offer wraparound support. The federal education department has told the Hackham West Community Centre that it will only fund their current arrangement of four mornings a week and the one afternoon session, a nonsensical arrangement for families who need more regular care beyond school closing time. By granting the funding for a full out-of-school hours care program the improvement in outcomes for our youngest community members could be completely transformative.

The Hackham West Community Centre's application for a full out-of-school hours care program was carefully developed as a whole of community approach. It brought together the Hackham West Community Centre, the Hackham West Children's Centre and the Hackham West R-7 School along with other community stakeholders with the explicit aim to develop a five-day a week out-of-school hours care program to measurably improve outcomes for the whole community.

In addition to improving both the numbers of new students and retention of students at the Hackham West R-7 School, the aim of establishing an out-of-school hours care program also included wrapping existing services and programs at the community centre around the families who would utilise an out-of-school hours care program. We know that services that wraparound children and provide them and their families with connection, engagement with other services and support work best.

We need to commit to young people and their families in Hackham West. The Department for Education and Child Development's decision not to fully support the application of the Hackham West Community Centre for a full out-of-school hours program undermines a genuine community response to better the lives of and pathways for all children and their families within the Hackham West community. Again, I urge those opposite and the federal Minister for Education to support the people of Hackham West by reconsidering this funding decision.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (15:25): I would like to discuss the open trading hours that have operated in the Victor Harbor/Goolwa region for many years, all my adult life. We have seen wonderful access to shopping hours in the tourist region of Victor Harbor and Goolwa for many years. We have seen all shop traders have the ability to effectively trade whenever they want.

In my electorate, I have seen businesses thrive under that scenario. We have seen small stores, small supermarkets, actually go from strength to strength. In the last five years, we have seen two new IGA stores built and opened in the electorate. One of them, the Mount Compass IGA, was

recently lucky enough to win an award for being one of the best IGAs in South Australia. They have done a fantastic job there, and they continue to increase their market share because they can trade as they wish.

Likewise, we are seeing the big retailers also having the ability to trade openly. The Woolworths centre in Victor Harbor is open from 7am until 9pm, seven days a week. We see people shopping there throughout those times. People are able to make adjustments to their lifestyle not based on shopping but on what they would like to actually do. I commend the fact that we have been able to have this, but I do not understand why that is not out there for everyone.

When my sister lived in Adelaide and went to university, I used to visit her, and I wondered why on weekends some parts of supermarkets were shut. There were little sections that were fenced off that you could not go to. That was just so they could meet the rules and have their doors open. To me, it makes no sense.

Why not let people shop when they want to shop? Why not let businesses operate as they wish so that the community can benefit from them being able to trade? Let the assets here, the bricks and mortar that people have invested in, be operational as much as the business requires them to be. I think it is a real shame that we have not had that in South Australia. When you go interstate, you see the shops open everywhere. People are out enjoying their weekend shopping. The counter argument is: what about the workers? Well, many people have to work.

In my former role as a dairy farmer, guess who milked the cows on a Sunday morning? Guess who worked on Christmas Day? The cows do not stop. There are people out there who need to work, and there are people out there who want to work. For example, even on my farm, I had my staff volunteering to work on Christmas Day just so they could share it around. It was not that they felt obliged to work, or even wanted the extra money that might be there because it was a public holiday, it was about sharing it around and making it fair for everyone. To me, it is something that we really need to address here in Adelaide, in particular in the metropolitan areas. Give that same opportunity to the businesses here in the city that we have enjoyed in my electorate of Finnis and many other tourist electorates around the state as well.

Let's give the opportunity to those businesses to thrive and enjoy and grow their businesses, allowing the customer to make the choice. If I want to go and buy a television on the weekend, why can I not go and buy a television on the weekend? To me, it makes no sense that I can go and buy a couch but I cannot go and buy a television. All those sorts of bizarre little rules around the place make no sense. I really encourage this this place to address those changes and bring us back to some sense of reality.

TOURISM

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:30): I rise today to reflect on one of my new shadow portfolio areas I am honoured to be appointed to that encompasses tourism. I raise in this place concerns about some early and very worrying decisions being undertaken in an area vital to the economic health of our state by the Marshall government. Disappointingly, we have already seen major controversy and a distinct lack of leadership on behalf of the Premier and his government in this area.

Firstly, we had the decision to award a multimillion-dollar contract to Victorian firm that will go on to promote us, a decision that essentially outsources South Australian jobs interstate. This is despite much bluff and bluster by the government in the lead-up to the election about the brain drain and loss of our young people to greener pastures interstate. It seems that one of the first major economic decisions of the Marshall Liberal government is to outsource these jobs to Victoria.

I acknowledge that the South Australian Tourism Commission follow due process in regard to awarding this tender. However, this does not change the fact that this government could have and should have overturned this decision and put South Australian jobs first. As I stated publicly, they have failed at the very first hurdle in terms of their commitment to creating South Australian jobs, particularly for our young people in the creative advertising and marketing space.

I note the initial tough talk by the Premier following the announcement, the bravado with which he said he would seek a full explanation and that SATC better have a pretty good reason for

the decision. What in fact happened was very little. A squeak about SATC being independent was all that was forthcoming from the Premier. His minister remained silent on the issue—no explanations about what steps the Minister for Tourism took when he heard about the tender result. We know now that he was briefed on the issue by the department. Did the government even query the decision to outsource a major state tender to an interstate company? One wonders what else this government are signing off on in this blasé manner behind closed doors.

Then we dive into the murky waters of the recent appointment by the Marshall Liberal government of Andrew Killey to the South Australian Tourism Commission Board. Mr Killey is a former co-founder of KWP! advertising, a South Australian company which formerly held the advertising tender which has now been outsourced to Victoria. One wonders if this appointment was an apology for the company losing the contract in the first place or simply an appropriate piece of timing to reward a fellow Liberal supporter for his attack-dog commentary on a former Labor government.

It seems that jobs for the boys is alive and well under a Marshall Liberal government. Indeed, it is the boys who seem to be filling the front benches opposite. Given that we are now nearly 60 days into the first 100 of this government's 'hit the ground running' agenda and the Premier has yet to get his website up and running, the Marshall team may need to ask the South Australian people for an extension. Under Labor, South Australia welcomed a record-breaking 442,000 international visitors in the past year, spending \$1.1 billion right here in this state. Our 2017-18 state budget committed a \$14.5 million boost for events and convention bid fund.

The Marshall Liberal government have committed to a big agenda in tourism and one would hope that this is a portfolio we could embrace in a bipartisan manner. Let's hope that their lacklustre effort to date is not an example of what is to follow. The people of South Australia deserve better. Our reputation on the national and world stage is at stake.

PATTERSON, MR N.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:34): I rise to put the achievement of Senior Constable First Class Nick Patterson on the parliamentary record and highlight the recognition he deserves. Senior Constable First Class Nick Patterson was awarded the certificate of commendation after responding to an incident at the Millicent swimming lake on 26 December last year. If you think about it, that was the day after Christmas. The outcome could have been very different for this lady and her family had Senior Constable First Class Nick Patterson not been in attendance.

He was performing general solo duties when he observed two people performing CPR on an unconscious female. She was unresponsive, had no pulse and was not breathing. Constable Patterson recognised that the chest compressions were not performed deeply enough and her airway was blocked, so he took over and gave clear and accurate instructions to the person managing the airway. CPR was continued until the arrival of SA Ambulance personnel, whom he assisted with the cardiac compressions and later helped to manage the airway. The certificate of commendation states:

...despite extreme emotional and physical pressure, Constable Patterson remained calm and continued to assist the patient. He provided support to SA Ambulance Service members until the patient was conveyed to the Millicent Hospital and subsequently retrieved to Adelaide where, after treatment, she made a near total recovery. Constable Patterson demonstrated a remarkable degree of courage and self-control under immense pressure. He directly contributed to saving the life of Mieke Owen-Philips. Through his actions, Constable Patterson has brought credit to himself, the Limestone Coast Local Service Area and the South Australian Police.

This is not the first time that Nick Patterson has saved the lives of others. At the age of 16, he pushed two of his friends out of the way of a speeding car and was himself hit, which resulted in a broken arm and leg. Nick attended Sacred Heart College, where he captained the school rugby team. He went on to captain the Brighton Rugby team at the young age of 19 and led them to a state premiership. After this, he joined SAPOL, where he worked on patrols, and then transferred to Millicent, where he lives with his beautiful wife, Joanne, and children, Angas, Drew and Tully. He is a delegate for the Police Association, but his community work extends well beyond his police work.

Nick is a member of Cops for Kids, which raises money for disadvantaged children in our region. Last year, Cops for Kids donated \$15,000 to the ac.care fund, where resources will go

towards foster carers and foster children with books and literature to assist in their development. Nick has also been instrumental in establishing the Beachport Surf Life Saving Club and serves as an office bearer in this association. I know that his dad is rightly very proud of his son and I commend Nick for his contribution to our community and his tireless service.

I believe that policing is a unique occupation. Whilst everyone is running away from danger, police officers are running towards it, often putting themselves in greater danger to protect us, the community. I would like to note Nick's contribution to our community and have it recorded in *Hansard* for all time.

Bills

PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:39): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to encourage and facilitate disclosures of certain information in the public interest by ensuring that proper procedures are in place for making and dealing with such disclosures and by providing protection for persons making such disclosures; to make related amendments to the Local Government Act 1999 and the Public Sector Act 2009; to repeal the Whistleblowers Protection Act 1993; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I introduce the Public Interest Disclosure Bill 2018. This bill, coupled with the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (Investigation Powers) Amendment Bill and the Evidence (Journalists) Amendment Bill are important parts of the Marshall Liberal government's transparency and accountability agenda that prioritise open and public hearings in maladministration matters and protect journalists from disclosing their sources in the public interest.

In accordance with the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption's recommendation following a review of the effectiveness of the Whistleblower Protection Act 1993, this bill will repeal that act and replace it with a scheme more in line with contemporary attitudes about disclosure of wrongdoing in public administration and in recognition of the existence of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and the Office of Public Integrity.

This bill has had a chequered history. By way of brief background, the Whistleblowers Protection Act has been in operation for some 20 years. However, since its inception there has been little recourse to its protection. In March 2013, the then attorney-general requested that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption review the legislation and, after extensive consultation, the commissioner prepared a report for parliament in 2014. The commissioner made 30 recommendations supporting a rewrite of the law.

In the commissioner's annual report of 2015, a survey of 7,000 public servants revealed that one in four was reluctant to report corruption, misconduct or maladministration, with the most common concern being personal repercussions and their job. Meanwhile, the State Ombudsman conducted a review of the freedom of information laws, with a report on the same tabled in parliament in June 2014. This report highlighted the need for protection of FOI officers against ministerial interference. Notably, both reports recommending substantial reform appeared after the 2014 state election.

In the absence of any reform from the tired and arrogant Labor government, the Liberal opposition prepared a bill to provide for offences for victimisation and the right to MPs and the media after certain time limits—following the recommendations made by the commissioner in 2014. The former Labor government, in an attempt to save face and after nearly two years of refusing to provide any reform to whistleblower laws, introduced a bill which cherry-picked the parts of the ICAC report without providing any true substantive whistleblower protection reform.

And then there was a deadlock throughout 2017 because the former government refused to protect whistleblowers in their own bill of the same name as this one I am introducing today. Those in another place saw merit in the substantial amendment. The then government refused to listen. The Marshall Liberal government has fiercely maintained the need for whistleblowers to be protected, especially disclosing matters of public importance, including maladministration and corruption, to journalists.

We on this side of the house recognise the important role of the media in fostering critical public debate and holding the institutions of government accountable. With this bill, misconduct across government can now be publicly exposed, something the former government were vehemently opposed to.

Turning to the key aspects of this bill, its purpose is to:

- facilitate disclosures about public administration information by public officers or former public officers;
- ensure that public disclosures are properly assessed and, where necessary, investigated and actioned; and
- ensure that a public officer making a disclosure is protected against reprisals.

The bill also provides protection for disclosures by members of the public about a wrongdoing in the private or public sector where the information is disclosed to an appropriate recipient and the information relates to a substantial risk to public health or safety and the environment. In order for a disclosure to be protected, the person must believe on reasonable grounds that the information is true or believe on reasonable grounds that the information may be true and is of sufficient significance to justify its disclosure. A person who makes an appropriate disclosure is not subject to any liability as a result of that disclosure.

Further, the bill imposes a duty on the person who receives an appropriate disclosure to take action in relation to the disclosure and take reasonable steps to keep the informant advised of the action or the outcome of any investigation. Importantly, the bill allows a disclosure to be made to a member of parliament or a journalist where a person has made a disclosure in accordance with the requirements under the bill and either does not receive notification within 30 days that an assessment has been made or does not receive notification with 120 days or longer, as specified in a written notice to the disclosure, of the outcome of the assessment.

This was a key recommendation from the ICAC report, which the former government failed to legislate for and simply refused to consider. The bill defines 'journalist' as a person engaged in the profession or occupation of journalism in connection with the publication of information in a news medium. 'News medium' is defined as a medium for the dissemination to the public, or a section of the public, of news and observations of news. The definition is based on the definition in the New South Wales Evidence Act 1995 and is consistent with the approach in the Victorian Evidence Act 2008. This definition also aligns with that in the shield laws bill introduced in this house last week.

The definition is intended to be narrow and to capture disclosures by professional journalists only. Flexibility is built into the bill to allow for development in modes of communication by allowing for regulations to specify classes of person who are deemed to be included in, or excluded from, the definition. This is an appropriate balance between the risk of defining too widely and not recognising the development of new forms of communication in public communication.

The government and the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption consider that the ability to make an appropriate disclosure to a journalist is critical to ensuring that there is an effective, transparent scheme and that the public can be assured that information will be dealt with in a timely and appropriate manner. It is a safeguard against secrecy and complacency in addressing matters of serious or systemic maladministration and misconduct in public administration.

Let me say again that this bill demonstrates the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to accountability and transparency in public administration. For 16 long years under the former Labor administration, public servants, employees and members of the public were reluctant and afraid to speak out against possible maladministration and corruption. My colleagues and I are very pleased

to say that that should no longer be the case with the election of a new government and with the introduction of this bill.

I wish to commend the work of my colleagues in the other place and their tireless efforts to pass important Liberal amendments, compared to the former government's meagre attempt at this legislation previously. I personally thank you, Mr Speaker, for your work and advocacy in this important area in a number of years since you were elected as the member for Hartley, and I am sure that you will continue to follow this debate with interest. I also thank members of the crossbench for their support for provisions to provide whistleblowers with protection in that same legislation in 2016, and I look forward to working with them again to pass this bill swiftly.

I would again call upon the opposition. The new Leader of the Opposition has said that he has been listening and that he will review his team's approach to this type of legislation. I hope that he recognises the significance of not only the legislation but the continued plea of the public for transparency in government and the responsibility we all have to ensure that those in the public sector are not layered with legislative responsibility and obligation, yet are left unprotected to carry out those responsibilities and exposed to reprisals or disadvantage to themselves.

That is the significance of this legislation. I urge members to read it carefully and to consider the bill favourably. I now table an explanation of clauses.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Mullighan.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE ADULTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:52): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:52): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, the government reintroduces into parliament the Criminal Law Consolidation (Children and Vulnerable Adults) Amendment Bill, a bill that lapsed on the dissolution of the last parliament, but one which the then opposition supported and attempted to swiftly move through the houses. Disappointingly, at the end of 2017 other legislative priorities were placed above those of children and vulnerable adults by the former government. Much like the failings of the former government with children in their state care, we saw a failure to ensure that this legislation was made a priority and passed urgently.

Members might find familiar the remarks I will now make about the bill. They are drawn from remarks made in 2017 by the former government. At the risk of being accused of plagiarism by those opposite, I adopt those remarks to indicate this government's enthusiasm for the reforms that the former government got right on a policy level, although they did not give it the priority that the children deserve.

The bill amends the offence of criminal neglect, in section 14 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, to address difficulties experienced in the prosecution of offenders for that offence. It also creates a general offence of child neglect. Members will remember the shocking images of the 'house of horrors', for example, as probably one of the worst cases of child neglect and consequential abuse of a whole household of children.

Currently, section 14 attributes criminal liability to carers of children under 16 and vulnerable adults where the child or adult dies or is seriously harmed as a result of an unlawful act. The offence occurs where the accused had a duty of care to the victim but failed to protect the victim from harm that the accused should have anticipated. Importantly, the bill addresses the shortcomings experienced in practice by the police and the Director of Public Prosecutions arising from the definition of 'serious harm' as it applies to children who are the victims of the offending. These

shortcomings have made it difficult to establish elements of the offence, particularly that the child has suffered 'serious harm' as defined.

In practice, this has meant that where a victim has suffered harm, perhaps multiple broken bones or other trauma, and healed quickly, the offender has not been able to be prosecuted in a way that reflects the true harm caused. The seriousness of these actions, and any harm against a child or vulnerable adult, should not be diminished, with the full force of the legal system able to punish such behaviour. For the purpose of the section 14 offence of criminal neglect, 'serious harm' currently means—

- (a) harm that endangers, or is likely to endanger, a person's life; or
- (b) harm that consists of, or is likely to result in, loss of, or serious and protracted impairment of, a part of the body or a physical or mental function; or
- (c) harm that consists of, or is likely to result in, serious disfigurement.

Children generally have a superior ability to heal from injury compared with adults. Where the victim of an alleged offence under section 14 is a child, it may therefore be difficult to establish elements of the offence, particularly that the child has suffered 'serious harm' as defined as a 'serious and protracted impairment'. Major injuries that would amount to 'serious harm' when sustained by an adult may not have this result when sustained by a child. This is because, although suffering much pain and distress from serious injuries, children possess a natural ability to recover quickly and fully that adults do not possess.

I hope it assists members if I use the example of myself. At two years of age, I was run over by a truck. Obviously, I survived; should I be hit by the same truck today, there is every likelihood that I would not. Bones are more brittle, obviously, and do not have the flexibility of those of a two year old. Fortunately, as in that example, children do recover, although it was quite a serious accident and, I think it is fair to say, harm was caused. I was lucky enough to be hit at that age when I had the capacity to recover. Some might think more's the pity, but nevertheless I am here.

Consequently, the definition of 'serious harm' for the purposes of the offence created by section 14 does not cover many serious injuries to children and is more apt to address serious injuries to adults. For example, a baby of three months of age who sustains multiple leg fractures or multiple serious injuries causing pain and suffering will, however, most likely recover quickly with no impact on his or her development because of the infant's capacity to repair and their young age. The injury is not likely to be considered a 'serious and protracted impairment'.

People who inflict such injuries on children may therefore escape criminal prosecution. If an adult suffered the same injury, there would most likely be a permanent impairment as a result. People who harm children should not escape liability in this way, and these anomalies should be corrected. The bill ensures that the offence in section 14 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act is capable of extending to injuries inflicted on children, notwithstanding their greater capacity to heal.

The shortcomings of the definition of 'serious harm' have also highlighted that the present law is such that an abusive parent or carer can only be prosecuted if there is either criminal neglect leading to death or serious harm or there is clear proof of an actual assault or a definite act giving rise to a real risk of harm or serious harm. There is no general offence of child abuse, cruelty or neglect as there is in some other jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Queensland and the Australian Capital Territory.

The only relevant local offences are the offence in section 14 and the limited and rarely used minor indictable offence under section 30 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act (which the bill renumbers as section 14A) of failing to provide a child or other vulnerable person with necessary food, clothing or shelter when one is liable to do so.

This means that in South Australia the situation must reach the point where there is clear proof of some specific offence, rather than proof of cruelty or a sustained course of abuse or neglect before an abusive or neglectful parent or carer can be prosecuted. This arguably undermines the protection that the criminal law should extend to children and other vulnerable persons and the ability of the state to punish abusive parents or carers.

The bill amends section 14 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act so that it applies to any act, whether lawful or unlawful, and where the relevant acts, omissions or course of conduct have caused either death or harm to a child or vulnerable adult. This is achieved by removing references to unlawful acts and serious harm from section 14 and associated definitions of those terms. 'Harm' is defined broadly for the purposes of the expanded section 14 offence to mean physical or mental harm and includes detriment caused to the physical, mental or emotional wellbeing or development of a child or vulnerable adult, whether temporary or permanent.

The penalties for the expanded section 14 offence have been significantly increased. It is appropriate that the maximum penalties on a conviction are substantial to reflect the gravity of offending against children and vulnerable adults. A person convicted of neglect causing death to a child or vulnerable adult would face a maximum sentence of life imprisonment. This reflects the penalties in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act for murder, manslaughter and aggravated causing death by use of a motor vehicle.

A person convicted under section 14 of neglect causing harm to a child or vulnerable adult would face a maximum sentence of 15 years' imprisonment. This places the maximum penalty at around the mid point of the spectrum of penalties for other analogous harm-based offences in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

For example, aggravated recklessly causing serious harm, aggravated intentionally causing serious harm and aggravated serious harm by use of a motor vehicle carry maximum sentences of 19 years, 25 years and life imprisonment respectively. Aggravated recklessly causing harm, aggravated intentionally causing harm and aggravated harm by use of a motor vehicle carry maximum sentences of seven, 13 and seven years' imprisonment respectively. I will come back and clarify if that last number is correct, but we will leave it as it is at the moment.

In each case under the expanded section 14 offence, whether the offender caused death or harm, it would be for the sentencing court to determine the appropriate sentence on a conviction having regard to all the circumstances of the offence, victim and offender. As a result, it is no longer necessary to attempt to define 'serious harm' in a way that reflects the different physiological responses to injury of children and adults as the court can take into account, when sentencing the offender, the severity, duration and impact of the injuries inflicted on the child or vulnerable adult and the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the underlying acts or omissions.

This government is one which places the safety of children and those most vulnerable in our society at the forefront of its agenda. That is why this important legislation is a priority for the Marshall government as it ensures that those who harm others are appropriately and quickly prosecuted for their actions.

I think members are familiar with the Oakden inquiry and the exposure of the vulnerability, in that case, of our mature-age mental health adults in our community. This only adds to the urgency for us to ensure that we protect our vulnerable adults. If I were to use any other example outside of institutional care, obviously, the community is becoming more and more aware and enlightened about the opportunity for neglect and abuse of our frail aged members of the community.

Whilst it might be uncomfortable or inconvenient to be left outside in the rain, for example, if you are in a wheelchair, if you are mature-age, if you are frail, if you are not ambulant and if you are left out in the rain with a current respiratory condition, you can imagine how much more serious the consequences could be, so it is important that we have this legislation.

I am personally very disappointed that the government did not progress this on the last day in the November 2017 sitting of parliament, spending most of the day fighting about whether we had a fairness clause in the Electoral Act rather than prioritising this important piece of legislation. We had publicly committed to support it, yet they were prepared to leave this off the list. It is disappointing.

However, that time is over. Our government is now in place and we will progress it urgently, and I ask the parliament to participate in ensuring there is no further delay in the passage of this legislation. I table the explanation of clauses.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Mullighan.

FAIR TRADING (GIFT CARDS) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:06): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Fair Trading Act 1987. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:06): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I am pleased to introduce the first of two pieces of legislation which explicitly put the power back in shoppers' hands and reform our current consumer protections. The bill amends the Fair Trading Act 1987 to require that any gift cards sold in South Australia must have a minimum expiry date of three years. This policy was overwhelmingly supported throughout this year's state election and is part of the Marshall government's 100-day plan.

A gift card is a good substitute for giving someone cash and, sensibly, should have the same longevity as cash. Further, a gift card is meant to be a gift for the person receiving the card, not the retailer from whom it was purchased who receives the benefit if the consumer is unable to spend the entire value of the gift card in time or at all. As many members know, consumers often do not have sufficient time to redeem the full value of a gift card with the current system and there are inconsistent rules applied from shop to shop.

The terms and conditions of gift cards vary greatly, with the time frame of expiry dates typically ranging from three to over 12 months, so it is unsurprising that many consumers find that they have run out of time on their gift card. Again, it is unsurprising that this supports the perception that the current system unfairly favours businesses and unfairly treats consumers. I understand that some larger companies, such as Apple and Bunnings, have set a higher standard by offering gift cards with no expiry, where consumers can consider the credit similar to cash, but this is not the norm.

This reform makes gift cards more consumer-friendly by ensuring that any gift cards sold in this state have a minimum three-year expiry date. The bill also contributes to the government's priority of modernising regulation by providing greater flexibility and certainty for consumers who are often confused by the varying rules in relation to gift card expiry dates. For consumers, the legal protection currently provided is limited to a situation where an expiry date is considered unreasonably short or where there are particularly unfair terms and conditions for gift cards, severely limiting where compensation can be sought.

The government's view is that, while some retailers will honour a gift card that is out of date, it should not be a matter of discretion and that consumers are entitled to a consistent approach across the retail sector. The bill will achieve this. The bill reduces the detriment caused to consumers when they are forced to redeem gift cards and make purchases that they otherwise might not, simply because of a looming expiry date. It also reduces the financial loss experienced by consumers who do not redeem their gift cards at all, simply because they have been unable to find something that they wish to purchase within the period of time that the gift card is valid.

According to consumer advocate group Choice, Australians spend approximately \$2.5 billion each year on gift cards. An estimated \$200 million of this is lost in unredeemed gift cards. Members I am sure, and I am probably like many of them, have a few un-presented gift vouchers sitting in a drawer with an expiry date on them for service or products no longer accessible. I should remind members that this bill does not act retrospectively so, unfortunately, its passage will not enable you to dive into the bottom drawer, find all those vouchers and rush off to redeem them, just in case you thought you were going to have a big year of massages, free candles or something.

The bill eases the pressure placed on consumers by increasing the period of time in which they have to redeem their vouchers, ensuring that they get what they pay for and are more likely to make purchases that they can benefit from. On 31 March 2018, similar reforms commenced in New South Wales, mandating a minimum three-year expiry date for gift cards. The New South Wales

reforms were widely supported for providing a fair balance between the rights and obligations of consumers and businesses.

The New South Wales reforms prescribe a number of categories of exemption, including loyalty or reward programs, temporary marketing promotions and vouchers supplied for charitable or fundraising purposes. Subject to the passage of the bill through parliament, targeted consultation will be undertaken to prescribe similar exemptions in South Australia by regulation to ensure the needs of both businesses and consumers are met with minimal disruption.

It is noteworthy that the federal government is currently investigating the feasibility of national reforms that would bring all jurisdictions in line with New South Wales. Until this occurs, the proposed South Australian amendments are limited in the same manner as the New South Wales reforms with respect to online and over the phone purchases where the gift card is delivered to an addressee outside South Australia, or where the consumer's contact details include a residential address outside the state.

Only last week did I formally alert my counterparts in the national Consumer Affairs Forum of SA's action to reform gift cards. It is a credit to South Australia that we act as a leader in this field by adopting reforms that are consistent with those recently introduced in New South Wales, to minimise varying and complex regulation across the jurisdictions. Simply put, these reforms will streamline the diverse practices of businesses and achieve greater confidence, consistency and fairness for consumers.

The impact on business is anticipated to be negligible, and transition costs are likely to be minimised for larger businesses already operating in New South Wales. Consumers deserve to get what they have paid for without time restrictions that limit their purchasing ability by forcing them to make purchases that they do not benefit from or by preventing them from redeeming their gift cards at all, which results in some businesses retaining the cash without consumers ever receiving a good or service that has ultimately been paid for.

I am pleased to be able to introduce this Marshall government reform that will assist countless South Australians in the government's first 100 days, and I look forward to support in both places for this important consumer reform. Again, I commend the bill to members, table a copy of the explanation of clauses and invite members to its serious and favourable consideration.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Mullighan.

SUPPLY BILL 2018

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 May 2018.)

Mr MULLIGHAN (Lee) (16:14): It gives me great pleasure to carry on from my preliminary remarks made last night on the Supply Bill. As I mentioned to members last night, I was only really just starting on some of the areas that needed exploration in the debate on this important bill. As we wound up debate last night, we were touching on the proposal for the new Liberal government to establish a South Australian productivity commission.

I was going to say that I was surprised—but we should not be surprised—at the commitment made by the Premier on becoming the state's Premier on 19 March that the membership of this body would be settled within the first 30 days of the new Liberal government and that, once that membership was settled, it would enable this body to start driving some of the policy agenda in relation to economic matters for this government, which, as I discussed last night, is imperative for the state of the budget and the state's finances, given that in some areas there is a direct correlation between economic activity and revenues enjoyed by the state budget. The example I gave last night was about the housing industry and how activity in the housing industry, particularly house purchase decisions, manifests itself in conveyance duty receipts in the state budget.

I want to talk in a little more detail about the concept of the establishment of a state-based productivity commission, hypothetical as it is at this point in time because we have had that broken election commitment from the new Liberal government to establish the membership of this

organisation within its first 30 days. Instead, we had the Premier come into this place at the beginning of question time and, via a ministerial statement, advise the house that, rather than the commitment that he made to South Australians to establish the membership of this organisation within the first 30 days, he would seek to issue drafting instructions for a bill to be prepared to establish enabling legislation for a statutory authority to be made. That is, I think, quite obviously a stalling tactic.

It is pretty clear that whatever entreaties had been made, by either the Premier or his representatives to potential members of this organisation, some or all of those entreaties must have been rebuffed, and hence the election commitment cannot be delivered, unless of course in the commitment we were given by the Premier—that not only is he personally monitoring every single one of the election commitments and the progress that the government is making on them but each and every one of his cabinet ministers is monitoring them personally, and everybody within the cabinet office of the Department Premier and Cabinet is monitoring them directly—there has been some sort of mass abrogation of responsibility by the Premier, his ministers and by the cabinet office in keeping check on these election commitments.

Regardless of that, we find ourselves in a position with a hypothetical concept of a productivity commission and what that productivity commission might do and how it might affect the economy and the state's finances. It is an important point to raise because we see the work of similar bodies nationally and interstate and some of the recommendations that they make.

Last night, I also touched on the almost revolutionary policy objective, for the time, of then prime minister Paul Keating in establishing a competition policy regime. That was designed to free up, through targeted bursts of micro-economic reform, economic performance nationally and within the states in particular industry areas. That national competition policy agenda was pursued innovatively, I think, with a carrot approach to provide competition payments to participating jurisdictions who successfully undertook what were initially competition reviews of parts of state legislation, in particular, which were found to be providing a barrier to improved productivity and efficiency either within those areas of government service delivery or in areas of private sector industry performance. Once those reviews were carried out, then payments would be made from the federal government to the states to incentivise that competition reform.

That agenda ran throughout the latter part of the 1990s and the early part of the first decade of the 2000s, give or take a couple of years at each end. In various areas, that was a success. In various areas, that did not amount to much. There were some very politically sensitive areas where state governments, for example, undertook their competition policy review, but did not implement any competition policy reforms, either because, for example, it would negatively impact service delivery or the public's expectations of what role government should play in superintending that service delivery, industry area or the standards that were being provided in the delivery of those services or the standards that industries were being held to in providing their goods and services to the market.

That wound up, as you can imagine, at least 10 years ago. I can remember having a number of conversations with federal ministers when I was a minister in the former Labor government, saying that, if the federal then Coalition government expected state governments to drive further reform or improvements in the area that I was responsible for in transport regulation or reform, then there needed to be an incentive approach, bearing in mind though that we were nearly the whole of the way through that national competition policy reform agenda that had been instituted more than 20 years ago. The low-hanging fruit, so to speak, had been plucked. Most of the reform that was deemed worthy or beneficial had been undertaken or other arrangements put in place.

What is the work program then for a productivity commission to undertake? I do not think that anybody would argue on either side of this chamber that we should not continue to seek productivity improvements. Of course, for a given level of input, we should seek to maximise economic outputs. That, I think, is something that can be broadly accepted and agreed upon. But what we are talking about is the public means by which we facilitate that outcome and what role there is for a state government to add in another layer of policy advice or reform options on top of what is already available to state jurisdictions.

What we currently have is a Public Service here in South Australia. It is an independent Public Service that is there to provide frank and fearless advice. We know that it must be frank and fearless and we know that it must be independent because we had the Marshall 'Passover' at the beginning of its term of government, with their going through the ranks of the South Australian Public Service and singling out those people whom they thought did not conform with their view of the world and removing them from the Public Service. We assume, given that the 'Passover' is now complete, that the Liberal Government now has what it desires and that is a frank, fearless and fiercely independent Public Service to provide it with the necessary policy advice.

We also have the national Productivity Commission and, say what you like about the national Productivity Commission (and I will certainly be saying some things about it), the very least you can say for it is that it exists. You would have to ask what in addition a state-based productivity commission could derive of value for Australian Public Service delivery, or for the pursuit of productivity or economic growth in addition to that national Productivity Commission.

I have to say that, while it is always good to have sources of advice when it comes to the formation of public policy, I am not sure that the national Productivity Commission has always got it right. It is always easy from a dry economic perspective to identify changes or policy options, which can derive at a very dry level improvements to economic output and productivity. But we are not here as elected representatives to achieve merely a set of economic metrics in South Australia: we are here, of course, to represent our communities first and foremost. We are here to do what is best for our communities collectively and, as much as possible, individually for members of our community.

When we have national policy bodies like the Productivity Commission that make recommendations about the abolition of penalty rates for some of our lowest paid workers in the community, then that is a very poor outcome for our community. That is one example that I will draw the parliament's attention to that the Productivity Commission can come up with. Of course, the other thing which we are waiting with bated breath to see is the outcome of its inquiry into horizontal fiscal equalisation, which is the basis of our GST distribution regime between the states and territories in Australia.

It is a regime that has been in place for the best part of 20 years since the introduction of the goods and services tax. This is an almost completely confected national issue that has now got itself a head of steam and momentum out of control of the federal government, let alone individual jurisdictions. In fact, I should not say 'individual jurisdictions' because individual jurisdictions in fact do retain a great deal of control over the outcome of this debate and this issue. Let's cast our minds back to how we got into the situation where we have had a Productivity Commission which is examining the principle of horizontal fiscal equalisation and the distribution of the GST and which is made based on that principle.

I will not go through the arguments for and against and the mechanics of the introduction of the goods and services tax but, once that argument was run and won by the then Howard government, then it was up to the Howard government and the states and territories of the day to work out how best to disburse those revenues on a reasonable and a fair basis to Australian jurisdictions. All of us would recognise, particularly here in South Australia, that the jurisdictions are remarkably different from one another in their geographic context, their size, their population and the population distribution over the land mass of the jurisdictions.

All these factors, amongst many others, are important in contemplating how we can come up with a fair way of disbursing these goods and services tax revenues so that, in principle, each Australian has the opportunity to avail themselves of government services that are of a same or similar standard regardless of where they are around the country.

That is an incredibly important principle and one that is clearly held closer to the chests of state and territory governments than it is to that of the federal government. It is not really surprising in the current political context. There is one jurisdiction in particular that has been making a lot of noise about how it feels it is getting the rough end of the pineapple on the carve-up of the GST in recent years, and that is Western Australia. There is no doubt, to be fair from the outset, that Western Australia has had literally fluctuating fortunes when it comes to GST receipts in that state.

Many moons ago, when I first started working in government as an adviser to a former treasurer, I can remember attending annual treasurers' conferences where there was a traditional divide between those larger states, principally Victoria and New South Wales, and the smaller jurisdictions like South Australia, Western Australia, even Queensland, the Northern Territory, the ACT and Tasmania. Ribbing and jibes would occur between New South Wales and Victoria and the rest of us about how they were coughing up and generating all this goods and services tax revenue for the benefit of the remainder of the jurisdictions.

Importantly, I make that point to include Western Australia as a net recipient of GST revenues in those early years of the 2000s. Indeed, in the Productivity Commission's draft report on horizontal fiscal equalisation, which it made available last year, there is some analysis of the fortunes of Western Australia when it comes to GST receipts—particularly when their mining royalty revenues are taken into account—and whether there is an argument that Western Australia is ahead or behind the curve in what they should have been receiving in GST revenues.

I think we can all admit that where we are today we can see that Western Australia, in the most recent financial years, has had a rapidly declining share of GST revenues. Indeed, I think its share, expressed in cents in the dollar, fell to 50, then 40 and then down towards 30¢. That is obviously a very significant financial impact, but it needs to be placed in context. For a 10-year period, between 2004-05 and 2013-14—despite the record revenues Western Australia was receiving as a result of the mining boom, the many extra billions of dollars it received over that period and, indeed, extra billions of dollars within some financial years—the lag effect of the regular assessments of the relativities by the Commonwealth Grants Commission left Western Australia in front rather than behind. It has only been in the most recent financial years when this has been a problem.

Of course, it is in those most recent financial years that the Western Australian fiscal problem has coincided with the federal Coalition's political problems in terms of being manifestly unpopular, particularly so in Western Australia. The reference to the Productivity Commission to review horizontal fiscal equalisation and make recommendations about that principle, and also about whether the GST distribution regime needs amendment here in Australia, was designed to try to assuage those concerns in Western Australia and those concerns of the Western Australian caucus members of the federal Coalition. It is a vexed issue, a complex one, a political issue that the Coalition government has created.

A short-term—maybe even, if necessary, a medium-term—fiscal and political solution to this problem would be what the Coalition government commenced doing but has now ceased doing, and that is providing some sort of top-up or transition payments to Western Australia to ease the impacts of the fluctuations of GST receipts on that state. Off the top of my head, I think it was \$1.2 billion in top-up money that was provided to Western Australia from the commonwealth government.

If that can be done in a way that does not impact further the CGC-assessed relativity by which commonwealth GST grant payments are made to Western Australia, let alone the other states, that is a temporary but, perhaps in the context of the options available in the scheme of things, perhaps not a bad solution. It is not an ideal solution, not a very fiscally pure option, but a temporary solution nonetheless. However, this argument now has gathered such a head of steam that we have seen lobby groups crop up in Western Australia to lobby nationally for reform within the GST distribution regime as it will affect all other states and territories, including Western Australia.

The draft report of the Productivity Commission that was provided to the federal government, but also released publicly last year, makes for terrifying reading for the other states and territories—absolutely terrifying reading. Changing the manner of equalisation between states, moving from full equalisation to a watered-down reasonable equalisation, would have disastrous consequences for the level of our GST receipts here in South Australia. The figures bandied around in the media would be that if there were a reasonable equalisation rather than a full equalisation, we could see an impact to South Australia in the current financial year of up to \$550 million, which is an extraordinary reduction in our level of GST receipts.

To put that in context, what does half a billion dollars mean in one financial year for the state budget? Well, it is a very significant amount. It is well over 5 per cent of our annual operating expenses. In the context of a health budget, it is far more than that even: we are talking well north in

the order of 10 or 15 per cent. In the education budget, it is even more. In the police budget and the Corrections budget, for example, it would have a very significant impact.

We have had quite a heated debate in recent days about whether appropriate levels of infrastructure funding have actually been committed to South Australia and when those infrastructure payments will be made from the federal government to South Australia. The sum of \$550 million is no 5¢ piece down the back seat of the car: it is a very substantial amount of money. It is more than the whole of the funds required for that next stage of the South Road upgrade, Pym Street to Regency Road. It is more than the whole of the required funding to complete the Gawler electrification project. It is a very substantial amount of funding.

I think it is always alarming when we have an almost blind adherence to wanting to establish these quasi independent so-called expert economic advisory groups because what they have come up with in the past, at least at the national level, has been potentially very, very bad news for South Australia.

To give a third example, when we pushed the Premier in the very early days of sitting of this parliamentary session about what again seems to be his blind adherence to the deregulation of shopping hours, he claimed that there is very favourable assessment from a productivity commission, albeit the Queensland Productivity Commission, to allegedly demonstrate some sort of positive jobs impact. I guess you have to search long and hard to find some modicum of economic research to support your policy position when you are pushing a policy that has many detractors and few supporters, although there are of course a few very major supporters such as Coles and Woolworths, who stand to gain the most in terms of market share and profiteering from such a change.

It is concerning that this policy is being pursued particularly when, if we were after a quasi-independent economic agency in South Australia, there is a third alternative for that source of economic advice and that is the Essential Services Commission of South Australia, which already has a provision within its act to enable a Treasurer to seek advice, either through public process or on a confidential basis, and hence provide advice to the government of the day on any matter that the Treasurer refers to it. That is an opportunity which, from time to time, has been taken advantage of by the government of the day since its establishment.

Now is perhaps a good time to give an example of that, given that the member for Hammond has come into the chamber. He and I, and another clutch of members across the political spectrum, have continued to raise concerns about the virtual monopoly that exists on grain handling in South Australia. In fact, as the member for Flinders, Deputy Speaker, you probably share those concerns. That is a great example of how the Essential Services Commission of South Australia can be tasked to provide either public or confidential advice to the government of the day on a matter of pressing economic importance.

That particular example is a concern, I think, for all South Australians. It is a concern that we have an extremely dominant market operator that may be imposing either inefficiencies into the system of grain handling or could be imposing unfair restrictions on competition or could be imposing poor-pricing outcomes, particularly for farmers, as well as for hauliers of grain throughout regional South Australia. That, I think, is an example of where a government has a good opportunity to examine ways, whether they are policy changes or legislative changes or some other market interventions, where they can look at micro-economic reform.

Again, I come back to that point of these different structures that we already have available to us, principally a now freshly minted independent Public Service, as we are told, after the Marshall pass over through its ranks, and also the Essential Services Commission of South Australia. Of course, it is not just the South Australian productivity commission which failed to be established within 30 days, as promised, by the new Liberal government, it was also Infrastructure South Australia. There was a commitment that within 30 days the membership of that and the entity would be established, so that it could be put to work on the new government's priorities.

It is actually an interesting story, in the context of recent Australian political history, of how infrastructure policy development has been superintended across the country. It is a little-known fact that until 2007, with the election of the Rudd federal Labor government and the appointment of Anthony Albanese to the federal cabinet, there previously had not been a ministry for infrastructure

at the federal level. He was the first minister to hold that title and that portfolio responsibility, which seems extraordinary in the context of the sorts of assumptions and discussions that we have about government expenditure at federal and state levels of government.

If you cast your mind back a little further, Deputy Speaker, in 2002, on the election of the former state Labor government, the former member for Elder (Hon. Patrick Conlon) was the first minister for infrastructure we had and, again, we established the first infrastructure portfolio of government. It has been interesting to watch how those two separated—not quite correlating in terms of periods of time—and parallel infrastructure ministries progressed priorities over their times in government.

We will start with the earliest first and the state Labor example. In 2005, the former Labor government released a strategic infrastructure plan, a 10-year plan identifying infrastructure needs and priorities. As I discussed in some detail last night, that then guided a raft of infrastructure investments over the intervening years, up until 2015. In the second half of 2013, in the months leading up to the 2014 state election, the former minister for transport (member for West Torrens) and the former minister for planning (member for Enfield) released the Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan, a 30-year infrastructure plan, to again identify infrastructure needs, to prioritise the delivery against those infrastructure needs and also to identify funding options to meet the infrastructure financing costs of that plan.

I raise those infrastructure plans for a couple of reasons: (a) South Australia was one of the first jurisdictions to engage in long-term planning for infrastructure within the jurisdiction in the Australian context and (b) the other infrastructure agencies, akin to what is proposed to be established in South Australia via Infrastructure South Australia, hold out their key achievements as providing long-term plans for infrastructure development.

If we look at Infrastructure Victoria, Infrastructure New South Wales or Building Queensland, it does not take too much searching around on their websites to see that pretty much front and centre of their long-term infrastructure plans are what they hold up as exemplars of their achievements since establishment. The point I make is that we are already ahead of that curve. We have already been ahead of that curve.

Aside from what you would anticipate as being some pre-election argy-bargy between the former Labor government and the former Liberal opposition about, 'Well, it's a 30-year plan,' 'It's \$36 billion worth of infrastructure works,' 'How much do you expect to pay?', 'How much can local government be expected to contribute?' and, 'How much can the private sector be expected to contribute?'—aside from that particular argument, which got some ventilation at the time, there has not really been any questioning from Liberal members of parliament about the priorities identified in that document. There has not even been much criticism about the balance between metropolitan and regional projects or about transport infrastructure projects and other areas of infrastructure, like utilities, ports or water infrastructure, for example.

In South Australia, that was supplemented by the development, over a number of years, of the Regional Mining Infrastructure Plan (RMIP). This document does two things. The first, I think, is a pretty radical achievement for an Australian jurisdiction looking to facilitate the exploitation of its mineral resources; that is, at the time identify all those potentially productive areas of the state when it comes to mineral exploration and development.

There is nothing new in that. We discussed the PACE initiative last night, although perhaps I should pause in my comments now and admit to the house that in the contribution I made last night I did get one particular fact wrong, for which I have been admonished this morning.

Mr Pederick: Outrageous.

Mr MULLIGHAN: It is outrageous.

Mr Pederick: You've taken this long to remedy it. You should have done it when you first knew.

Mr MULLIGHAN: A mere three hours to remedy it, I think. That is, I said that the PACE initiative was an initiative of the former Liberal government. I can tell you, Deputy Speaker, that I

have been roundly chastened this morning by a number of my colleagues who have pointed out that it was actually Frank Blevins who started this initiative in the late 1980s/early 1990s. I offer my unreserved apologies to the house for getting that fact wrong. Perhaps we will move on.

Members interjecting:

Mr MULLIGHAN: There is furious agreement with that suggestion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That done, member for Lee, I would bring you back to the subject at hand.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Thank you for your guidance, Deputy Speaker; it is always gratefully appreciated. That Regional Mining and Infrastructure Plan not only assessed those productive areas of the state but also—quite radically, I think—made an assessment of the market conditions of the day as well as the likely medium-term market conditions, about how quickly those projects could come to fruition (those projects not already in production), what the long-term commodity prices were going to be for those products or ores, etc., that were to be exploited, how financial or otherwise those tenements would be, and then the infrastructure to bring those to market.

It stepped those out in a batting order to make sure that we were taking advantage of those mineral resources but also that we were using our financial resources to invest in the right infrastructure at the right time to bring those projects about. There was some unpleasantness in global commodity markets in the intervening years, and those equations have changed somewhat for many of those developments, particularly on Eyre Peninsula for example; nonetheless, that work has been done.

This is the sort of work which, as I said, is held aloft by these infrastructure agencies around the country as what they are there to do. Some of those agencies go a little step further; some of those agencies start making recommendations not just about the provision of new infrastructure but about the management or superintendence of existing infrastructure. There has been quite a hullabaloo in Victoria about the proposal to introduce congestion charging on some of its inner-city road network, which is, of course, of great concern to many Victorians. Notwithstanding that, in very, very populous cities like London they would point to that as being somewhat successful in alleviating congestion and pollution and reducing the risk of road traffic accidents between different classes of road users.

That is not to say that there is not something that can be taken from agencies interstate. Indeed, I am very proud to say that in our time in government, especially in the last term of government, we borrowed quite heavily from one or two agencies in particular, that is, Partnerships Victoria and their equivalent in New South Wales. That is because South Australia had engaged in a series of public-private partnerships to try to balance the impact of investment in infrastructure on the state budget and on the state's balance sheet.

I am pretty sure that I will get this right, but the first I can remember was indeed done by the former Liberal government with the regional courts and police stations PPP, I think one or two facilities of which were provided at Murray Bridge in the member for Hammond's electorate. That was a relatively small PPP but an important one because it was the first that had been done in South Australia. It gave the next government, the Labor government, the confidence to embark on another PPP, which was the schools PPP, to deliver six new schools in metropolitan Adelaide. We then had the PPP to deliver the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

The pipeline of PPPs, and the extraordinary amount of work it takes for a bureaucracy to successfully call, negotiate and execute those agreements with the private sector, is important but, while we were out to market with those particular projects, we were getting increasing calls from industry, from the private sector, with new and more innovative projects and means of delivering either infrastructure or government services. It is difficult when somebody comes and pitches to a department, let alone to a minister, something that has not previously been attempted by a state government agency.

It might be very attractive, both in terms of service delivery and benefits to the community, and also in terms of impacts on the state budget, to take up that opportunity, but of course you cannot award a contract or an agreement to one company just because they have come and pitched to you

a new and innovative idea. That is why South Australia, like Victoria and New South Wales, developed an unsolicited bids policy.

There are things that can be drawn from these advisory agencies, but does that really mean that we need the replication of the agency here in South Australia? That is no doubt something that we will be debating. In lieu of having the election commitment delivered with Infrastructure South Australia established within 30 days, we are instead getting a bill to establish a statutory body to comprise this new agency so that members can be appointed and whatever the work program of this organisation is to be can be contemplated.

I think it is an interesting signal in the context of another initiative, this time in the health portfolio, put forward by the new Liberal government, which is the re-creation of local health boards within SA Health, or whatever SA Health is now to be called given that it is to be rebranded. On the surface, it perhaps seems to be a fairly basic argument about whether you subscribe to the theory that local health boards, and hence corporate governance, are best located as close as possible to the service delivery functions of health, or whether you do not and argue that financial and corporate management of health services should be done centrally.

I am sure that the health minister, the shadow health minister and those with particularly close interest in the health portfolio will have much to say on this on an ongoing basis. However, in the context of the state budget, I think there is an important point to consider in the establishment of these boards, and that is: who is accountable and who is responsible for the financial performance of those health units? I talk about that in the case of a regime where we have local health boards re-established above, for example, a major metropolitan hospital.

All of us are very familiar with the pressures that the health agencies generate for the general government sector and the state budget. I spoke about that at some length last night. On the basis that a health unit (for want of a better description) finds itself with greater demand than was originally anticipated—more people coming through the doors for treatment, more expensive treatments, or perhaps even some unexpected circumstances to arrive, for example a worse than anticipated flu season and so on—let us assume that that health unit is unable to meet the budget that has been provided for it in a financial year.

The previous Labor government wrote into chief executive contracts a direct responsibility for meeting budget outcomes, for meeting budget requirements, for the agencies that fell within that chief executive's purview and responsibilities. They were to achieve balanced budgets in those agencies or they would be held accountable. There are others in the room who have a just as good if not better understanding of fiduciary responsibilities in the context of the corporate environment and serving on boards, as I do.

When it comes to the accountability to the central government, to the cabinet, when it comes to accountability to the Treasurer, who will be accountable for a health unit's budget if it fails to meet its budget targets? Will it be the health minister who is accountable to the Treasurer? Will it be the chief executive of SA Health, or whatever it is to be rebranded, or will it be the chief financial officer or the chief operating officer of that same agency, or will it be the local health board?

Are we either mistakenly or, even worse, quite deliberately confecting an environment where the health minister can place themselves at long arm's length away from financial responsibility for the financial management responsibility of his portfolio? That is a vexed question, and a question to which I am yet to hear a cogent let alone acceptable answer. It is going to be very important in the context of what I also discussed last night, and that is the current Treasurer's confection of a budget deficit in the current financial year claiming that health as well as child protection is exceeding its budget or is not living within its means, or not delivering its savings targets despite of course the extra \$148 million provided within the Mid-Year Budget Review to offset those very pressures.

In that context, where we have a Treasurer who is already indicating that SA Health, or whatever it is to be called, as a department is constantly placing pressure on the state budget and on the general government sector more generally, and that that is caused by underperformance in terms of financial management, or overperformance in terms of service delivery and hence additional cost pressures within that health unit, that question needs to be answered. That question I am sure is going to be the subject of some commentary and examination by the Auditor-General.

The principles of the Westminster system of government and responsible government would deem that the health minister is ultimately responsible to the Parliament of South Australia for the performance of the departments that fall within his portfolio responsibilities. That much is clear. What is less clear is what happens at that lesser level from the minister down and whether he has a single individual whom he can hold accountable under a regime of local health boards for financial performance and budget management.

Whether or not he realises it, that is creating a very difficult circumstance for the Minister for Health, particularly when it comes to the estimates process and particularly when it comes to the thorough examination from the Auditor-General which, while members opposite might like to think is a great opportunity in terms of this parliament, they will soon learn is something very much akin to what men over 50 have to experience on a regular basis from their general practitioner. I would finish perhaps slightly further on from that note by saying that those three—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MULLIGHAN: That is right. I slipped in that little example and it went straight through to the keeper, didn't it? Maybe not. I will finish, to members' great relief—

Mr Pederick: No, no, please.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Really, it is only 54 minutes.

Mr Pederick: As I told you earlier, your call.

Mr MULLIGHAN: It is a mere canter. I will finish on one summation of the last three issues that I raised, that is, putting together the concept of the establishment of a South Australian productivity commission of Infrastructure South Australia and also the re-establishment of local health boards. This seems to suggest a worrying trend of this new government divesting itself of certain responsibilities of executive government.

It is the responsibility of the cabinet, if it believes it has a role in trying to manipulate, improve and provide beneficial outcomes in the South Australian economy for the government and executive government themselves to articulate an economic strategy and vision for South Australia. That is not something that can be outsourced to a panel of appointed acolytes on a new productivity commission for South Australia.

The same goes for Infrastructure Australia. I have already mentioned that there are ample policy advisory capabilities that the new government can draw on without having to establish yet another organisation and pay yet another tranche of board fees and sitting fees and create yet another environment where at least a minister, if not a cabinet, can abrogate their responsibility for making decisions when it comes to priorities for the new government.

I commenced my comments by saying that the state budget is an expression of priorities of a new government and that I would hope that, in those three different examples of the establishment of organisations, what we are not seeing is a state budget that is the expression of priorities external to the government, an expression of priorities of a group of unelected and unaccountable people who sit around a table and decide what decisions a government should make. That would be a very poor outcome indeed. Members will be greatly relieved to know that we are nearly at the end of my comments—

Mr Pederick: No, no.

Mr MULLIGHAN: —although I am being asked to continue my comments by the member for Hammond.

Mr Pederick: I am riveted.

Mr MULLIGHAN: I think the former member for Ramsay, former premier Mike Rann, called that a goad to action and I am trying to resist being goaded. I want to finish by saying one thing. I did make mention at the outset of my remarks last night that I thought it was regrettable, but I had assumed a mere oversight, that the Treasurer, or his agency or staff, had neglected to offer the opposition a briefing on this bill. Perhaps they thought that this is such a routine matter for the parliament that a briefing would not be necessary. Perhaps they sought to flatter me so by ignoring

me, thinking that I had, perhaps, been around the traps long enough to understand what all this is about and I did not need a briefing, and if that is the case, well, consider me flattered, Mr Lucas. However, I did make the point that it is a courtesy to extend the offer of a briefing on legislation to other members of parliament, particularly the opposition.

I am pleased to say that I have since been offered a briefing. I do not mean to make a big deal of that in itself but it does lead me to make a subsequent point, and that is the regime that we are finding ourselves in in terms of sitting. Now, it was a surprise to us, I think, that late yesterday afternoon we received the directive that we would be sitting to midnight—although not an unpleasant surprise; I have certainly enjoyed it and I am sure that everyone else has—but also that we will be doing the same again tonight and that is terrific.

Nearly all 47 members of parliament have made a contribution to the Address in Reply and, of course, this debate gives the opportunity for those same members to make another contribution and indeed a third contribution in a subsequent grievance debate related to the Supply Bill, so I do not begrudge that at all. I am not sure whether I am going to be in a position to avail myself of the briefing that has been offered to me tomorrow morning, given the competing commitments that I have on my time, but I will do my best.

However, I do want to place on the record a query as to why the hurry with the Supply Bill. We know that it is important; there is no question about that. I said in the opening sentences of my remarks many, many thousands of sentences ago, that of course the opposition supports this bill and will be supporting it the whole way through in both houses. I do not think that anyone should feel that there is a problem or any threat to this bill being passed by the last sitting week in June, which I note is the second to last sitting week on the agenda which has been circulated by the government for sittings in parliament for the rest of the year.

I raise that point because, even if the parliament in its entirety took right up until the last moment of that last sitting day in June, it is only the second to last week of June and there is more than enough time for any further consideration—principally by the Governor—for the bill to be assented to and for supply to flow and for the lights to be kept on. But I do ask, somewhat rhetorically, because it would be good to have an answer at some point: why the hurry in here? Why the hurry to get this bill through?

There are four sitting weeks left. There are 47 members of the lower house all just as entitled to have full consideration of a bill, not just compared with one another, and, of course, we are provided an equal opportunity to make contributions on bills—some more equal than others—and there are only 22 members upstairs in the other place. I would ask, perhaps somewhat controversially as a member of parliament with a definable constituency, why my opportunity as one of 47 in this place should be curtailed to within less than one sitting week on this bill while those in another place, who I assume are tucked up in bed by now, are afforded the full benefit of—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: No, they're over at the Adelaide Club.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Well, that is probably true as well—they probably have sleepers over there as well. I wonder why we are curtailed to less than one sitting week to consider this bill, the approval of more than \$6.5 billion worth of money, the purposes for which, other than the broad continuation of government operations, we have not yet been fully apprised but, of course, perhaps that will be forthcoming in the committee stages of the bill.

Why the constraints on the consideration in this house? Why less than a quarter of the opportunity than will be provided to the members in the other place, who are less than half our number? I find that strange. One of the other questions that we perhaps need to ask in the committee stage is: is there a hurry? Is there a hurry with this bill? Is there not just some need to get this through before the end of June to continue government operations for the new financial year but something else we need to be aware of?

I assume not. In fact, I hope not, but the question has to be asked. I do not mean this in a way that is having a dig, but maybe it is just because, from a government perspective, the government would like this one out of the way so that they can get on with some of the other things

that have been introduced into the house. If that is the case, well, they are the government, they have the numbers on the floor and that is their prerogative.

That is absolutely fine and I can understand that, but I have to say that the late notice, the late-night sitting—and if you want to know why I was pretty much forced into the situation where I had to speak for more than two hours straight last night, it was that we knew that we were not going to finish the Address in Reply contributions before last night's dinner break. I think it was a reasonable assumption by most members for most of yesterday that we would probably pull stumps afterwards, but then we were advised that we were sitting late.

For people like the member for Hammond, for people like the member for Unley, for people like the member for Port Adelaide and other members who are confident and able to stand up and make riveting yet impromptu contributions about bills like the Supply Bill, that is not such a big deal, but I think we have almost a record number of new members at the moment. When pressure is placed on this chamber very late for the consideration of a bill to commence only a little bit before 10pm and to continue for at least—

Dr Close: They have risen.

Mr MULLIGHAN: —they are probably testing the buzzers—to continue on for two hours, fair go for us to be given notice at sometime between 4pm and 5pm that we will be sitting and that we will need to have, at least on one side of the chamber, at least two hours of Supply Bill contributions to get us up until midnight. It is not a criticism of either whip at all. Let me make that absolutely clear, particularly to the member for Hammond. It is not a criticism.

I know that the whips' job is to make what happens on the floor work for their respective party's interests, whether it is the government side or the opposition side. It is not a criticism of the member for Hammond any more than it is a criticism of the member for Playford. I think it is a genuine and legitimate question about whether there is some other urgency about this bill. If there is, that might be absolutely fine, but just tell us. The last point I want to make in that vein is this, and this does not have to be inappropriately interjected upon across the chamber: is it the expectation that this bill will go through all its stages in this sitting week?

For the benefit of Hansard and those unfortunate enough to be tuning into this parliamentary debate, I am sorry that I am trying to work out my diary commitments live, but I am trying to ascertain whether the opposition need a briefing on this bill before the conclusion of this sitting week. Are we going to go into committee and try to see this bill through all three stages, or can we be afforded some modicum of recognition of our equal standing with those who sit on the same plane as us, notwithstanding that they consider themselves to be higher than us in the other place?

I place those comments on the record. Perhaps the Treasurer or the Treasurer's office, or the government via the whip or otherwise, can come back to me or to the Opposition Whip to provide us with some further advice about what is going on with this bill. As I said, the combination of the last-minute hurrying to get through this bill, to engage in late-night sittings and to expect new MPs—some of whom have only made one contribution to this chamber, and that is their maiden speech—to be in a position between the hours of 7.30pm and midnight to make some sort of cogent contribution on this bill and/or on the state budget, and/or on financial matters or matters relating to government expenditure I think is unfair.

Regardless of which side of the chamber they sit on, it is an unreasonable burden for many of us in this age, and for many new MPs, particularly those who like to publicise their parliamentary speeches, to be expected to come up with somewhere up to 20 minutes of contributions on the bill. I will leave it there for the government and the other powers that be to contemplate and perhaps come back to the opposition with some further advice.

I summarise by saying that we look forward to hearing more about what sits behind this bill and what the purpose of the expenditure will be for the \$6.6-odd billion. We look forward to seeing how the state budget is going to meet all the challenges I outlined last night, in terms of balancing the competing demands from agencies ever hungry for more appropriation, as well as some of the external pressures that continue to be placed on state governments, like wrangles over commonwealth funding arrangements in health and education infrastructure and other areas of service delivery. With that, I conclude my introductory remarks.

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (17:22): I rise to indicate my support for the Supply Bill presently before the parliament, which seeks approval of the appropriation of \$6.631 billion for the Public Service of this state. I commend the member for Lee—I think it was somewhere in hour 3—for his indication of his support for the same.

Before I move to further detail my support, I am attracted to several points made by the member for Lee. He did seek to provide some indications of the sizeable nature of a potential loss of the GST of some \$500 million. I noted with some interest that one indicator he did not use was that that sum is about one half of the annual interest bill left to the people of South Australia by 16 years of Labor government.

I am further attracted to point out that there were several references to the Marshall 'Passover'. I am attracted to pointing out the fact that the Passover was actually a celebration of the Israelites finding the Promised Land after wandering in the desert and being delivered from their subservience. The analogies with the South Australian people are similarly quite strong in that regard as well. However, I move on.

In indicating my support, I note that the bill will enable delivery of a number of commitments enshrined in the government's first 100-days election commitments whilst the 2018-19 budget is being finalised. The 2018-19 budget will be a landmark document in that it will have as its focus not just the implementation of our election commitments but also the development of a sustainable budget position for the future. To be clear, a sustainable budget position for South Australia will be based on the application of prudent, honest and realistic measures and processes as opposed to and distinct from the smoke and mirrors and back-of-the-envelope efforts South Australia has been subjected to for the last 16 years.

For the first time in 16 years, South Australians will see a budget that will not be based on the Labor modus operandi of selling every state-owned asset possible and deeming the proceeds part of a surplus and, optionally, blowing up those that are either unsaleable or deemed ideologically unsound. In late-breaking news we can now add the motor vehicle registry to the list of state-owned assets flogged by Labor, as details emerge of the secret deal done in August last year by Labor's former treasurer. I invite members to consider the details and data contained on the average driver's licence and dwell for a moment on the prospect of the former treasurer doing a deal to sell that data.

I take this opportunity to highlight some of those first 100-days commitments that will be delivered as a consequence of the passage of this bill, with particular reference to my seat of Davenport. The closure of the Repat hospital by Labor resulted in a net loss of 160 beds in the southern suburbs of Adelaide. I repeat that this is a net loss.

Those opposite have been fond of confusing people in my electorate, or seeking to, by referring to money spent at Flinders Medical Centre with a statement, concurrent statement or implication that this somehow obviates or mitigates the closure of the Repat. It does, or it did, no such thing. The closure of the Repat, in fact, placed enormous additional strain on the facility and especially on the staff at Flinders. In evidence to committee in July last year, Professor William Heddle and Associate Professor Michael Shanahan, who hold positions at both Flinders Medical Centre and Flinders University, stated that Flinders had the second busiest emergency department in the country, which was routinely already overcapacity prior to the closure of the Repat.

During the course of the election campaign, I spoke on doorsteps and at functions to countless numbers of staff who worked at Flinders or who had been retrenched from the Repat once it had been closed back in November last year. The Flinders staff all told of the enormous stress placed on them, as well as on ambulance personnel, arising from the increased workloads at Flinders, caused by the closure of the Repat.

The staff all spoke about the pressure they were under to move patients out of the hospital prematurely because of the increased pressure on bed availability and the resulting high rates of patients subsequently representing for readmission. They told me about the enormous number of beds being purchased by Flinders from Flinders Private, merely in order to cope with the volume of patients. They talked about their fears of being identified as having disclosed this information because of the threats made in order to keep secret the real impact of the closure of the Repat as part of Labor's Transforming Health fiasco—the usual Labor standover stuff.

The government's first 100 days marks the reopening of the Repat as a genuine health precinct, providing hospital and other health services to the south. The vandalism of Transforming Health has been stopped, lies about its impact have also stopped and the south, including residents of Davenport, will once more avail themselves of the treatment and the employment provided by the Repat.

A further feature of the first 100 days is the delivery of a reduction of the ESL bills of South Australians to the tune of some \$90 million a year. The people of Davenport universally indicated to me their support for the government's measure to reinstate the emergency services general remission, which, on average, provides a reduction on the ESL bill of around \$150 per annum for an average household. It is worth reiterating that the remission was removed and South Australians were, as a result, effectively taxed that extra amount of \$150-odd each year, as a direct result of measures adopted by the previous government in 2015.

It is difficult to distinguish which is the more amusing: the tortured logic at the time from Labor as to the rationale for this increase, or their response when the Liberal Party made a commitment to reinstate the remission and in so doing reduce the cost of living for thousands of South Australians. It is worth remembering that the emergency services levy impacts not just households but also sporting clubs, community groups, churches and independent schools.

As a result of the increase levied by Labor, a total of over \$90 million extra ESL was gouged by Labor from South Australians every year. Evidence was given in committee last year that in excess of 20,000 South Australians had difficulty in paying their ESL, in part as a consequence of that increase. In November last year, *The Advertiser* reported that SES and CFS volunteer numbers dropped by about 640, leaving volunteer numbers at a five-year low, as a direct result of their dissatisfaction with the ESL increase.

I noted with great interest the question yesterday to the Premier by the member for Lee when he asked for confirmation from the Premier about whether he stood by the commitment listed on his (the Premier's) website to restore the full general remission, which the Premier duly affirmed. By way of reciprocation, I note with more than just an element of amusement the assertion by the member for Lee on his own website, still available in April 2015, that 'it is a lie that ESL contributions will be used for purposes other than funding our state's emergency services'. I rhetorically ask the member for Lee if he would still have us believe that the extra \$90 million in ESL levied by Labor was all exclusively spent on an increase in ESL funding to an equivalent amount?

I note, too, the Leader of the Opposition running a line of questioning in the other place prior to the election with a similar implication, namely, that the Liberals' reinstatement of the general remission would necessarily and directly result in a reduction of spending on emergency services of the \$90 million in question. I am pleased to inform the house that, in discussions with a number of emergency services personnel in my electorate during the course of the last election, none of them believed this assertion because they could clearly see the \$90 million had effectively been pocketed by the then government; it certainly was not spent on any extra emergency services.

The removal of the general remission by Labor was a cynical increase in the tax imposed on South Australians, with consequent additional hardship. The money was pocketed; it was not spent on increased provision of emergency services. I very much look forward to the first tranche of ESL reductions being made available to the residents of Davenport by this government.

A further measure taken under the first 100 days commitments is the establishment of the Glenthorne national park. Glenthorne national park has particular resonance in the electorate of Davenport, given that a centrepiece of it is the Happy Valley Reservoir. I can advise the house that there is enormous support within the Davenport community for the whole concept, in particular but not limited to the ability to use the reservoir precinct for light recreational activities, including bushwalking.

Of particular note is that the establishment by this government of Glenthorne national park will not just address the long-term future of Glenthorne Farm but, in particular, the surrounding CSIRO land, with a strong suspicion that, had the other side prevailed at the election, a large amount of that land would have been flogged off by a cash hungry Labor government. The implementation of the Glenthorne national park will ensure the retention for public recreation of some 1,500 hectares

and will result in a bigger park than Belair National Park. I very much look forward to the continued establishment of Glenthorne national park as yet another first 100 days priority, with the consequent increase in amenity that will attach itself to the residents of Davenport.

The first 100 days series of commitments will also engender energy strategies that will increase the affordability and reliability of energy whilst also reducing the hubris that was so often a feature of Labor's own energy policy. By far and away one of my favourite measures is the appointment of a special investigator to examine the acquisition of the diesel generators and related aspects of the former government's energy plan.

Delivered under Labor, the world's biggest battery will provide power for 30,000 homes for roughly one hour. Its use as a baseload solution was effectively underwritten by the little-mentioned diesel power plant, and evidence was provided that that would consume 80,000 litres of diesel an hour. I await with great interest the outcome of the details regarding the purchase by Labor of easily the least green, most expensive, most secretive solution in Australian base load history, with the possible exception of our earlier historical use of whale oil as an energy source.

Our plan will also help deliver an interconnector to New South Wales not merely in order to enable the use of power sourced from interstate but also enable the sale and export of renewable-sourced power which cannot otherwise be used or stored here in South Australia. We will begin the introduction of other home-based storage, demand management and grid integration initiatives. This is a means whereby pre-existing solar panels used by a home owner can be complemented by means-tested government support for the implementation of battery storage for the homeowner. This power can then be utilised by the home owner or be supplied to the grid. It enhances the pre-existing assets of the homeowner and increases the capacity of the broader grid.

The final first 100 days commitment I will cover that this Supply Bill will enable is one that the residents of Davenport strongly support, namely, the capping of council rates. Most Davenport residents—not all, but most—are in the Onkaparinga council area, with Onkaparinga having well-publicised issues with expenditure control and governance. Consequently, many residents see rate capping as a means to effect some increased accountability.

It was bitterly ironic to see the Local Government Association attack the Liberal Party during the last election campaign via its use of ratepayers' money to fund a campaign to oppose a measure to reduce the prolific spending of ratepayers' money. My constituents, including local government employees, all fully supported the efficacy of a rates cap set at LGPI, above which it is necessary for the council in question to seek approval for a bigger rate increase from the independent body charged with that responsibility.

I note, too, that some senior council staff privately expressed their support to me for what amounts to be a rudimentary 'NAPLAN for councils' as part of these measures. That is, they were keen not just to have the accountability afforded by the rate capping measure but also the ability to detail how their spending is devoted to the best value categories on behalf of residents, councils being accountable and subsequently competing with each other to be seen to be providing the best value for their ratepayers. This could only occur as a result of the implementation of the Marshall Liberal government measures, particularly those implemented in these first 100 days.

I very much look forward to taking every opportunity I can to help implement this measure so that not only are rates capped to equitable increases but also that the consequent reporting will enable ratepayers to rate and compare their council against others based on what they actually spend their money on. The 2018-19 budget will be the first step on the long road back for South Australia's financial state of affairs with the restoration of the accountability and numeracy promised by this government. With that, I endorse the passage of this Supply Bill.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (17:39): I am very glad to speak to this Supply Bill, which is of course seeking to appropriate approximately \$6.631 billion from the Consolidated Account for payments of very important services for the people of South Australia by Her Majesty's government.

The focus of the 2018-19 state budget, which of course is going to be handed down in September, will be the implementation of this new Marshall government's commitments as well as developing into the longer run a sustainable budget position. We have just—obviously last week—

had the federal budget, and I must commend Treasurer Morrison and the federal Liberal government for their return to surplus, predicted in the coming years, and to that sustainable budget position by then.

It is Liberal governments that deliver sensible budgets, and it is Liberal governments that always fix up Labor's mess. It was the Brown-Olsen-Kerin governments that fixed up South Australia's mess after the State Bank, it was of course the Howard-Costello duo that got Australia's finances back on track after the Hawke-Keating fiasco, and it is going to be this Marshall Liberal government that over time does its bit to repair this state's fortunes. Over the last 16 years of Labor, we have seen nothing but debt and deficit, debt and deficit.

The member for Torrens is shaking her head. When the government did show a budget surplus, it was on the back of privatisation. The most recent one was on the back of the lands titles privatisation and the motor accident division privatisation. Reading today's press, I note a little catch for the people of South Australia, courtesy of a parting gift of the former Labor government: another \$100 million blow to the state budget. There are a number of election commitments that are aligned with the government's first 100 days, and the passing of this Supply Bill is essential for the timely delivery of these commitments while the 2018-19 budget is being finalised.

Some of the election commitments that the Marshall Liberal government will be prioritising include, of course, creating a more competitive place to do business in South Australia through a range of initiatives such as scrapping payroll tax for small businesses, deregulating shop trading hours to allow businesses to remain open and cutting land tax. There is the slashing of ESL bills, as the member for Davenport so rightly alluded to in his speech.

Cost of living is a huge issue for South Australians; it really is. Whether it is in the member for Davenport's electorate or in mine, or in the member for Heysen's or in the member for Hammond's or in the member for Unley's electorate, we know that when we are talking to our constituents, the number one grizzle is how expensive it is to live in South Australia. The biggest imposts that have increased year on year are state government rates, fees and charges. It is our desire and it will be our aim to do our bit to ensure that South Australians can have an enjoyable standard of living in this state, because that is the right thing to do.

Policies that we are implementing include increased public transport, and that has already happened. I commend the transport minister for improving train times on the Belair line through my community and the bus services as well. Another policy, over the term of this Marshall government, is to develop our vision for the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site, including an innovation incubator; start-up and growth hub; an international centre for tourism, hospitality and food services; and a national gallery.

Investing in defence is so important. We will be creating new apprenticeships and traineeships. It is fantastic that the member for Unley is the new minister in relation to apprenticeships and traineeships because this is how he started his working life. It is really commendable on this side of the house that we have ministers in portfolios where they have a bit of an idea of what is going on because they have been there themselves and done the hard yards.

Capping council rates, participating in affordable and reliable energy strategies, reopening the Repat as a genuine health precinct—which is so important to my community—and a comprehensive program to improve literacy and numeracy outcomes for all students are just some of the election agenda items that will be pursued in the 2018-19 state budget. As I said, I am very happy to be supporting this bill. The budget is just one way in which we will meet our election commitments. I look forward to the coming months, especially in September to see the vision of our Treasurer (the Hon. Rob Lucas in the other place) for the people of South Australia.

Before I go on, I just want touch on a few comments made by the member for Lee. I believe the member for Lee started his contribution at about 10 to 10 last night. I would be really keen to see the viewing audience on the live stream at midnight. Clerk, that would be something to talk about with the new Speaker. If we can somehow track that in the future, we can see how many people were listening because I doubt there were very many at all. If they were insomniacs, I think they would have been cured of insomnia. For two hours last night and for almost another hour today, the member for Lee reminded us so eloquently why Labor is no longer in government. It was two hours

of platitudes, motherhood statements and, quite frankly, delusion. One of the first statements the member for Lee made yesterday is, and I quote:

The Premier was very quick to tell us in that answer that the Liberal Party had made some 300 commitments in the lead-up to the last state election and each and every one of them would be delivered.

He then went on to criticise us, saying we would not be meeting those commitments. In our 100-day plan we have quite a lot of commitments that we are rolling out and meeting—and we will meet those commitments. Not all the 300 commitments that we took to the election will be delivered in the first 100 days, and nor should they be. Quite a lot of our commitments require genuine community consultation, something which those opposite never did during their time and government.

I always think it is quite ironic when those opposite lecture us about election commitments. There are two really big election commitments. I had the pledge card from former premier Rann, co-signed by then ALP state secretary, the Hon. Ian Hunter from the other place, upon which they made two big election commitments, especially in the lead-up to the 2010 election. One was to never, ever sell the Repat. Lo and behold, Labor tried its absolute very best to sell the Repat.

The other big Labor lie was the commitment to create 100,000 new jobs in six years, from 2010. The member for Davenport would be keen to note that, as it stands now, eight years down the track, the Labor Party probably created about 80,000 jobs in South Australia. To give credit where credit is due, quite a lot of that jobs growth has come in the last 12 to 18 months, which is fantastic for the state. They are two glaring Labor lies and election promises that were never met. The other big Labor lie, which I always love, is that Labor left the government in surplus. Once again, the member for Lee in this contribution last night said, and I quote:

I am pleased to say that the groundwork has been laid out in what the former Labor government have left this new government. They inherit a budget in surplus.

Of course, it would seem to be in his political interest to confect a budget deficit outcome for the 2017-18 financial year, to be painted as the last financial year of the former Labor administration before swiftly moving into a budget surplus position for the financial year 2018-19 onwards.

The reality is that if you look at last year's state budget, and the year before and the year before that, and then go through the forward estimates and then back to look at contributions from the privatisation of state government assets, the state budget had an underlying deficit in each and every year. The paper surplus, which was printed in the budget documents, was there on the back of Labor's privatisation agenda. It was not there through a revenue and expense position. The reality is that every household and business in Australia knows that it is a phantom surplus to have one on the back of asset sales. The Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas from the other place, recently told ABC radio:

It will be impossible for the 2017-18 budget to be in surplus given the problems that we are uncovering, and in particular the health issues, the hospital issues and those sort of budget pressures.

Once again, the Treasurer was quoted on the ABC, saying:

Further blowouts in health, along with Labor's pre-election spending spree and softer than anticipated revenues are certainly going to more than wipe out a \$12 million projected surplus.

Once again, the Treasurer was on the record, saying:

The general problems in health remained unresolved as we arrived in March, and you add to that the continuing challenge of child protection and an additional challenge in relation to TAFE, because of a catastrophe that befell TAFE in the last 12 to 18 months, plus significant revenue improvements which were advertised are highly unlikely to be met this year.

The member for Lee would have us believe that the Treasurer was telling porky pies when he made those statements to the press in previous weeks, but this is what we inherited. We inherited a multitude of Labor sins that are going to take time to rectify. It is only prudent that we are up-front with the people of South Australia because that is what they expect from good government. They expect to be told when the news is not good and they expect to not have the wool pulled over their eyes.

There are quite a lot of issues. Once again, the member for Lee in his contribution last night, and again today, talked about Labor's fantastic record in the Investment Attraction agency. The reality

is that corporate South Australia has been used to a former government that has been hellbent on picking winners in the way that it produces corporate welfare. We all know this is not best practice. What we need to do, and as we have said as a government that we will continue to do, is to improve business conditions in South Australia and, of course, create a level playing field.

Since the March state election, Deloitte Access Economics has released its first quarter business outlook for the nation and has found that South Australia may soon take over the other states and may soon be given the title of 'fastest growth in the nation'. This is actually a very good thing. It is good to see South Australia trending in the right direction. Of course, we are coming off a very, very low base, and that is why our state policy suites that we brought to the people in the last state election around cuts to business transaction costs—whether it be stamp duties, payroll tax or land tax—coupled with the very sensible tax reform agenda that Treasurer Morrison handed down and his desire to see more low to middle income Australians (and in particular South Australians) benefit from cuts in personal income tax, I think are going to create the right setting for a better South Australia.

I am optimistic that the future for South Australia is always going to be better when we are blue—when the Liberal Party is on the Treasury benches, both in Canberra and in South Australia, because we understand the importance of supporting small business and the importance of supporting families. In the lead-up to the last election, we said we would not match Labor's huge spending promises. In the lead-up to the last election, the ALP went to the people of South Australia with a \$2 billion spending commitment. Quite a lot of them were very worthy commitments. Spending \$1.3 billion on level crossings was a very worthy commitment. Investing \$150 million into the Housing Trust and the ports authority was very important.

I am not sure if I agreed with their \$279 million plan to extend the tram to Norwood and North Adelaide. Whilst some elements of the package for the Port Adelaide Football Club was welcome in what it was focused on, I do not think we should be favouring one football club over another in this state, especially when we have a footy club that is the team for all South Australians. However, there were one or two election promises around capital infrastructure that were worthy, but quite a lot of Labor's election promises were nothing more than uncosted figures on the fly to try to save a 16-year-old government.

On our side of the fence, I believe that we took some very sensible components of spending policies and modest costings to the election, including striving to achieve operating surpluses over the forward estimates; an efficiency dividend similar to Labor's and in line with the former government's efficiency dividends; a \$75 million cut over three years in consultants and contractors for government; a \$15 million cut over three years in government advertising and communications; and abolition of certain boards that really have not driven investment in South Australia.

In terms of some local election commitments and policies that I briefly want to touch on—and I do most of the time—I know that the infrastructure minister will be happy when we finalise the Blackwood roundabout because then I will not be talking about that commitment every single week, as I have over the last three years in the house. The member for Unley is certainly sick of it. We are investing in local roads, which is actually really important. It is not just local roads in my community, which we have understood, but also local roads in the member for Heysen's electorate, Flagstaff Road in the member for Davenport's electorate, roads in the member for Narungga's electorate and also in country South Australia, where they know the importance of road investment as well.

Over previous years, we have spoken a lot—and the Minister for Primary Industries talked about it today as well—about investment in the regions, which is so important, and about the economic benefits that South Australia needs to really push in terms of exports and our export agenda because it is an export agenda that actually creates wealth. So often, on this side of the house, we have been looking over the Tasman at an example of a Liberal government—the Key National Party coalition government in New Zealand—that, in its term of government, was really focused on exports. New Zealand is a nation that does not manufacture a single motor vehicle and never has. It is a nation that imports fossil fuels for its industry, but it is a nation that has supported and looked after its agricultural sectors to drive economic growth.

At the beginning of my address, I touched on the Repat, and in my electorate it is one of the biggest single issues that people talk to me about, as it is in the member for Elder's electorate and

in the member for Davenport's electorate. I am very proud that the Liberal government is continuing with its reform, renewing and revitalisation of the Repat as a health precinct. I find it quite incredible, and in a way a little bit disappointing, that not more has been made of this.

The Labor Party, after saying that they would never sell the Repat, were prepared to flog it for only \$20 million. At least if they were going to go the whole hog and privatise it, you would have thought they would put in the DPA themselves and got a developer. They could have got Lang Walker or someone down at Gillman to look at the whole redevelopment, but to flog that parcel of land for a \$20 million consideration is absolutely offensive. It just goes to show that the former government, if they were not reckless, were certainly stupid in their decisions. I am very proud that this government, the Premier and the minister in the other place are working to ensure that the Repat is opened as a health precinct, which is so important.

Rate capping was another really big issue that we took to the election. The former minister for local government, the member for Unley, really kickstarted the conversation five or six years ago about the need for us to reform rate capping as part of a cost-of-living suite of policies that we took to the election. Of course, the LGA decided to spend \$177,000 of your money and the taxpayers' money fighting us and that policy, and to date there is still no retraction from the LGA. We on this side recognise that cost of living is a really big issue.

Another sleeper issue which we have inherited from the previous government, but which is something we need to be mindful about as well on this side of the house, is youth unemployment. The scourge of unemployment is the biggest scourge that faces society and individuals. More than a third of the total of unemployed people in Australia are aged between 15 and 24 years of age, so it is really important that we deal with this issue of youth unemployment. It does not matter if it is in the north, west or south of Adelaide, unemployment is a really big issue.

In the time that I have left, I will say that jobs and apprenticeships are a really big and important part of our commitment, our pledge to invest almost \$100 million in matched funding with the federal government. I would also like to briefly touch on our plan to scrap payroll tax. Payroll tax is one of the most insidious taxes there is. It is pleasing to see that the opposition have agreed to meet us some of the way in our payroll tax reform, and we will certainly be seeking to push that.

Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:29.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (19:29): I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak to the Supply Bill. I wish to because I want to get clearly on the record the expectations I have of this government in how it spends funds through this bill. I turn first to the portfolio of education. As I have said before in this chamber, there are many important issues government grapples with, but none surpasses the importance of a quality education for our children. They as individuals, and we collectively, rely on their preparedness for the future they will inherit. What is most important in education is quite simply that each child receives the education they personally need to fulfil their potential and to equip them for the future labour market and life more broadly.

In Australia, we have a challenge because we do not live in a particularly economic or educationally homogenous society. While our cultural diversity is one of our very great strengths, the disparity between people's incomes, earning capacity, access to resources and educational attainment is more widely dispersed than is healthy for social cohesion, and our education system is internationally known for being more unequal in outcome than the OECD average.

This means that young people from lower socio-economic families will be disproportionately represented in the lower end of education results and, conversely that students from higher income families are disproportionately represented at the higher end. This should be of no surprise to us, given that the last 10 years of NAPLAN results have ordered schools by SES status broadly, and similarly states and territories.

It is no accident that the ACT is the leader in NAPLAN results and that the NT has the lowest results. This is not because the teachers in the NT are not as competent as those in the ACT. This is not because the curriculum is different. Indeed, for the last several years the foundation to year 10

curriculum has been a single Australian curriculum. It is because students from lower SES backgrounds do not do as well in our schools as those from more advantaged backgrounds.

We must take this seriously. I worry that many just assume that this is somehow immutable, that it is a natural state of affairs in which a child who is born in a lower income house will do worse on average than one born to wealth. But there is nothing innately superior in the child born to well-off parents, nothing that should reasonably dictate that the child will lead a life of lower achievement, yet the weight of evidence is that they will.

This is not the story we tell ourselves of our country: the story of the fair go, the country of opportunity and the classless society. It is what most threatens that most Australian value of reward being earned, not inherited. We must respond to this state of affairs. We have to do it in the education system, which is the last and best chance to deal with inherited inequality, and we have to do it with the parents and not to the parents.

This was the basis of the funding mechanism that was called Gonski, and it was quite simply that need required response. If one school (and I am quoting last year's figures) had each year \$28,000 to spend on each student, and another had \$16,000 (and I have chosen a school in my electorate, contrasted with one of the elite private schools in Adelaide), then this was bound to lead to a differential in the results for those students, above all for the students of greater disadvantage who would not have the specialised support and teaching required to assist them to achieve what they ought to be fully entitled to: a quality education responsive to their needs and their talents.

The great insight from the Gonski funding proposal is that we should recognise what all students require and make sure they have it. But the federal government and the now state government, then opposition, agreed between them that this was too expensive, that we could not afford to properly and speedily fund our students, that the money was not there, as I recall being shouted at me across the chamber when I urged the then opposition in this place to join us in fighting for our schools and for our students.

I think they were referring to the fact that the original commitment ran past the then forward estimates—something they should keep in mind with these illusory promises from the recent federal budget to fund our infrastructure sometime in the future, just a bit past the forward estimates. I have learnt what they think of money that is more than four years out.

When I fought to the last, not signing up to an anodyne, mediocre statement of principles to replace our six-year detailed bilateral agreement to fund schools properly, again the then opposition were slightly hysterical about the threat my opposition posed to the schools, a threat entirely caused by the federal government seriously stating that they would not fund a single dollar to a single South Australian school if I did not bend the knee. Yet the government in waiting in Canberra, the Labor opposition, stand firmly committed to the original deal—the deal that would make sure that we had money in our schools for our students.

But the then opposition, now government here in South Australia, could not and would not see past blind party loyalty to agree that maybe they have more to offer students than the penny-pinching Liberal federal government. Instead, they endorsed a federal government act that hardwires private schools receiving 80 per cent of the student resourcing standard from the commonwealth coffers and the government schools receiving 20 per cent.

It is an act that will require state governments to comply with an as yet unspecified set of requirements to even get that funding flowing. They had a chance to stand with the schools and fight, and they gave in. This augers very badly for the future of our schools in South Australia. A state government that does not know how to fight for their state, who believes the federal government pleading that the coffers are bare while it is trying to give huge tax relief to the government's biggest companies, may not have the ticker or the stamina to be responsible for our school system.

But we had a partial victory, a victory that has a number attached to it: \$125 million in two years. That is the difference between what was being threatened by the Abbott-Hockey-Pyne budget: a loss of \$335 million in the school years of 2018 and 2019, this year and next year, compared to a loss of only \$210 million under the revised Turnbull-Morrison-Birmingham budget. Imagine if we had had as allies the Liberal Party of South Australia. Perhaps we could have closed that gap still further.

What of state funding? That soared this year and next as was always planned in the six-year agreement, and so this government inherits that funding. This Supply Bill allows them to spend it. How will they spend it? What will be their priorities? Much of the new government's election commitments mirrored existing policies: literacy and numeracy, addressing attendance in legislation and resourcing, languages, parent engagement, entrepreneurialism, which is embedded in the STEM curriculum already, and apprenticeships in schools while completing the SACE.

It is all work started and, importantly, funded by the previous government, as were additional speech therapists and behaviour coaches; as was money to primary schools based on student results to allow additional intervention; as was an academy of leadership and teaching excellence to drive up the quality and usefulness of professional development; as was funding for music education, starting with a strategy being developed by the conservatorium and the ASO; as was lifting the income level for school card recipients; as was establishing a panel of experts to advise an evidence base for improvements in our education system; as was increasing the number of special options places for students with disabilities; and as was an increased focus on Aboriginal education generally and Aboriginal school offering in particular.

I ask that this government not act in a partisan way and abandon any of these policies that were funded last year to wisely spend the money going into our schools as a result of South Australia increasing our funding commitment through the six-year Gonski deal. They may not have supported the money coming in, but I urge them to support it going out to our schools.

What was also funded by the previous government on top of our commitment through that bilateral agreement, which became effectively unilateral, was our injection of infrastructure money. Much-needed upgrades of high schools were at the top of the priority list, although many growing primary schools also received money under the Building Better Schools program. Teaching practice has changed over the last 30 years, but the design of our existing high schools largely has not.

Increasing education is about the guide on the side, not the sage on the stage. Students benefit from learning in a way that suits their abilities and understanding, and engages each of them in what they are learning and why. We no longer have rows of desks with students taking dictation and learning reams of information by rote. We need students who understand what they are learning and why, who can apply it in new circumstances and who can solve previously unseen problems.

While good teaching can and does happen anywhere and in any kind of room, best learning happens where students can work in a single class, alone or in a small group, depending on the task, and can incorporate technology and creativity as required. Flexible learning areas that have technology incorporated and that allow different configurations of seating and working are now the most desirable for our schools. New high schools built by the previous government and the substantial upgrades of five large metropolitan high schools reflect these new teaching approaches, and many high schools benefitted from the new STEM facility funding, but we wanted to go further.

Building Better Schools offered 91 schools the opportunity to upgrade and renew, to plan for growth and to modernise. While the minister recently seemed surprised that the whole project had not been delivered before the election, in fact, from the announcement in October, the department worked very hard with schools on their allocations to determine what need was best met by the finances available. The government and department also sat down with the construction industry—engineers, architects and builders—to talk about how to achieve the projects both speedily and in a manner that would maximise local jobs.

The initial result is now on the website of the department and I check it constantly to see if it has yet changed. It shows schools building performing arts centres, science and technology facilities, trade training facilities, upgrading sports facilities, clearing away old demountables, improving access and learning spaces for students with disabilities, and generally making their schools modern and fit for today's needs.

I am deeply concerned at the news I keep hearing from the school communities about the anxieties they have, that they have been told not to keep planning on the upgrades they want but to wait for instructions from this government about what they will get. There are deep suspicions that high schools will be required to use the funding to build year 7 classrooms instead of new science, sporting, trade training or performing arts facilities. I will be watching this carefully.

The government is now entrusted with the fate of our young people. It has been given the gift of an excellent and strong education system that is in the process of becoming even better and even stronger. It has been bequeathed if not sufficient funding for need—thanks to the commonwealth's priority of multinational tax cuts over our children—substantially more than the previous government inherited from the last state Liberal government. It has a department that is prepared for major modernisation, that knows that quality is at the centre of what we expect from our schools and that this means a quality of outcome for all students, not only those advantaged by background.

The department has a program of expenditure that is shaped to respond to the major priorities of investing in the early years, with a focus on literacy and numeracy first, educating for the jobs of the future, every child achieving their best and teaching of the highest quality. I urge the government to stay the course and allow our schools to do the job they want to do to prepare our children for their future, for all our sakes.

On the subject of a healthy future, I now turn to the portfolio of environment and water. In the election, the now minister (then opposition spokesperson) issued a flurry of policy, and I will be watching with great interest his progress in implementing it. Thus far, all I have seen is the dispatching of one of our few female chief executives, a woman with an excellent reputation in South Australia and outside, who is no longer of service to the environment of this state. I will be interested to see who the minister and the Premier consider better placed to lead the environment department.

Promises have been made that we will only be able to test once we see the budget, such as 20 new park rangers. We will see if this will be a newly funded commitment or if other vital areas of work will be cut to accommodate it. Promises have been made that are deeply troubling, such as proposals to open up our reservoirs of drinking water for recreation activities, repealing the Natural Resources Management Act and revising sanctuary zones in marine parks.

These proposals are deeply significant because they reveal a casual approach to environmental protection and a fundamental lack of understanding the challenges facing our natural resources and our natural environment. They are an amateurish attempt to satisfy everyone, while in fact they will please no-one, and will risk real and actual harm to the base of most of our economic activity: clean water, healthy fisheries, sustainable natural resources and an overall preparedness for climate change.

I note the government has allocated some \$12 million over the next two years to assist with the loss of the Chinese market for recycling materials. This is not sufficient to cover the costs local government has estimated that sector will be facing immediately. The threat and opportunity represented by the loss of China as a destination requires serious consideration and response.

We must not let local government down with a black hole to fill financially. We must not allow products that can be recycled to be added to the waste stream. We must facilitate an industry solution and, given all of Australia has the same issue, we should get the early-mover advantage and be ready to process other states' materials here. Waste to resources will be increasingly essential as we transition more deeply into a carbon-constrained global economy, and penny pinching now will cost us in the long run, and our councils and their ratepayers right now.

This Supply Bill is the first stage of the important process of deciding how money will be spent by this government. We on this side of the house will be watching carefully to see what choices the government makes.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (19:46): I rise to make some brief remarks this evening in support of the bill. I say 'brief' because, unlike the member for Lee, it is immediately apparent to me and members on this side why we need to get on with it. I note that I admire the member for Lee's stamina, although apparently driven by just that, and I presume the fact that he is not here indicates that he has gone to take some well-earned rest. However, it is worth making and emphasising the point that, after 16 years of incompetent government in this state, it is high time that we got on with it, and that is very much what this Supply Bill is all about.

As the member for Lee indicated, it is an unexceptional and unusual appropriation of \$6.631 billion before a budget anticipated in September, and I note that the member for Lee indicated that the opposition will support the bill. So one might ask: why are we not done and dusted? Well, I

will briefly take this opportunity to emphasise what we have in mind. It is all about delivery, and that is very good news.

The change of government that occurred on 17 March came with the clearest of electoral mandates, and I made some remarks in my Address in Reply yesterday about the fact that this is a true electoral mandate. It is the first that we have seen in quite some time in this state. Not only can we say as a new government that we have a clear electoral mandate but the government also went very clearly to the people in the course of this campaign with a very detailed and extensive program of more than 300 policies that we committed to deliver on should we be successful in winning government.

More than that, the government and the Premier went to the people well ahead of polling day and said, 'Not only do we have a whole lot of commitments to offer that we've thought through and set out and you can make your choice against but we will publish a 100-day delivery program.' So, in the context of this Supply Bill, we are very much focused on that 100-day plan that we published well ahead of the election.

As to the first 100 days, I refer to the Premier's statement published on 18 February, a month out from the election. The Premier indicated in very clear terms that the government would be hitting the ground running and doing so with a suite of policy and legislative initiatives over the first 100 days with the objective of kickstarting South Australia's renewal. And here we are. The Premier indicated the promise to deliver more jobs, to lower costs and to deliver better services. That is what is going to frame the agenda of the new government.

We have heard it over and over, but the conduct and disposition of the new government have been very much about steadily and surely delivering on what we have now set out in great detail: on the job, from day one, delivering on half a billion dollars in tax cuts to South Australian households and businesses to grow jobs and ease cost-of-living pressures. Number one on that list, from my point of view as the member for Heysen, is the restoration of the general remission on the ESL. That will deliver \$90 million a year over the forward estimates—a \$360 million reduction in the cost to households and businesses throughout this state.

It is a policy that we announced in an orderly way well ahead of the election, and it is a policy that we are now going to deliver on—similarly, our innovative and rational policy in relation to energy of \$100 million on a home battery subsidy scheme. That is going to be critical to restarting and reigniting our moribund economy, as well as delivering reliability on the renewables side. We have been clear and up-front well ahead of the election not only on the policy side but also on the timing of delivery. So when the member for Lee said, late into the evening last night and again before dinner this evening, 'What's the rush?', from our point of view it could not be more apparent.

We want to get on with it, we have a mandate for getting on with it, and that is what the Supply Bill is all about. I am glad to hear that it will be supported by the other side. I would only urge that we do so without delay. I will come back to the ESL reduction in a moment. Capping the burden of council rate rises is another key policy commitment, a key and important policy commitment that we have made. It is key to reducing the burden on households and one that, in our community campaign at the door, was an absolute priority for people throughout Heysen, and so we want to get on with delivering on that.

As a result of the range of commitments which we made and the way in which we went about it, people knew very clearly what they would be voting for. I cannot emphasise enough that, in making this change after 16 years, people now expect that the Marshall Liberal government will go about delivering on the change that has been long awaited in a steady, predictable and humble way. There is no hubris on this side. There is no sense of exaltation. There is a sense of having an obligation to deliver on our priorities and restore good government to this state. That is about slashing taxes and cutting costs, it is about creating jobs through the funding of 20,800 additional apprenticeship places and it is about restoring a rational approach to policy, and energy policy is key among them.

I reflect briefly on the history of opportunity in this state. When I was completing my studies, it was unremarkable and unsurprising that people might leave this state to find job opportunities elsewhere. At that time, it was regarded as a given that well-educated people growing up in South

Australia could take an opportunity in the job market elsewhere but that they would have no trouble coming back to South Australia if ever and whenever they were ready to do so.

What has changed, particularly over the last decade and a half, is that we see the continual exodus of our top students, our top young people, our top performers, and that they are going not just for the opportunity to broaden their horizons but they are going because they simply cannot find work in this state and so there is no guarantee that they will come back at all. That is key to the change that we need to make. With the tremendous new federal defence spending coming down the pipeline, we need to make sure that we invest in skills training for people so that we will have local people equipped to take the opportunities coming down the line. That is all part of restoring an enterprise culture to this state—too far lost and one that we need to turn around and turn around without delay.

I talked about the ESL reduction as being a substantial priority. It goes again to the difference in the way that we have approached this election campaign and this transition to government compared with similar circumstances four years ago. We went to the electors of this state saying very clearly to them, a long time out, 'If you elect us, we will slash the ESL. We will reintroduce the general remission.' They knew that, they expect that and they expect that the \$90 million a year is going to be delivered. That is the direct opposite of the way in which the electorate was treated by the previous government.

The previous government went to the last election and we did not hear anything about the ESL. We had had a system of the general remission being in place throughout the time that the ESL had been in place and, all of a sudden after the last election, without warning the previous government decided, 'No more general remission. You can all have your ESL bills doubled. Just deal with it.' Not only is it going to be a welcome change for the electors of Heysen to have a substantial reduction in their day-to-day living costs but they are going to know that that is being delivered because that is what they voted for, that is the change they have called for and that is what we are going to be delivering.

I take the opportunity also to make very clear and to amplify my remarks earlier today in support of the motion recognising International Firefighters' Day. Going door to door throughout Heysen in the course of the last year, there was some discussion about, 'You are going to slash ESL bills. That's fantastic, but we all know and rely on the tremendous work that our volunteers do through our CFS brigades throughout the Hills.' It needs to be made clear that the ESL take has been paid into general revenue and always has been paid into general revenue. The increase that has resulted from the removal of the general remission has no consequence on the facility provided to the CFS. So, by reintroducing the general remission, we make no change whatsoever to the support that is provided to our CFS brigades.

On the contrary, we have a policy that makes sure that CFS infrastructure is boosted, and we have a \$5 million commitment to making sure that CFS infrastructure is boosted. That is in addition to what is being provided in the ordinary course. So there should be no doubt about it: we are committed to the very important volunteer work that is provided by our CFS. In the remarks I made earlier today—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —the commitment of those volunteers is something that ought be recognised and supported at every turn. It was a constant for me throughout the course of the campaign that we recognise people who had put in 30, 40 and even 50 years of volunteer service. The CFS brigades rely substantially on local community fundraising in order to fund what they do and in my local area of Bridgewater we fortunately have the most successful op shop, for example, that provides my local brigade with the sorts of facilities they would not otherwise have. It is true that the CFS relies upon substantial state funding and so I completely support and will always stand up for securing funding for the CFS, and the important work that it does.

I do not want to let this opportunity go by, as I may not have the chance next week, to recognise in particular the commitment of three people who have been recognised in the course of the last year. I had the honour, along with the member for Finniss, of attending last July at the

CFS awards at Mount Compass. Rob White was recognised with a fifth clasp for his decades of volunteer service. The week prior at the Echunga awards Malcolm Hale was recognised with his third clasp for 40 years of voluntary service and Commander Christopher Martin was recognised with a fourth clasp for 50 years of service. I might add that they were among many tens of people of all ages who were being recognised for what is essentially a lifetime commitment of volunteer service to their local brigades.

That is just to emphasise, when we reflect on the importance of producing the general costs of living such as the reintroduction of the general remission of the ESL, in no way do we for a moment look to reduce the funding and support for our CFS brigades. They do excellent work and they will continue to be supported by this new government, and long may that continue. With those remarks, I commend the bill.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (20:03): I thank the government for bringing this bill to the house. Can I just point out that I think it is the greatest act of hypocrisy of any government to try to procure \$6.6 billion on one sheet of paper. There is no budget attached, no spending, no provision for health or education—\$6.6 billion in the hope that we should trust you; \$6.6 billion and you cannot tell us why you are procuring the money, borrowings that South Australians will have to pay back.

There have been people in the past who have spoken from this bench who have talked about and lamented the idea of governments procuring money after elections without a budget. Here we are, four years later, and what is the government doing? Exactly that. There is a word for that, a Greek word. It is called hypocrisy—the idea that a government can come into this house and suspend standing orders, because it is disorderly to introduce a Supply Bill while the Address in Reply is being considered, and have us agree to borrow \$6.6 billion.

Make no mistake, they are borrowing it because they do not have it in reserves, but they are not going to tell us how they are going to spend it until September. 'Trust us, we are from the Liberal Party.' That is the motto. I see members opposite shaking their heads in disagreement. I just say that I will look forward to the budget because I hope that each and every dollar of this \$6.6 billion is justified.

I heard my friend the honourable member for Heysen talking about being clear and up-front about this \$6.6 billion, clear and up-front. Well, I have read the Appropriation Bill, all three clauses of it, and clause 3, subsections (1), (2) and (3). Yes, we know that they want to borrow money, but they are not going to tell us when they are going to pay it back, they are not going to tell us what the time frame is, they are not telling us what percentage of debt it is costing us. Most importantly they are not telling us what they are going to spend it on—but they are open and they are transparent.

Ms Luethen: Yes.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That is right; the member for King says that yes, that is right. I also heard with interest that the people have clearly spoken and have given this government a mandate. Let us be honest about this. The Labor Party received 32 per cent of the vote, not a mandate to govern, and the Liberal Party received 38 per cent of the vote. Over 60 per cent of South Australians voted for someone else other than the Liberal Party, yet members are getting up in this house and saying, 'We have a mandate.' A mandate for what? What does 38 per cent get you? I will tell you what 38 per cent gets you: nothing.

In the Westminster system, I accept that the Liberal Party has won a majority of seats in the election and they are the government—it is our system of government—but do not come in here and try to tell us that you have a mandate for anything else other than sitting on that side of the house. A majority of South Australians did not vote for your policies, a majority of South Australians did not endorse what you are attempting to do in the budget. In fact, a majority of South Australians voted exactly opposite what the government is intending to do, a majority of South Australians voted against many of the measures that members are up there today saying they have a mandate for.

Then again, I like the idea of the government saying that 62 per cent of South Australians are wrong. I think that is a great message from the government, and I hope it continues. I love it when the government tells South Australians that they have got it wrong and that they do not really

understand how this works, rather than having a little bit of humility, rather than walking in here and saying, 'Look, at the last election the two-party system in this state was shaken to its core, to its foundation. The Liberal Party received not only a two-party preferred swing against it but a massive 6.5 per cent primary vote against it.' Instead, members are arrogantly walking in here and saying that they have some massive mandate to govern, like it is some landslide, like it is Dean Brown in 1993. That was a mandate, that was a landslide, but how did you treat him? We all know what happened; it is history.

I think the member for Kavel—who I have a lot of time for because I think he is going to go far in this place and seems like someone who is going to do exceptionally well—may have inadvertently told the house something that is not true. The government is not restoring the general remission. The general remission in 2014 was \$90 million. For members opposite who do not understand how the ESL works, it is a lot like a council rate. The government calculates the value of what it wants to spend on our emergency services—our police force, our MFS, our SES, our CFS—and works out what the budget is. It looks at property values and it works out a taxation rate.

To restore the general remission as was applied in 2014 the remission would have to be over \$110 million per year. What the government is doing is restoring a 2014 remission on 2018-19 prices. Householders in Kavel, in Heysen and throughout the entire Adelaide Hills rely on these volunteer services, and members opposite are unhappy about contributing to their emergency services through the tax that members opposite introduced through former premier Olsen. It is a reform that he told this house was important because of underinsurance. It is a reform that former premier Mike Baird and Gladys Berejiklian introduced in New South Wales and what some economists would call good economic reform.

When they introduced it, they said that people were underinsuring, especially in the Adelaide Hills, in the wake of bushfire disasters and that what we needed was to fully fund our volunteer services to provide these services. If I was a voter in Heysen, after seeing my party get a very low vote but seeing a massive swing against the incumbent to make it one of the most marginal Liberal seats, you would have to ask yourself: are voters in the seat of Heysen saying to themselves are they really going to introduce the general remission or are they just going to introduce a remission based on property values from four years ago, on expenditure from four years ago?

In the interests of being open and transparent, why does the government not say, 'We are introducing remissions at the same rate and level as 2014,' and introduce \$110 million-plus remission for the people of South Australia? Why perpetrate this con? Which one is it? Is it \$90 million a year you are returning or the general remission? The member for Heysen was adamant in his remarks: the Liberal Party is returning the general remission.

I know that is not true, the Treasury knows it is not true, the Treasurer knows it is not true, the Premier knows it is not true. Why are members opposite telling their constituents they are getting the general remission back when they know they are not? But I will not move a privileges motion on the member because I think he has a bright future and I think he will do exceptionally well. Given the performance of two of his ministers over the last two weeks, I think his prospects are doing exceptionally well.

I will just add that the Liberal Party campaigned quite heavily on returning people home to South Australia, people who have fled abroad. They have brought one back: Georgina Downer, it is very impressive that you have brought her back, but what a price! I have heard the government say they are not going to pick winners, but they brought Georgina Downer back—quite an omen. I find it fascinating that the best the Adelaide Hills has to offer the people of Mayo through the Liberal Party sub-branch is someone who has not lived in the Adelaide Hills for 20 years. She failed at preselection once in Victoria. I think she gained preselection in another seat but was rejected by the people. I think the slogan should be perhaps: Georgina Downer, the best Victoria has to offer.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, that might be your view, but you will bring it back to the Supply Bill, I am sure.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The wisdom of Solomon from that chair, sir. I will return to the bill. I am fascinated by this idea of bringing them home because I heard it from John Olsen when he was premier. He was going to bring them home; 'action man' was going to bring them home. But when

we asked the Premier in this house, 'What is the target for net migration into South Australia?' there was no answer. Just the power of his personality alone, just the power of the effort of telling people he was going to bring them home was enough. What policies will bring them home? Apparently the ESL general remission, slightly less what it actually is, will do it. Perhaps payroll tax reductions will do it. Perhaps it will be some other great policy like rate capping that will bring them home from Victoria and New South Wales, or perhaps it is just sloganism.

Perhaps the government does not know what it is going to do. Perhaps the reason they are procuring \$6.6 billion of taxpayers' money without telling us how they can spend it is that they have landed in government and they have no plan. They have no new ideas. They have no new bold vision. They do not actually know how they are going to bring them home. They do not know how they are going to get sniffer dogs into schools. They do not know how they are going to extend operating hours at police stations. They do not know how they are going to create jobs and grow investment. Apparently trade offices are all the difference. Apparently that is the difference.

There once was a time when the Liberal Party believed in the ingenuity and the entrepreneurship of businesses, but apparently the only way businesses will export now is through a government program. Congratulations to members opposite. What a great vision for small business in South Australia. Perhaps the way they are going to bring them home and grow the economy is to attack 30 per cent of the retail sector by saying that they have to compete with multinationals and companies that make most of their money at a headquarters interstate rather than businesses based in South Australia.

There was once a time in this state when Tom Playford created a party for small business and for people who wanted to break free of the shackles of having a boss telling them what to do, who wanted to unlock their entrepreneurship, get some capital, go out and start a business, take a risk and get a return for that risk. They had a Liberal Party to back them, the people like Roger Drake and the Romeos, people who have gone out and taken on Woolworths and Coles, as have the small newsagents who operate in tourist precincts like Jetty Road, Glenelg, and like Millicent, who want to open where they do not have to compete with the large companies that can use their profits from interstate and overseas to subsidise losses in areas simply to get market share.

There was once a time when the Liberal Party stood up for those small businesses, but today the machine rolls on. It is all about multinationals. It is all about big business. It is not about the little guy, the little woman, the people who are out there alone with no-one to help them in a business, in a deli, in a chicken shop, in a newsagent, in a small retail outlet trying to get by. Where is the Liberal Party for them? It is missing. Instead, they tell them, from one double-sided page, that they are going to borrow \$6.6 billion and not tell them how they are going to spend it.

I would wager that members opposite who are going to speak on this bill have no line of sight on what the cabinet is going to deliberate on the budget. I would wager that members opposite are going to be speaking about things they know nothing about. It is not their fault—they are government backbenchers, and it is a terrible job. I have been there; I served my time as a government backbencher and I watched, and it was terrible. There is nothing worse than the curse of a government backbencher, nothing worse. I can see my wife now via FaceTime and say goodnight to the kids; I can go away and have a phone call with my kids afterwards. I have had a bit of fun here today.

Government backbenchers will read out their prepared notes about what a great job it is to borrow \$6.6 billion on a double-sided A4 page that does not even tell us how much of that \$6.6 billion will be spent on health. How much? Silence. How much will be spent on education? How much on infrastructure? How much will be used to match commonwealth funding for infrastructure? How much will be used to make our police officers safe? They cannot tell us, and do you know why? Because they do not know.

Powerless government backbenchers, they go to their communities, they have been elected and they have been disenfranchised by the people who sit on that front bench. They have seen how they have behaved over the last two weeks. Imagine the caucus! Imagine the police minister getting up and telling Liberal backbenchers to be disciplined, telling them to make the right speeches and follow the notes, while he gets up and plays ad lib about whether there were notes, who turned up,

who did not turn up and whether he is going to direct the police commissioner or not direct the police commissioner.

Imagine sitting on that backbench, watching that unfold in front of you and thinking, 'I could do that, and not only could I do that but I would not make the rookie mistakes that the current police minister is making.' You are being forced to make speeches about things you are not being told about. What a sentence! The worst part about it is that there are four more years. In four years' time, these backbenchers, these brave few—and trust me, you will get close—all of you will get close and you will bond. You will all start little groups, talking to each other about how terrible it is, how you are being treated by the ministry, how they are not answering your letters. Maybe you will meet at night, maybe you will meet during the day, maybe someone will bring tea and scones—who knows?

An honourable member: Doughnuts.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Don't bring doughnuts! And you will talk. You will talk about these ministers you have to go out and defend. I know what is going on right now because members are getting phone calls in their electorate offices about this idiot who will not let a member of parliament take doughnuts to a fire station because he wants to thank them for International Firefighters' Day.

I know that every member in this chamber—all 46 of us bar one—knows that that was a stupid email to send. The political smarts in my little finger could have told you that that is an email that you should not send. Members opposite have to sit there and watch while this person holds a ministry, and I feel for you. I share your pain—and I am here to help. I am not from the government, but I am here to help.

I also want to remark on a few other things. The government promised us a productivity commission and Infrastructure SA. I note the Premier made a ministerial statement about the delay. In terms of openness and accountability, the government said that within the first 30 days we would have a list of the people who would sit on these two organisations. They have not been able to do that. I can surmise from that that there are two reasons why they have not released those names: one, they cannot find anyone to sit on these bodies, or two, they have not got around to it.

You have to ask yourself: if the economy is the focus of the Liberal Party, and the solution that the Liberal Party has to the economic malaise members opposite claim is occurring in South Australia (which I disagree with) is a productivity commission and Infrastructure South Australia, why is it not a priority? Why were people not scoped out before the election? Why were people not sounded out? Where are these names?

The Liberal Party will go to Business SA, they will go to the Property Council, they will go to the usual suspects and say, 'Who have you got?' but we are not seeing that and it really concerns me. I have gone from thinking that this government is taking a different approach to caution and consideration to thinking they are just not doing anything.

What I want to finish on is the surprise I had. I mean this in a polite way, and I hope the member, who is in the chamber, does not take offence to it. I feel for the member for Unley. The member for Unley was one of those opposition shadow ministers who got up every morning at 5 o'clock, listened to the radio and at 6 o'clock was there, waking ministers up and annoying them. He was getting on radio and making our lives difficult, talking to journalists.

If there was a train station or an issue at any piece of public infrastructure, if there was a delay, he was there. Whether it was cold, whether it was hot, whether it was annoying or an inconvenience, he was there. As much as I hate to say it, I respected him for it. In terms of warriors for the Liberal Party, there are few who worked as hard or as diligently or were as committed to our destruction as the member for Unley.

An honourable member: Hear, hear!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, hear, hear! The question then comes, why was he taken away from his portfolio?

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: I've got the dream job now, Tom—the dream job.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: The thing that you didn't think was important: jobs and trade.

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: That's why you kept having junior members in that role.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley will not interject, although he is being provoked. The member for West Torrens.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: See, I was trying to be charitable and what do you get? You get abuse from the warrior. Why demote him? What really happened? Why was he not given his portfolios?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The opposition will find out.

The SPEAKER: The member's time has elapsed. The member for Narungga.

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (20:23): I stand in support of the Supply Bill. Not only that, I stand in support of implementing the mandate that was endorsed by the people of South Australia at the March election when they voted a majority of Liberals into the different seats. I stand in support of the Supply Bill, for the release of in excess of \$6.5 billion worth of funds this evening, as without its passage public services cannot continue to be provided and our hardworking public servants cannot be paid. Thus, I am pleased to play my part in ensuring that such vital services can continue between now and the September budget, and the passage of the appropriation bill can proceed.

I proudly stand in support of the Supply Bill as the vital mechanism it is, because its passage will ensure that the new Liberal government can begin to fund its pre-election commitments designed to deliver change and improve the lives of South Australians and the prosperity of our state. Despite the member for Lee's best efforts, we are keen to get this bill through so we can get on with the job, and I myself am exceedingly keen to get on with the task ahead and understand that whilst it is easy to spend money, it is harder to effectively manage the finite resource that it is—the bottomless pit it is not—to ensure the budget is balanced and available funds are allocated to best meet need.

In the few weeks that I have been in office—the very few—it has become very clear that there are many needs and many conflicts for decision-makers to consider in sorting priorities, but we in the Marshall Liberal government have a vision and a plan, and there is an urgent need to get on with it, methodically and responsibly spending the money we have to address identified issues. I am mindful of the trust the people of South Australia have placed in us here in this place to spend the allotted revenue we have as money that belongs not to this parliament nor its members but to the South Australian people, provided by the South Australian taxpayers out of their hard earned.

The passage of the Supply Bill will ensure we can make good on pledges made so we can get on with creating a more competitive place to do business by cutting red tape; lowering the cost of living and doing business; slashing the ESL and cutting council rates; creating 20,000 new apprenticeships; putting back services removed by the damaging Transforming Health agenda, such as reopening the Repat; as well as getting on with our reinvigorating regional tourism plan and opening up development opportunities in Stenhouse Bay, inside Innes National Park.

Tourism to Innes National Park is up 50 per cent on last year's numbers, but we believe more can be done to encourage a more diverse range of tourists to visit. Not everyone is willing to camp in a tent or swag out in the wilderness in the beautiful national park; some want alternate forms of accommodation. That is what this opportunity will provide. It will open up alternate forms of accommodation to the people who would not ordinarily be willing to stay in the area. Having more people staying more nights can only be a good thing for tourism on the peninsula and for all the local businesses in the region.

I am excited about instituting the change that will benefit business across the state, including those businesses in Yorketown that will reap the reward from the increased tourism we will bring to the region. We have one of the most uncompetitive payroll tax regimes in the country, and it continues to hinder business and business growth. It does not encourage a growing business to hire

employees, nor does it make that bottom line any easier for those businesses that have grown and now currently exist beyond the threshold.

Similarly, I look to ease the burden on small to medium-sized businesses by making the land tax regime more palatable for people who own more than one property. The current tax regime, unsurprisingly, is also one of the most uncompetitive in the nation and is contributing to the stifling of business and investment. Too many are looking to invest elsewhere in places with far more sensible tax programs than we have here in South Australia. We need to arrest that and encourage more business to invest here. If we can get this right, in addition to lowering the utility costs, which have skyrocketed over the past 16 years, all business will want to invest in South Australia, not just a few lucky winners that the previous government had picked.

I support this Supply Bill so we can start work on the Port Wakefield Road overpass to ease the notorious heavy congestion that plagues the intersection of the Copper Coast Highway and the Augusta Highway, one of regional South Australia's busiest road intersections. The issue of traffic congestion rears its ugly head each and every long weekend, as the masses attempt to escape gridlocked metropolitan Adelaide for the beautiful country areas South Australia has to offer.

This can be far north South Australia, the Far West Coast or my favourite place, the beautiful Yorke Peninsula. We on this side of the room encourage everyone who may be considering getting away for a long weekend to consider our own backyard first and to visit regional South Australia. But all those destinations place stress on the Port Wakefield intersection and contribute to the delays that have been frustrating motorists for years. Those opposite have had 16 years to remedy the situation and have not shown the slightest inclination, so we will. It is essential that we ease that traffic congestion so that those who do visit the regions both enjoy their journey and get there in reasonable time. I look forward to delivering the overpass at crash corner as part of the solution to the traffic congestion.

As part of that solution, this Liberal government will provide funding for increasing investment in regional roads so that people who are travelling out can enjoy their journey and so that locals who are travelling to different parts of the electorate in Narungga can do so safely. In terms of those all-important pictures on social media, I can see one beautiful shot right now, looking down over Cape Spencer in Innes National Park, one of a nice road that looks beautiful on social media and attracts more people to visit our wonderful area.

There is another important function in building the overpass at crash corner and improving the quality of our roads. They need to be drastically safer roads. A number of lives have been lost at the crash corner intersection, and it is bleedinly apparent to all who traverse that intersection that the solution currently imposed on the people is just not the right solution at all. People have been calling for an overpass, and we in the Liberal Party will provide one.

We are sincerely lucky that the number of lives lost on regional roads is as low as it is currently. Certainly, every life lost on our roads is great tragedy. It is a testament to the drivers who reside in regional South Australia and the skills that they have accrued that more have not occurred. The roads are too undulating, not wide enough and filled with potholes. Indeed, the opposition acknowledged this when they decided to lower the speed limit across the state in order to justify having their dangerous roads. More needs to be done to bring these roads up to standard, so we can return the speed limits to where they were previously.

Yorke Peninsula and the wider regions are also some of our state's most productive areas for agriculture, and farmers deserve efficient infrastructure to support the important contribution they make to our economy. We need to get on with supporting the Mobile Black Spot Program to ensure that regional SA gets the mobile towers it desperately needs, not just for convenience but for the vital need in times of an emergency. Again, this is an issue of safety, an issue of not being able to reach vital emergency services, next of kin or first point of contact when the situation calls for it.

After having been in office for only a matter of weeks, I can safely say that one of the most common questions posed to the Narungga electorate office is about phone reception. Infrastructure and technology are certainly lacking in regional South Australia, and I can confirm to the people in this place that they are sorely missed. Only yesterday, I was talking to a constituent whose daughter had called from Darwin whilst he was within 10 kilometres of the town of Port Broughton. Their phone

call dropped out within a minute of picking up. It is just not good enough to be living that close to a regional centre and not get phone reception.

We can get on with reforming natural resources management and changing it to landscape SA and making it far more democratic and efficient, investing in rural roads, like I said, and starting the work of reviewing reduced speed limits on them. Vitally, support of this bill will: allow improvements to be made in our health services; reduce outpatient waiting lists; make inroads into addressing the \$150 million maintenance backlog at neglected country hospitals around the state; and, closest to home, upgrade surgical facilities at Yorketown Hospital and support the accident and emergency services at Ardrossan Hospital.

Access to health care was a forgotten consideration of the previous government. It gives me great pleasure to note the importance that the Marshall Liberal government has placed on providing health care to everyone. Ardrossan is a great regional hospital, a community-owned hospital, that services a fluctuating and ageing population. The palliative care division of the hospital is a wonderful testament to health professionals and the care they show their patients. It is a wonderfully run local hospital, but it does run an A&E department and, as with all their patients in palliative care, they do not turn away patients but provide a high standard of care to everyone, even if they do not have private health cover.

The Ardrossan community used to receive a government contribution so that they could run their A&E without incurring a loss. That government contribution was removed during the 16-year term of the previous government. I was pleased to see that that funding contribution will be reinstated by this government because, while the Ardrossan Community Hospital has continued to operate on the generosity of local donors, it is incumbent on government to provide health care. Similarly, it was terrific to see a commitment to the famous Yorketown Hospital—or the infamous Yorketown Hospital, as it has come to be known, I suspect, over its many funding issues. During the election campaign, I looked forward to delivering that commitment in good time.

Health care is a vital service for any community, but particularly so for communities so far out of reach that the next closest facility is unattainable. Yorketown and anywhere south of that, which includes quite a few townships, rely on the hospital to care for them as their closest hospital. Ensuring that it has the proper facilities and equipment that it requires to treat people should be a primary concern to any government. The concerns of the people of Yorketown extend to ensuring that they have a doctor in their area and that they do not rely on a locum service for their health care. People want to have a family doctor who can relate to them, who is familiar with them and who actually cares for them.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I stand to support the 2018 Supply Bill and the Liberal Party agenda that needs to be implemented following the mandate of the people at the election, and I encourage all members in this house to do so.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (20:36): I rise today as a member of the house to make some remarks on the Supply Bill currently before us in this place, totalling some \$6.6 billion. In particular, I would like to reflect on some of the great achievements made in recent times by our previous Labor government in the human services portfolio and, of course, in my own electorate of Hurtle Vale. In addition, I will reflect on some of the essential services we on this side of the house expect the government to deliver—supports that many of our state's most vulnerable people rely on every day.

There should be no question, no doubt in anyone's mind, that we still stand with the people in our community who need our support the most. There should be no question, no doubt in anyone's mind that, in this 54th parliament, it is the opposition that will stand up for the community sector and organisations that deliver essential services to those in the community most vulnerable and most in need.

I come to this place to advocate for the many essential components of the human services portfolio, which I am lucky enough to hold now as a shadow minister, in good faith and with a strong sense of bipartisanship. In doing so, the community can be confident that I and other members of the opposition will hold the government to account to ensure they deliver the services that our community need to ensure no-one falls through the cracks, that no-one is left behind.

It is a privilege to be given the honour of representing the opposition as shadow minister for human services. Labor has a strong track record in this area, a record we are very proud of.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: You're joking!

Ms COOK: Settle, member for Unley—I have only just started. When in government, Labor delivered significantly improved services for South Australians living with disabilities. As members would be aware, under the Labor government South Australia was the first state to sign up to the National Disability Insurance Scheme, the biggest social reform since the introduction of Medicare. This is something our state and all in this place can be immensely proud of. Through signing up to the NDIS, we were able to double the funding of the disability sector in this state, with total funding to the sector rising to around \$1.5 billion per year.

Under the Labor government, we were able to commit some \$723 million to the disability sector, and this is a financial commitment that we on this side of the house expect the government to maintain, at the very least, to ensure essential disability services are delivered to those most in need across our state. It is expected that through the previous government's commitment to the NDIS, we have almost doubled the number of South Australians living with a disability that will receive support, increasing the number to about 32,000 receiving support once the NDIS is fully rolled out.

That said, we recognise that a lot is changing in the NDIS area, and there will certainly be challenges. It was only a week ago that South Australians with a disability learned that there was to be a delay in the NDIS rollout in this state. It is when we learn about delays like this that make it so important that the government commits to advocating for the sector in the strongest possible way. I know those opposite maybe have a bit of a record when it comes to picking up the phone and lobbying their federal colleagues—and not a good record at that. However, the NDIS is too important for some of those most in need in our community for those opposite to be afraid to do so.

The Minister for Human Services must work with the federal government and the NDIA to ensure that this time line does not blow out further leaving those requiring essential disability services to wait for an even longer period for support, which would be a shame. The NDIS will mean better care, choice, control and participation in everyday life for people living with a disability. It is focused on ensuring that every community member can participate in every aspect of community life and in our economy. The current government must ensure the resources are available to deliver this significant social reform on time for the benefit of South Australians living with a disability.

The NDIS will also deliver more jobs for South Australia. We know that one in five new jobs created in this country is created in the disability sector and that two in five new jobs are created broadly in health care and wellbeing, and that is nationally, not just South Australia. Around 6,000 new full-time equivalent jobs are expected here in SA through the rollout of the NDIS, which will mean the disability sector will double in size to about 12,000 full-time equivalent positions across our state.

The types of jobs being created are diverse. There are great opportunities in personal care and allied health and in areas like speech pathology, physiotherapy and occupational therapy. There are jobs in transport, IT and, of course, management and administration. We have spoken and spruiked a lot about the STEM opportunities moving forward in our state, but there are also enormous opportunities in caring roles. I understand that we are currently travelling slowly in attracting the employees required to service the needs of the sector.

The government must ensure that South Australians are given every opportunity and every support to take advantage of the careers offered in the disability sector moving forward. I am working now with South Australia's not-for-profit organisations. I am in discussions with many of them to ensure that we work together to build this capacity to fill the jobs that will come online in the sector. After all, it is really one of the most significant job growth opportunities for our state in recent times.

I am not yet convinced that disability and, more broadly speaking, human services, is a key priority for this government. I am sceptical as to the policies and vision that those opposite have when it comes to that sector in our state. I am more than happy to be proven wrong on that. I do hope, for the sake of those in our community who need the services, that I am wrong. I would like to reiterate that, as a first step, the government must demand their federal Liberal colleagues deliver on all promises regarding the NDIS.

On this side of the house, we are committed to listening and to standing up for organisations delivering the essential disability services in South Australia and, of course, the people who need them. The government must ensure that the federal government keep to their promises, ensure that no-one in our community falls through the cracks and that no-one is left behind. They must not let the federal government renege on their commitment or let the NDIA hold back on the funding commitment made for the benefit of South Australians living with a disability.

This government must commit to delivering a more accessible and inclusive South Australia. Over the coming years, I expect this government to commit to supporting local groups in our community delivering programs and services that promote access and inclusion. I look forward to working with the minister in the other place on the Disability Inclusion Bill that is now in front of us. The government must use this as an opportunity. We have to see support to local groups and investment in upgrades, equipment, programs and infrastructure, like accessible playgrounds, beaches, pools and walking trails. This all must be a priority for the government in targeting inclusiveness and safe communities.

The community needs the provision of inclusive sport, art and recreation programs and, of course, the community facilities need to be delivered that meet the needs of all in our community. I am proud of our track record in terms of women's facilities for sport. The previous Labor government invested in much-needed facilities like Changing Places. It provides a service that is a significant change for people with a disability who had to previously change their clothes or attend to bathroom needs in the most inappropriate and undignified places. It was either that or just avoid participating in community life at all. I have heard terrible stories, and I have participated in this myself as a nurse over the years, where grown adults have had to have their clothes changed on the floor of public toilets. It is simply not good enough.

Changing Places toilets provide a range of features not available in standard access toilet facilities, features like height-adjustable, adult-size change tables, a tracking hoist system, non-slip flooring and more space to accommodate a person using a wheelchair and up to two carers. These facilities are much needed, and it is no surprise that they are expensive, but in order to provide dignity in our community we need to invest the money.

If the government is serious about providing the infrastructure for people living with a disability, the infrastructure that they need, they must commit to continuing to expand facilities like the Changing Places accessible toilets across this state. I will help advocate for this. This will ensure that South Australia is a more accessible and inclusive state for everybody. There can be no question, no doubt in anyone's mind, that we will stand with the people in our community who need our support the most.

There should be no question, no doubt, that we will stand with the community sector organisations that deliver the essential services to those in the community who need them most. The community should be confident that I and other members of this Labor opposition will work with and hold the government to account over the next four years to ensure that these services are provided for our community, that nobody falls through the cracks and that nobody is left behind. The government did make some commitments in the lead-up to the last election, which, over the course of this parliament, I will be watching and scrutinising intently.

The first commitment I am watching is the audit of Housing SA properties. I understand from answers to questions in the other place that the purpose of this audit is to provide a condition assessment report on the Housing Trust stock. Make no mistake, we will always advocate for a well-resourced public housing system that provides quality affordable housing for those in our community who require it. We will hold the government to account as it undertakes the audit process and deliberates on the recommendations that may come from it. I look forward to hearing more detail on this audit process, particularly who is actually undertaking it.

The second point I would like to make is in relation to the government's commitments to amalgamate the functions of Housing SA and Renewal SA. Again, in answers that have been provided from the minister in the other place, she has indicated that work is underway with a project team that consists of members of Renewal SA and Housing SA to determine what the new housing authority should look like.

I understand from remarks that the team is currently considering a range of options, which it is expected will require machinery of government changes and, potentially, legislative changes. I look forward to a robust discussion around this to ensure that we get the best result for the community. The government will need to convince the community on how the competing objectives of these two very different authorities will develop the essential housing and support services required by some of the most vulnerable people in our state.

I would like to close my contribution to the debate by speaking about some of the commitments and investment for the wonderful people living in my electorate of Hurtle Vale and some of the services and investments they require. As I have said previously, it is an honour to have been given the privilege—as it is for all members in this place—to represent our community, and my community is the good people of Hurtle Vale.

Let me start by commending the government for its commitment before the election to install surface lights at the intersection of Main South Road and the Southern Expressway, Kenihans Road and Panalatinga Road. I look forward to receiving information from the minister in the very near future regarding the time line for the implementation of this upgrade. This will give people in the area, particularly those visiting the area, some confidence using an intersection that takes some getting used to.

During my term as a member of parliament for the seat of Fisher, our government, the Labor government, invested a lot of money in road upgrades in the area. Just to touch on the areas, there was Kenihans Road with an intersection of Regency Road and Bishops Hill Road, which had been a big problem since I was a learner driver—so a couple of years ago. It took a lot of planning and a lot of consultation with the community, but it seems now that an upgrade to this area has led to reduced fear and worry for use of the intersection. I have had good reports from locals, so I am very happy with that advocacy.

Blacks Road was given a full upgrade of surface. It was an undulating surface prior to that and now is a much smoother ride, and the locals are very happy with that. Chandlers Hill Road had large potholes and was a very rough journey along the stretch between Kenihans Road and Happy Valley Drive. With a few little hiccups along the way, that surface has certainly smoothed out, and people are happy with that also. The surface on Happy Valley Drive was also redone earlier in the piece.

In the last year of government I was able to achieve other investments in programs and projects in the local community of Hurtle Vale. A \$30,000 investment in essential upgrades is coming to the Hurtle John Potter Reserve in Woodcroft, which hopefully will make that area a much safer and more comfortable place for young people to gather and use the skate park. There was no shade and no water supply, so I am very happy about that upgrade.

There is \$10,000 to repair the Lisa King mural at Base 10 youth centre, which was vandalised in the early part of the year. That will be repainted soon and bring a great sense of pride to the people who use that youth centre. At Morphett Vale basketball Stadium, the home of the Tigers and the home of many other social and competitive clubs, a \$290,000 investment is being made to repair the roof which had been leaking on and off for 10 years and causing surface damage and injuries. As that area is a new part of my electorate, I am very happy to see that that is now getting repaired.

I am pleased also that during the course of the election campaign—campaign; was that a Freudian slip, using the word complain instead of campaign, Mr Speaker? It could be; I'm not sure. During that campaign I secured a commitment for a \$1.3 million investment towards a nature play upgrade and other facilities at the Wilfred Taylor Reserve, which the Liberal Party matched. That will not only benefit Hurtle Vale; that will benefit the seats of Black, Garner, Reynell, Davenport, Mawson, potentially Heysen as well because that is not far away, and Gibson. It will really benefit a lot of people and attract people to the area and hopefully stimulate some local economy as well, creating jobs. I am very happy about that investment.

I am committed to continuing to impress upon the government the need to continuously improve the services and infrastructure in the electorate of Hurtle Vale for the benefit of all of my constituents. I look forward to putting on the table investments in areas like the female change facilities and upgrade of clubrooms in some of the sporting clubs like the Morphett Vale football club.

I am also looking forward to talking to the Minister for Road Safety regarding the traffic issues around the Woodcroft Primary School, a rather large primary school, which has significant traffic issues before and after school.

I will finish my contribution by committing to the people living in the electorate of Hurtle Vale and across South Australia this: the Labor opposition will listen to your concerns and act in your interests. When it comes to vulnerable people in our community, we are the party that represents you and we are the party that will stand with you to ensure that no South Australian slips through the cracks, no South Australian is left behind. To ensure that every South Australian has the opportunity to live a fulfilling, safe and prosperous life here in the beautiful state of South Australia we need a cooperative and sensible approach, and I look forward to working with all members in the house as we deliver on this Supply Bill.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (20:54): I rise to speak in support of the Supply Bill. There are several issues that I would like to raise, particularly in the area of Finniss, that I have concern about how they have been managed over the past years. One issue was raised with me only last week, which was to do with the Mount Compass Area School.

The Mount Compass Area School has been expecting some significant development to fix some problems that have been there for many years. About 20 years ago, in a very quick rush they decided that they needed a temporary building, which was meant to last four to five years. That building is still there. They still have to use that building. They still have buckets sitting permanently in the spots where the roof leaks. The roof has leaked basically the whole time that building has been there.

I had a phone call from the chairman of the governing council last week and he said that he is so hopeful that eventually the commitment of funds will actually turn up to address this problem. In speaking to the education minister, I am pleased that that funding is on its way. Their bigger concern was that they had also received some other funding. They received some STEM funding for some development there, and the chairman's comments to me were, 'It's a bit like giving the kids a PlayStation when they don't own a television.' They just do not have the basics. They are getting the specials, but they do not have the basics. To me, this is because of the mismanagement that has occurred throughout the region.

Turning to health, there has certainly been a problem with health services in Finniss. This was highlighted to me on the night of 2 May, the night before we first sat here in this place. Unfortunately, I had to spend some time in the emergency department at Flinders Medical Centre as one of my family members was unwell. We spoke to my father-in-law, who is a retired GP, and he was concerned about the symptoms of my family member. He said that there was no point in going to the South Coast District Hospital because it no longer has the required doctors and local GPs operating in that hospital. He said that the services there were probably not adequate and that we would need to go to Flinders.

I guess the big positive of the night was that, as we walked into Flinders and were lining up to see the triage nurse, I overheard the conversation in front of me. The triage nurse said to the patient in front of me, 'It's really great, the department is now being helpful; we have had a change of government.' I was quite amazed. I wondered who told them a member of the government had just walked in, but I do not think they knew. So we are starting to see things flow through and we are seeing the effects. The level of confidence is changing, which is so important. It is not just about what we spend and where we spend it; it is actually about shifting confidence as well.

I am so pleased to be part of this government. I am pleased that we can deliver these measures for the communities of Finniss. One concern I have is that we have also lost the community spirit to help itself, and we need to bring that back. One of the commitments that the Liberal Marshall government made in the election was to fund a playground at Mount Compass. I think that is fantastic, but I think it is a little bit sad that every other playground that has ever been built in Mount Compass has been funded by its own community fundraising, and the community does not think that is even something they should be doing any more. They think that a grant is just going to be given to them. I would love to bring the community back to the point of thinking that those who help themselves are the ones we want to help.

I want to keep my speech really short because I think it is so important that we get this Supply Bill through, so I am going to sit down at this point.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (20:59): I rise to speak on the debate of the Supply Bill 2018, which is obviously the first bill that this government is seeking to have debated and passed through this house. As far as the number of dollars per words go, it would have to be right up there in terms of the percentage. Essentially, on this one piece of paper the government is asking for \$6.6 billion from the Consolidated Account. This is what they are asking for up to 30 June 2019.

We have no detail as to what the government wants to spend this money on. We have no detail. In fact, ministers basically cannot answer the simplest questions in question time as to how they are going to outline what their commitments are or how they are going to implement them, yet they come to this house and rush through this bill, basically, to give them \$6.6 billion to spend. No briefing was offered to the shadow minister outlining this. They have delayed the budget until September. We know that the shadow treasurer is working on what cuts he is going to implement across the budget and across the government, and this is obviously a significant concern in my new portfolio in the health sector.

Of course, we have no detail, but one presumes that roughly one-third of this \$6.6 billion is going to go to the health system. Hence, it is a pretty significant liability, in terms of the amount of money coming out of this bill, for the health system. I am very proud to take on the health portfolio. It would have to be one of the most significant and important roles to have in parliament, and in government.

In South Australia, we have a health system that, on the whole, provides good outcomes for patients. On the whole, if you compare it internationally with health systems around the world, it performs very well. Sadly, over the past 16 years we have heard the trashing by members opposite of our doctors and nurses who work in our health sector, which is very disappointing—trashing of the work they are doing day in and day out to provide excellent services for South Australians.

We know that we have amazing, dedicated staff in our health sector—doctors, nurses and allied health professionals—who work very hard to deliver results. We know that we now have excellent facilities across our state. We have upgraded every major hospital across Adelaide, and a very large number of our major regional hospitals as well, to give those doctors and nurses the upgraded facilities they need to provide excellent services for the people of South Australia.

We know that we have strong public health laws in South Australia. We know that we have a well-funded system. We know that over the past 16 years the health budget has increased dramatically—it has roughly tripled over that period of time—to ensure that our doctors and nurses have the resources that we need to meet the ever-increasing demands on our health system across South Australia.

Personally, I am proud to have worked in health policy areas before, being involved both at a state and national level in health reform. I know it is complex work, I know it is difficult work, but it is very important work. The people of South Australia look to this parliament to make good decisions and to ensure that we are looking after their best interests in the health sector, and to make sure that we continue to provide high quality services on a universal basis, on an affordable basis, to ensure that when and where they need services they will be available.

We do have a number of significant challenges facing our health services, namely, the ageing population. That is something that has been widely noted, and this state is facing that curve faster than other states. It is increasing the demand that we are seeing upon emergency departments, increasing the demand that we are seeing across the primary and aged-care sectors as well, and that is placing additional strain upon emergency departments, elective surgery and the like.

We are seeing increasing costs in our health services, and that is another challenge as well. We are also having to adapt to new technology use across health services. All of those are challenges to confront in the future, but I am very confident that we have excellent doctors and nurses. We just need to make sure there is leadership and that there is actually some planning in place.

When you look at what those opposite proposed when they went to the election, essentially it was, 'Well, we will fix the health system.' But when you look at the next level of detail of what they are proposing—when you lift the hood and look at their policies—it is very bare indeed: back to the future in terms of going back to health boards, creating a range of governance challenges with their proposals to do that, creating the ability for our health services to be competing with each other and to be duplicating services rather than working together, for things to be fragmented and for there to be no clear lines of accountability. If a health service is accountable to the board, the minister, the department and the parliament, the lines are very blurred and it creates all sorts of problems.

Those are the problems we saw in South Australia when we had these health boards, both in the city and in the country, where we had three levels, essentially, of governance in our Country Health services: local, regional and central. This is essentially what the Liberal Party proposed with splitting the country into six regional health boards, keeping the local health advisory councils and presumably keeping some sort of central oversight as well. We are going to have three levels of oversight. That is clearly not going to be a recipe for fixing issues in the health sector.

They have also said that they are going to introduce a whole range of very populist policies that we know have a range of risks attached to them. There is no doubt that putting more services into hospitals can be very popular, but the government needs to advise what the risks of that are and how they are going to address those risks. For instance, with the Modbury high dependency unit, the government has not provided details of how they are going to address the risks of that. We have heard the health minister say that he has received advice from the health department that there are clinical patient risks to this. What are those risks? Will he release advice about what the risks are? Are lives going to be put at risk?

These are things where the government needs to provide transparency, particularly when we are talking about patient safety. Clearly, he has received this advice. How are they going to address that in the future? There is no detail there. They have had letters from very senior clinicians in South Australia, outlining the risks associated with their policies. They have gone ahead with it because it is clearly populist policy, but if you read the advice we are getting from clinicians and the advice the minister said he got from the department, there are very serious questions they need to answer about what they are going to put in place.

We also understand there has been some advice that basically says that putting elective surgery into the Repatriation General Hospital is going to be very difficult, very expensive and very risky. The minister has not outlined how he is going to do that, when he is going to do that and what services are going to go in there. Essentially, this was a thought bubble, a populist announcement during an election campaign. But they are now the government. They have to outline how they are going to do this. We know the department is telling them that it is a bad idea and it is going to be very expensive as well.

These are the sorts of election policies that they announced, none of which constitutes a comprehensive plan for fixing the health system. They have said that they are going to fix the health system, but when you look at the details of their policies there is no detail as to how that is going to happen. I think there are some very significant risks that we are going to see over the next four years. Risk number one, essentially, is the detail that hides behind this one page and this \$6.6 billion request for funding from the parliament, namely, what is the Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas in the other place, going to cut from the health system? What cuts is he working on right now with his Department of Treasury and Finance that are going to affect Health?

We know the track record of this Treasurer when it comes to the health system. We know it is about closing beds. We know it is about—

An honourable member: Privatising Modbury.

Mr PICTON: —yes, that is right—privatising hospitals, as we have seen in the past with the Modbury Hospital. We have asked a number of questions of the health minister in recent days and he has been unable to rule out privatising a whole range of different services in our health system.

Clinical services provided by clinicians, that are provided by publicly run services at the moment, are potentially at risk from privatisation in the future. This is a very serious threat to our

health system. If the government is not considering this in the future, they should rule this out, but they refused to do so. It is causing concern amongst clinicians, amongst doctors, nurses and allied health professionals in our health workforce, and it will be causing significant concerns amongst patients.

We know what they did with Modbury and we know what they wanted to do with The QEH. What is that going to mean for SA Pathology? What is that going to mean for out-of-hospital services across the state? What is that going to mean for X-ray services? There is a whole range of different clinical services. What is going to be privatised? Those questions have not been answered.

Look at what the government has done in the health sector since they came into government. There have been some very significant failings. I think first and foremost was their complete acquiescence to the federal government in terms of rushing to sign up to the federal funding agreement, locking in Malcolm Turnbull's cuts to the health system, cruel cuts that Tony Abbott brought in and that Malcolm Turnbull has continued as Prime Minister.

This government was fighting fiercely, absolutely fiercely, to defend South Australia's interests, to defend what we had originally, which was a signed deal between the commonwealth and the state where the commonwealth would commit 50 per cent of growth funding in our hospital system. That is not important just from the perspective of providing that 50 per cent of funding, it is also very important for making sure that the commonwealth has the incentive to invest in primary health care and to invest in aged-care services.

We know that the hospital system is not an island, that it relies upon those connections to services outside of hospital to ensure that we can keep people out of hospital, or if they go to hospital that they have somewhere to go afterwards. If the commonwealth government has no incentive in terms of reducing expenditure on hospitals, then they have no incentive to invest more in primary health care and aged care.

We have seen this federal government's cuts to those sectors already. We have seen what they have been doing to the Medicare system in terms of capping NBS indexation and we have seen some of the cuts they have made to the aged-care sector around the country, particularly when you look at some of the dementia nurses who were cut in the first Hockey-Abbott budget. These are not just esoteric debating points. These have real effects on the ground, not just for those services but for the people who come through our hospital doors.

The new Marshall government has come in and said, 'We are just going to sign up. Show us the dotted line and we will sign up.' They have signed up to a deal that gives us less funding, that does not give the federal government a fifty-fifty share in new services. They have signed up for a deal where there is a cap on the growth that they will pay into the future.

We know that we have an ageing population. We know that we have increasing health demands and we know that that will mean that our health costs will increase rapidly in the future, but we have signed up to a deal now, through this government, where we are just going to set an arbitrary cap and the commonwealth is off the hook after that. If the commonwealth gets off the hook, what incentive do they have to invest in those other services? That is a very significant problem. I think that it is going to play out not only in the short term but over the long term.

We saw what a difference federal funding can make only recently with Mr Shorten's budget reply speech, where he announced that he would restore another \$2.8 billion to hospitals over the coming years to reverse those cuts. If that is the case, why has this government not picked up the phone to Malcolm Turnbull and asked for the same deal? Why has this government not done that? Why has this government not stood up for South Australia and done that?

It is because we know that they just want to have a happy snap with the federal government, sign on the dotted line and not cause any problems for their Liberal masters in Canberra. I think that is going to be very disappointing in the long term for South Australia because we know that getting those funding arrangements right between the state and the commonwealth is going to be so important.

We have seen already a lot of the delays that have happened in relation to vaccinations. We came out and called for the government to introduce flu shots for children under the age of five. It

took them a little while, but they came out and agreed to do that. That is excellent. It is something that was vitally important. It is something that we think the now government should have committed to during the election campaign as well.

However, they still have not moved on what is another vital area of vaccination policy, and that is to ensure that our kids in South Australia can get access to meningococcal B vaccines. We put our money on the table and said that we would ensure that we would cover the cost of kids getting access to meningococcal B vaccinations. Anybody who has gone through this process in terms of talking to their doctor about it would know that the costs are massive. Because it is not covered by the PBS yet and because, sadly, it is predominantly an issue in South Australia and not in other states, what we see is that families are having to shell out at least \$500 to get these vaccinations done.

Parents are very worried about this, but parents cannot afford that cost. This is an area where the government needs to step in and step in quickly. After we called upon the government to match our promise, we released all our costing documents that we had on this, documented from the Parliamentary Budget Office. Of course, we know that the now government refused to use it and hence a lot of their costings are going to be way off.

We gave them those documents. Did they say, 'We are going to do this'? No, they said, 'We're going to have a committee to look at it.' It has been weeks and weeks now and we still have not heard if they are actually going to do this. I hope that they take swift action on this because I know that families in South Australia are desperately wanting to make sure that their kids are vaccinated. I do not want to see more kids in South Australia contract this very dangerous, very deadly disease.

We have seen the minister refuse to rule out privatisation. We have seen the minister and the Premier sack the chief executive of the hospital system. In fact, I think the minister was quite keen to keep her, given how effective she had been in running the hospital system and the health system over the past year. He seemed to be quite keen, but the Premier stepped in and said, 'You're out.' They sacked her and brought in somebody new. I hope he goes very well, but I worry that it is an unnecessary change, in that the previous chief executive was performing quite well in addressing a number of the challenges that our system faced and it is going to be an unnecessary disruption to our system.

Importantly, we have not yet seen from the government their winter management plan. We are not that long away from entering winter. Anecdotally, lots of people are getting the flu already and we have seen the official statistics show that our flu cases are already higher than last year, and yet we have seen no plan from the government. It is almost unprecedented for the government not to have a winter bed management plan, particularly due to the fact that we have seen what happened last year.

We saw a record number of flu cases last year, and it is very important that we ensure that the government has a plan in place for what extra resources are going to go in, what extra beds are going to open, what extra ambulance services need to happen, what extra out of hospital services they are going to employ, and how they are going to spend some of this \$6.6 billion that they are asking the parliament for to ensure that, during the winter period, our hospitals are going to be looked after.

For weeks, we have been calling upon the government to release this plan. They have refused to do so either because it is secret or because they do not have a plan. I suspect it is the latter. That makes me very fearful about what is going to happen over this winter if there is no plan in place to do that.

All of this, of course, leads into the risk of cuts happening. I say this: if we see cuts happening in our health system in South Australia, we in the Labor Party will fight that every inch of the way. This is a government that came in promising not to cut the health system. They promised to fix the health system.

If they breach that promise, if they implement cuts, if we see beds closing, if we see doctors and nurses losing their jobs, if we see important programs closing across South Australia, then we

will be there fighting every inch of the way, fighting for health services in South Australia to ensure that we look after the patients and we do not see what happened under Mr Lucas's previous term as treasurer.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (21:19): I rise to support the Supply Bill. We are being asked to allow the government to spend \$6.631 billion of taxpayers' money, and I support that principle. I support that principle because, although we inherited a forward trajectory when it comes to expenditure growth and debt, I am confident that our new government will plan and control expenditure better than any other previous government.

We have long-term sustainable plans. If the Supply Bill is not passed, it will not allow the continued payment of our public servants until the Appropriation Bill is passed by parliament later this year. The focus of the 2018-19 budget will be the implementation of our election commitments as well as developing a sustainable budget position. The passing of the Supply Bill is essential for the timely delivery of these commitments. Our election commitments cover key areas, including:

- creating a more competitive place to do business through initiatives such as scrapping payroll tax for small businesses, deregulating shop trading hours to allow businesses to remain open, and cutting land tax;
- slashing ESL bills by \$90 million per annum; and
- a range of major transport, health and education projects, which will include our \$110 million investment in Modbury Hospital.

More specific King election commitments cover key projects including the upgrade of Golden Grove Road. I have been pushing for this upgrade on behalf of my community for nearly four years now. The importance of this upgrade was raised to me by residents in 2014 when I first doorknocked for the Tea Tree Gully council elections.

I subsequently raised the desire of residents for this upgrade with council's elected members and gained unanimous support at the Tea Tree Gully council to advocate to the previous state government for the upgrade of Golden Grove Road. However, because the state government would not commit to the upgrade of the road, I made the Golden Grove Road upgrade an election issue in 2017, and was thrilled by the support of residents and local businesses for my petition.

Golden Grove Road is an essential road used by thousands of north-eastern suburbs locals each day. The Labor government failed to provide sufficient investment as the population grew, leading to many issues including:

- the road is too narrow to cater for existing traffic flows, with turning cars and stopping buses creating chaos;
- the poor condition of the road surface and the lack of overtaking lanes create safety risks;
- locals have no safe place to walk, and a lack of footpaths near bus stops forces people to walk on uneven and often muddy tracks;
- insufficient stormwater drainage causes the road to flood after rains, creating dangerous situations for pedestrians and cars; and
- the busy intersection of Hancock Road and Golden Grove Road is unsafe for local traffic.

Local residents and businesses are heavily dependent on this stretch of road, so we must have a solution and funding to fix the problem. There are over 1,200 signatures on the petition, and below are samples of some of the comments sent to me from residents:

Turning right from John Road is increasingly more difficult, especially at peak times, with more and more traffic from both directions due to housing developments and shops.

Lots of work needs to be done to improve Hancock Road, better lighting all the way, kerbing, footpaths, this road is no longer a country road. It is never been upgraded and ought to have been.

The businesses on Greenwith Road and Einstein Drive suffer because of time delays and this would make the area more accessible and give growth to those that would be happier to travel a bit further out if the path was more free-flowing. The Hancock Road/Golden Grove Road intersection drastically needs a change, lights or roundabout.

The road surface is uneven and causing more damage to our cars. The intersection of Hancock Road and Golden Grove Road is dangerous and so is the intersection of John Road and Golden Grove Road. These both need traffic lights and I'm amazed no-one has been seriously injured or killed there.

I have nearly been killed there myself with my nine-year-old in the car turning right from Hancock onto Golden Grove Road.

The intersection of Golden Grove Road and Hancock Road is a death trap. I travel this road every day and am constantly furious over its condition and lack of proper maintenance.

When campaigning to have this road fixed, on the side of the road I was nervous when I saw joggers, pedestrians and cyclists struggling to use this narrow, poorly maintained road with no footpaths at the same time as negotiating trucks, buses, cars. I saw people getting off buses on uneven rubble paths in the dust on hot days and stepping into puddles on wet days.

People who signed the petition who regularly use this road do not just live in King but all the way out to Gawler. Furthermore, my neighbours in Golden Grove and Surrey Downs, who live alongside Golden Grove Road, raised the issue of noise and dust problems from trucks bumping up and down the old country road, which they have been putting up with for too many years. Funding of this upgrade means real change for the residents of King.

Similarly when I doorknocked in the area of Hillbank where people must enter their estate through Skyline Drive, I was repeatedly told about people's concern turning from Blacktop Road into Skyline Drive. Moreover, the trucks and commuters travelling up Blacktop Road support the addition of a new slip lane into Skyline Drive as this turn-off is sharp and sudden and is in a location where drivers are accelerating up a hill. The issue for all drivers is one of safety. Our election promise is to deliver a slip lane to make this turn-off safer for all drivers.

We are committed to fixing the South Australian Districts Netball Association (SADNA) car parking situation, which will benefit so many people who visit the SADNA courts at Golden Grove and the residents. Finally, we will deliver more car parks at the Golden Grove park-and-ride, so more people can easily use public transport. With this funding support we will deliver for the people of King. I support the Supply Bill. I have confidence in our new government to carefully allocate South Australian taxpayers' money.

While we are going through a transition, we are looking to the future. We are focused and disciplined, committed to real change and, most importantly, to leadership and accountability to the people of South Australia. Our plan is for a stronger economy, more jobs and to ensure that all of the essential services provided by our government are fully funded. I encourage all members to support the Supply Bill.

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (21:26): We are here in this house to talk about the Supply Bill, and what is this bill for? This bill is about us continuing to pay to keep the state going, to provide our services in education, health, transport and justice. But, of course, we do not have that detail before us today. My particular area of interest is tourism, trade and investment. We know that in A Strong Plan for South Australia the Marshall government has identified key areas in the tourism portfolio to continue to increase the numbers of tourists to South Australia and to continue Labor's great legacy of building our tourism sector. Far be it from being Adelaide centric, it has an impact on the whole state.

The details we have are that the proposed event bid fund has an increase of money of \$40 million over four years. That funding is going to be equally spent between the major event fund and the convention bid fund. The support of Adelaide Convention Bureau's Billion Dollar Benefit plan aims to better target conventions and encourage delegates to linger longer. The expected cost for this is \$5 million. There are smaller areas in our regional perspectives; for example, extending the Cape Jervis breakwater by 100 metres to maximise the KI ferry at a cost of \$2 million. Of course, there is the desire to increase ecotourism accommodation in national parks.

A bipartisan supported project from both sides was the Chinatown redevelopment alongside the Central Market upgrade, supporting our economic and cultural ties with China. The proposed

Great Southern Bike Trail will be a world-class cycling trail, working alongside the federal and Victorian governments to have it linked with other existing bike trails, all the way from Adelaide to Melbourne over 1,000 kilometres.

The purpose of that is quite positive: to leverage off the Tour Down Under (TDU). Just yesterday we heard how successful this event is now in its 20th year. We had 43,000 interstate and overseas visitors to our state which generated \$63.7 million. In its time here, it has created 774 jobs. We know that there are opportunities here with the economic benefits of cycling tourism, and we know that this proposal would look towards that.

We all know that tourism is a massive economic growth area for our state, and every elected member is equally committed to seeing South Australian tourism continue to grow and to flourish. Therefore, one would think that tourism would be an area in which we could look forward to working in a bipartisan manner with the government. However, my concern—and we are talking about money in the outlined proposal—is how much it will cost.

We have some propositions. We have some proposals. Where will this money be sourced from and how will these commitments be delivered? These are some of my concerns. Following the recent awarding of a major tourism advertising contract by the government to an interstate firm and their clearly political appointment to the SATC Board, this will be a space to watch with some interest. I look forward to seeing continued growth in this sector, and we have an ambitious plan of more than \$8 billion in this tourism sector. I think we can get there, but I will be watching how we are going to do that.

Let me pivot towards trade and investment. We had a very clear statement in the election proposals that we needed a trade way of transforming. Trade is the opportunity to transform the South Australian economy. One of the areas of focus, of course, is to create brand-new trade offices in Japan, Malaysia, Dubai, the USA, Shanghai and an additional embedded office in Guangzhou for an export-led recovery for South Australia through deeper, long-term engagement. Yet, again we have no costings for this proposal.

There are other areas we see some focus on: increasing the funding to StudyAdelaide to \$2.5 million to support them in promoting Adelaide as a centre of educational excellence and encouraging more students to live and spend time here and to have Adelaide, South Australia, as a destination of choice for international students. We have had some growth in this area, and I am very proud of this growth—once again, another Labor legacy. We are on the same page here; we want to grow this sector of our economy.

We know that there is opportunity to continue to export our goods and also our services while at the same time building investment locally. We hear that the government's objective is to double the international student ambassador campaign and strengthen our interaction with overseas education agents. In other areas, the government has asked Food SA to focus on growing markets, on growing the capabilities of individual businesses and linking industry with export support through a liaison officer. This is an excellent part of our economy.

In 2016-17, the food and wine industry generated almost \$20 billion in revenue and contributed almost half of South Australia's total merchandise exports. It is a natural growth area, identified by both the former and current governments capitalising on our clean, green image. I am particularly interested in and remain focused on what we see in the northern Adelaide region, with the development with additional water available, and to see that become the food bowl of South Australia.

Defence has also been recognised by the new government as an area of focus. Again, there are many areas of common ground between the vision of the Marshall Liberal government and that of the former government in terms of our commitment to export and investment growth. However, there are also many unanswered questions in regard to the continuation of successful programs, such as Investment Attraction South Australia, the International Education Office, the Industry Capability Network and planned business missions. We will welcome the clarification. I will be listening and I will be watching to see where the new government will land on these areas.

Let me go back briefly to the issue of trade offices and unpack the status quo and the plans by the Marshall government in more detail. The South Australian government currently has

commercial representation in key targets in the form of trade offices or being embedded in Austrade. Our overseas staff members provide export assistance to South Australian businesses and help attract business investment and migration to the state. We currently have trade offices stand alone in China—in Jinan—and of course in the United Kingdom, servicing Europe. In the others, we are embedded in Austrade: Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand.

The Marshall government is proposing to create new trade offices in Japan, Malaysia, Dubai, the US and Shanghai and an additional embedded office in Guangzhou, for an export-led recovery for South Australia. Yet again, we have no costings, so the financial impact of the budget is unknown. The question is how much of this Supply Bill will go to these trade offices?

We know that our Jinan trade office in China has an estimated budget of \$326,000 for 2018-19. Based on this, the establishment of five new stand-alone trade offices is likely to have a minimum budget of more than \$6 million over the next four years, but it could be significantly more. The key question here is what business case shows return of investment of new stand-alone offices versus being embedded with Austrade. What are the facts? What is the business case? Will this get us to where we jointly want to be?

Other state governments have also taken different approaches to this question. Victoria currently has 20 stand-alone trade offices, while New South Wales has 11, with roughly half of those embedded with Austrade and half stand alone. Western Australia has eight stand-alone offices. The total operation costs of the WA offices, including property, employees and others, is just shy of \$7 million. However, Western Australian trade offices employ locally engaged staff on a contract basis on local salary scales. They do not receive additional allowances or accommodation, and therefore this is a more economical alternative to employing Australian staff to work overseas.

Obviously, stand-alone offices are more expensive options than their embedded Austrade counterparts. Even more obviously, employing Australians for overseas trade office posts is more expensive than employing local staff. The merit of independent trade offices will largely be assessed by the cost of the policy and by the return of investment that can be evidenced, but it will be expensive. What kind of trade offices are we going to have? Are we going to have the Rolls-Royce of trade offices? If we do, will we see the benefit? Those are my questions.

There was a Labor review of South Australian export trade in 2012—the Hartley review—which proposed a shift in priority from trade facilitation to inward investment. To achieve this, it was determined to continue to embed our overseas trade offices with Austrade, increase the frequency of our trade missions and pursue a clear export trade strategy with measurable targets. It also paved the way for the closure of our stand-alone trade offices at that time.

There is evidence that increased and direct trade missions by local business has increased exports for South Australian businesses. In 2017, more than 300 businesses, featuring 423 delegates, participated in outbound missions to 21 countries. This resulted in 60 South Australian businesses becoming exporters over that time period, an additional 60, and 10 more than the South Australian government target. My concern is that the money we are talking today about the supply, some of which I assume—because we do not have this in writing; we do not have this detail—will be needed to establish and operate the five new trade offices. Will this come at the expense of direct funding to South Australian businesses that want to start exporting or diversify, but more importantly, grow?

It is still unclear whether the planned trade missions for 2018 will now continue under a Marshall Liberal government. I have them noted, and I will be watching. I look forward to monitoring the progress in these vital areas of tourism, trade and investment. Let me be clear about the outstanding questions. Will the Marshall government deliver on the previously scheduled business delegations, advertised in advance, to give businesses in South Australia certainty, continuity and commitment?

The one thing I heard when I went on the trade missions is: 'We want to continue to develop our relationship, and this will take time. We need certainty, and we need a commitment that these will continue.' Has the government done any costings for the new trade offices? It is an ambitious plan, but I think it will be costly. And will the Marshall Liberal government honour the \$60 million

committed to Investment Attraction South Australia for supporting new businesses to invest here, for job creation and for growth?

I now have the opportunity to mention a few of the key areas in my own electorate. Once again we are being asked to support the Supply Bill, which involves a significant amount of money. At the heart is our Building Better Schools initiative. Settlers Farm Campus R-7, Paralowie R-12 School and Salisbury High School were all successful in receiving support to upgrade their facilities. All three of these schools in my electorate are large, but they are beacons of support, growth and positivity as we support our children to complete their schooling to support their future endeavours.

Recently, the proposal was to have our second synthetic athletics track in the state at Brahma Lodge, previously in my electorate and now snugly next door to it. We have a commitment through sport and rec, but we want to make sure that that athletics track is delivered. Further to that, we are keen to have the linkages supported—to support liveability in the City of Salisbury—from the Salisbury Interchange to the Bridgestone athletics redevelopment.

There is the electrification. Electrification to Salisbury is already underway, and we understand there are commitments for that to continue to Gawler. Of course, along with that we need a new interchange, and I will be speaking to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government over and over again about that commitment for Salisbury. That brings me to the issue of the railway crossing.

I had much support in the electorate—and I continue to do so—on our commitment to support congestion issues throughout South Australia and more importantly in relation to the Park Terrace railway crossing. For someone who is dropping their child off on occasion to school, it could take one minute, or eight, to go through that crossing, and for people who do that several times a day, whether for domestic purposes or business purposes, it is something that holds up many things in the electorate. We have some costs out there in terms of going under or over, and as local member I will continue to pursue that opportunity to unlock and lessen the congestion within my electorate.

Today, we are supporting this Supply Bill, but it is a concern—without details and information. Although we have plans and we have some proposals and some figures of what it might cost, there are no details here. We are on the same page in relation to tourism because we want to grow the tourism economy in South Australia. We are very proud of being a livable and attractive place to be. We want to increase investment in our state—we agree with that—and we want to increase exporting to the world. We agree on all these issues. Our path to get there may be different and the cost may be different—and I will be watching.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER (21:44): I rise to address the matter of privilege that was raised today regarding the Minister for Police failing to table notes he intimated he would provide to the house. After seeking advice, I make the following statement with regard to the matter of privilege raised by the member for Enfield in this house earlier today. However, before addressing that matter, I wish to outline the significance of privilege as it relates to this house and its members.

Privilege is not a device by which members or any other person can seek to pursue matters that can be addressed by debate or settled by the vote of the house on a substantive motion. McGee in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand* in my view makes the test for whether or not a matter is a matter of privilege by defining it as a matter that can 'genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the House in the discharge of its duties'.

An essential aspect of privilege is to ensure that each member can speak without fear or favour but at the same time be able to rely on the accuracy of the statements made in the house by any member. It is not a protection from the consequences of misconduct, poor judgement or inaccurate information.

I refer to the matter raised by the member for Enfield in relation to an answer provided by the Minister for Police to the following question asked by the member for Enfield in the house on 9 May 2018:

Given the State Records Act provisions, did your staff member keep their notes from the southern suburbs forum?

In response to the question, the Minister for Police answered by saying, and I quote from *Hansard* at page 154:

My staff member will have taken notes, and we have discussed those notes. Have I seen a handwritten copy of those notes? No, but I am happy to give those to the house, provide them to the house, as is needed or wanted.

A little further on in his answer to the same question, the Minister for Police states, and once again I quote from *Hansard* at page 154:

Yes, I am happy to look at those notes and return them to the house as deemed fit.

The member for Enfield then refers to an answer provided by the Minister for Police to a question he asked in the house on 15 May. In particular, the member for Enfield asked the following question to the Minister for Police:

When will the minister table the notes taken by his staff member that he undertook to table last week when asked questions in the house?

The Minister for Police answered by saying, and I quote from *Hansard* at page 291:

I thank the member for his question and note that, having checked the State Records Act, those notes were compliant 100 per cent with the act, and he [the member for Enfield] has every manner to go about receiving them and he knows how to do that through FOI, I think.

The member for Enfield has requested me to consider this as a matter of privilege. He does so on the basis of alleging that the Minister for Police has breached his obligation and duty to the house to act in good faith by refusing to provide a copy of the notes to the house, which it is alleged he earlier offered to provide to the house.

The only obligation the minister would have to furnish documents to the house is if the house ordered the production of the documents. In this instance, there was no such order. In respect to the obligation and duty to the house for the minister to act in good faith, any breach of this obligation or duty does not amount to a contempt. On close examination of the answer provided by the Minister for Police to the member for Enfield's question on 9 May 2018, the minister clarifies his position in respect to providing notes to the house by saying:

...I am happy to give those [notes] to the house, provide them to the house, as is needed or wanted.

And further:

Yes, I am happy to look at those notes and return them to the house as deemed fit.

Clearly, the minister has placed a caveat on the provision of the notes to the house by reserving his position to provide them based on need or want or whether he deems them fit for presentation to the house. As the minister has stated:

Have I seen a handwritten copy of the notes? No...

I would assume that it would be imprudent of the minister to make an undertaking to release the notes without sighting them first, and for that reason he has clearly placed a caveat on their presentation to the house.

In this instance, the minister's behaviour cannot be regarded as a contempt resulting in a breach of privilege. In reaching this decision, I have no doubt that it does not fall to me to make a judgement either way because, in my view, the conduct complained of cannot, per the test in McGee, genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties, which as members would know is the test described by McGee in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*.

In the Chair's opinion, this is not a matter of privilege for the reasons I stated earlier. In the Chair's view, the matter could not genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties; therefore, I also decline to give the matter the precedence that would allow the member for Enfield to immediately pursue the matter. However, my opinion does not prevent any member from pursuing the matter by way of substantive motion.

*Bills***SUPPLY BILL 2018***Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (21:50): I rise today to very happily support the Supply Bill to keep the government going from the end of the financial year until the budget is brought forward in September. In total, this is a budget of about \$6.6 billion. This is taxpayers' money. This is the people of South Australia's money and, as a member of this government, I am very confident that as Liberals we take that fact very seriously. It is not our money; it is the people of South Australia's money and so we will be ensuring that all of the decisions that are made are done in the interests of the people of South Australia.

This is in contrast, I suppose, to those in recent times who have perhaps treated taxpayers' money in a slightly different way. There have certainly been a lot of vanity projects and ideological obsessions—a lot of things that might perhaps make people feel very warm and fuzzy inside, but do very little to actually improve the lives of South Australians and that are really lacking in practical application. The other principle we come to is only to take as much as we absolutely need to do the things that we absolutely need. We made it very clear before the election what that would be and we are going to be very consistent on that.

We listened to what the people of South Australia wanted from our government and there were three main themes: they wanted more jobs, they wanted lower costs and they wanted better services. Lower costs was one of the major issues that came up during the campaign in Newland. I am pleased to say that we have quite a number of commitments on that part to reduce the cost-of-living pressures on both households and businesses. The emergency services levy is an important part of that. Shortly after the 2014 election, the previous government, without any warning, massively increased this impost on households and businesses. This was an extraordinary increase, hurting so many people. We will be reversing that—we will be cutting it. This will be giving back \$90 million a year to households and businesses.

This is really critical tax relief for households, businesses, farmers and for so many other people in the community. On top of that, what this also does is help deal with this trust deficit that was left behind by the previous government by doing something that they did not say they were going to do, while we will be doing exactly what we said we were going to. In general, the idea on this side is that we would rather be giving taxpayers' money back to taxpayers, who are best placed to spend their own money, rather than us fleecing them whenever the opportunity arises.

Another important policy on the topic of cost of living is, of course, capping council rates. This is a policy that we have been talking and campaigning on for quite a long time. We will be capping council rate increases, keeping them to the smallest amount possible, matching the local government index. If councils really need to increase rates beyond that, then they have to make that case and that is what our policy will allow them to do. This will, of course, be done by an independent regulator.

The other important part—and this was probably one of the really hot-button issues in terms of cost of living—was the cost of electricity, which has skyrocketed in recent times. It was quite incredible when, particularly towards the end of the financial year in June last year, overnight, after announcements of large increases, every single person I doorknocked that next day was talking about power prices. So this is a major focus for us.

We have put together a positive plan that will tackle the problems that have led to these increases in costs by essentially dealing with the extraordinary fluctuations that have been in our generation and supply, given that we had lost so much of our base load power and with inadequate storage to counter that fluctuation.

We will, of course, be providing a subsidy for households to install batteries with their solar panels so that they can store their own power when they are out during the day and then use it into the evening, taking that peak out of the evening load. We will also be helping to support the building of a new interconnector to New South Wales. This is important when there is no wind or sun in South

Australia, and we can be importing power from interstate, but when the opposite is true and there is lots of wind and sun we can be exporting that power interstate, helping to stabilise our local grid.

This issue is not only hurting households it also had a major impact on local businesses. In fact, there is a local fish and chip shop within Newland that cited increasing power prices directly as the reason for laying off three casual staff. This is a case where not only was it impinging on their ability to do business and hurting households but three people lost an opportunity to earn an income for themselves.

In a business like that, they were even having to go as far as turning off a lot of their display refrigeration equipment, which, of course, draws a lot of power, and storing everything in standard fridges. So they were really hurt by that. It is very important that this issue is dealt with and that we have a comprehensive plan that deals with the issue on all the different fronts to ensure that we will deliver the reductions in price that businesses and households really need.

The other major issue for Newland, and one that we have committed to resolving, is the cuts around Modbury Hospital. A lot of people in the local area rely on the local hospital for services, and the previous government, under Transforming Health, removed a lot of those services. We have committed to bringing them back. We have committed \$110 million—\$20 million of that is for reinstating the high dependency unit, which will allow for more complex procedures to be performed at Modbury Hospital. We will also be investing in a number of other infrastructure improvements, including a purpose-built palliative care unit, a general refurbishment of the hospital building itself, a new acute medical ward and acute surgical ward, and a number of other things as well.

This is really critical. It was a major issue for the local area and another example of where I think a lot of people felt betrayed by a government that was presenting a particular image, or attempting to present a particular image, but really doing something very different at the same time. Having that occur for such a long time, I think, has been responsible for a lot of degradation in the trust of politicians in general.

One thing I came across quite frequently is that we would go out campaigning and committing to people the things that we were going to be doing if we were successful in government and many people would come back and say, 'That's great. We agree with that, if you do it.' There was this real sense that people would say one thing before an election and do something very different afterwards, and this is where we absolutely will be different. We must be very different and we absolutely will be. I look forward to assisting in the delivery of all our commitments.

A number of very specific commitments, on top of the Modbury Hospital, include, of course, the Tea Tree Gully sports hub, which is where the Tea Tree Gully netball and tennis clubs train and where the tennis club plays. We will be investing in additional courts at that site because at the moment the courts there are completely over capacity, and kids are being turned away from those clubs. There is of course Tea Tree Gully Gymsports, a great local club, the largest gymnastics club in South Australia with 2,000 members. We will support and help them put a new spring floor into their facility.

We will also support the upgrade to the Kersbrook Primary School crossing on Kersbrook Road. For a number of years now the local governing council has been concerned that the crossing there has not been as safe as it should be, so we have committed to additional signage and lighting to make the crossing more visible to cars as they are coming through. As the member for King alluded, we will also be upgrading the South Australia Districts Netball Association courts at Golden Grove to make sure the car park there is safer so that cars are able to more efficiently move in and out of there.

The policies the Marshall Liberal government is implementing are making and will continue to make real differences to the lives of South Australians. Little by little we will be saving, which the government can deliver to households and businesses, and eventually this will really add up to make a very real difference to people's lives. We will be as careful with taxpayers' money as absolutely possible, rather than see it as our own plaything to maintain our own positions. I am very happy to support this Supply Bill and look forward to assisting in the delivery of the Liberal government's agenda over the next few years.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The SPEAKER: Could members be seated or leave so that I can see who would like the call. The member for Giles.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (22:04): It is great to have such an extensive audience, given the numbers who have been in here recently. I am sure that you are all waiting with bated breath for the comments that are to come. Of course I rise to support supply, as we all do. I reflect upon the comments from the member for West Torrens that we are essentially signing off on a blank cheque. A lot has been said in the lead-up to the election, and a lot has been said in the Address in Reply speech and the Supply Bill speeches about the commitments of the new government, but there is still a lack of clarity about just what is going to be done across a whole range of areas.

We have heard on a number of occasions tonight about the great work the government is going to do when it comes to the ESL. It has been mentioned that there is a trust deficit. However, there seems to be a view that the changes that took place back in 2014 all happened in some sort of vacuum. Of course they did not happen in some sort of a vacuum. They happened as a direct result of the Abbott government.

If anybody is talking about a trust deficit, you have to look at what the Abbott government did when elected. It made a number of commitments in relation to education and health and the agreements that had been entered into with all the states. In its first budget it just walked away from those agreements; it just tore up those agreements. It was not just Labor governments that were deeply upset about the action on the part of the Abbott government; it was also Liberal governments. In that budget, nationally we saw \$80 billion ripped out of expenditures for health and education in Australia. Of course, that had a marked impact on South Australia as well.

The health agreement that was walked away from was something that was essential. The National Health Reform Agreement was an attempt to get things back on an even keel when it came to the health system both in this state and nationally. That is because the increases in costs associated with health, associated with the public health system and other associated elements to do with health, were rising far higher than CPI.

They were rising for a whole range of reasons, including an ageing population, which in a sense is a measure of success as a nation. We have one of the highest longevity rates now in the world, which is a good thing, but along with that comes a range of challenges, not least of which is a number of chronic diseases, a number of diseases associated with age. There have also been huge advances in what we are able to do. That in some ways has saved money on one hand, but it has also massively increased costs on the other.

There was an attempt by the federal Labor government, in cooperation with Liberal state governments and Labor governments, to do the right thing, to recognise the real cost increases when it came to the health system nationally. Abbott broke the commitments that he made. The Liberal Party broke the commitments that it made when it went into that election when it came to health and education. That had a significant impact here in South Australia. The amount of money that was ripped away in one fell swoop was incredibly significant.

We have seen a return of some of that funding, but it is only a fraction of what was originally taken away. We are still today living with the consequences of those Liberal Party cuts, of those Abbott cuts. That is something that the new government is going to have to take into mind when it does eventually frame its budget and as it spends over the coming period in the lead-up to the budget.

I will be paying attention to a number of things in my electorate when it comes to seeing where money is going to be spent. On this side of the chamber, you get to look up at Sir Thomas Playford. If not for Sir Thomas Playford, I acknowledge that I might not be in South Australia. The role that he played back in the 1950s in doing the foundational work to secure—against some reluctance by BHP—an integrated steelworks in Whyalla, which was commissioned back in 1965, was commendable.

It is interesting to look back on those years and the bipartisan approach that was taken to secure that major investment in South Australia. Indeed, it was a major investment that for a time led

to Whyalla being the largest regional centre outside Adelaide. I acknowledge that the world has clearly moved on, but at that time there was a willingness on the part of this agrarian socialist to use public money in a way to actively facilitate the development of industry. One could say that he was picking winners in the way that the recent Labor government is accused of doing. If we go through some of those winners, it is interesting to see that they have been very worthwhile investments.

The work that was done way back then secured a major industry and, over recent years, that major industry has faced, as has the community of Whyalla, an existential threat. We are part way through that existential threat, and this is where my interest is going to be in the Supply Bill and in the budget when it is handed down. What is the approach going to be to a community like Whyalla when we have a government that talks about lowering taxes, not picking winners and just using a limited number of tools, such as payroll taxes and other approaches, to encourage business development in South Australia? But the question is: what do you do with the challenge of an industry like the steelworks?

I mentioned that when Sir Thomas Playford did the foundational work on securing an integrated steelworks for Whyalla and for this state he did so with the cooperation of the Labor government. Indeed, Ron Loveday, the member for Whyalla at the time, sat on the committee that Playford chaired, and there was a strong bipartisan approach. I acknowledged in my Address in Reply speech that when Whyalla, and the steel industry, was going through its difficulties nobody on the opposition side attempted to play any politics with it.

The federal government was a bit hit and miss at times, but I think we were fortunate to have Arthur Sinodinos—and I wish him well because he has cancer; I wish him a speedy recovery—in the ministry that he was in at that time, because he recognised the importance of securing the future of the steel industry and, indeed, the future of the community of Whyalla. I indicated in my Address in Reply speech that the South Australian people have handed the baton on to the new government, and I would expect the new government to do all in its power to do the right thing by the community of Whyalla, to do the right thing by the structural steel industry in this state and to do the right thing by the state, because it would be a major hit if we were to lose that industry.

We all know that Sanjeev Gupta and GFG Alliance have said a lot. They went through their 100-day planning process in the lead-up to Christmas. Out of that, a lot of other work has come, including a whole range of feasibility studies, but the major investment has not yet started. I suspect that the major investment will need a trigger, and that trigger will be some form of state government intervention. It might well be a form of intervention very similar to what we as a government did in Port Pirie to help secure the future of the smelters.

That was a very similar situation. Had Pirie lost the smelters, the consequences for that community would have been dire. As a state government, we were willing to underwrite the redevelopment at Port Pirie, and that has led to a very positive outcome for that community. When we were in government, we were willing to entertain the probability of underwriting the investment in Whyalla in order to create that transformation in the steel industry.

So I strongly hope, wish and pray that we will all be able to work constructively with the current state government when it comes to the argy-bargy, the negotiations about what needs to be done at Whyalla to secure the future of what were the Arrium operations. I certainly will, as the local member, to secure the future of that great industry that has given so much to this state. If we were to secure that future it will be transformational given what Sanjeev Gupta has talked about. There is reason to have that confidence, looking at his record and what he has done in the UK.

I will move on to some other issues, but I thought I would raise that one first because it is such a big issue. After all, Whyalla is the third largest community in South Australia, after Adelaide and Mount Gambier. It is my belief that if we line up all the ducks, it might well power on into the future and once again become the second largest community.

I want to mention education. Obviously, there are some potential question marks around the funding that has come through the Building Better Schools program and how that is going to be used. We made a \$17 million commitment for the upgrade at Fregon, in the APY lands, so that money is on the table ready to be used. I am assured that the school and the education department are actively planning how that money is going to be used.

The sum of \$7 million was allocated to the school at Roxby Downs through the Building Better Schools fund. Roxby Downs has a very young population, and it has a great school with great teachers, so I would like to see that money put to good use. I am quite proud of the work that we did as a state government in regional South Australia when it came to supporting the upgrades of schools. Through the Building Better Schools program, we allocated \$200 million to regional communities, in proportion to the student population. We built 48 brand-new science and maths labs for 48 regional schools as part of the STEM Works program, and I was happy to get five of those STEM facilities in my electorate.

The big one when it comes to education—and it has been a perennial issue in the community of Whyalla—is the need for a new high school. We have three public high schools in Whyalla. We have two junior schools that feed into a senior high school, and one of those junior schools has fewer than 200 children. All those schools have structural problems. One was built in the 1940s and is an impressive building. It is still in place, though it is probably not fit for purpose these days as it has a whole raft of maintenance issues. In terms of the built environment in that school, it is a bit of a dog's breakfast, with a mix of a 1940s building, a multistorey building that is no longer fit for purpose, and what are essentially a range of transportables. So those facilities are not ideal.

As a government, we committed money to building a new high school next to TAFE and the University of South Australia in order to create an educational precinct. That school will have just over a thousand students. I went to Eyre High in Whyalla, and Eyre High alone—bear in mind that we have three high schools in Whyalla—had about 1,200 kids back in the 1970s and early 1980s.

A new high school in Whyalla will create a lot of opportunities not only because of its co-location with TAFE and the University of South Australia but because the greater critical mass will mean more students, more specialised services, more curriculum choice and more resources for those kids who have particular needs. We need to do this. It is a ridiculous situation in a community the size of Whyalla to have three public high schools.

Then there is the issue of the vacant sites. I have a few ideas about that, but I will share those at a later stage, as I want to talk about another issue. We went to the election with a proposal for a virtual power plant. I was particularly interested in that because I have a longstanding and active interest in ensuring that people on low incomes and in Housing SA properties get the advantage of having solar on their roof. Indeed, I put some costed proposals to the government at the time, after speaking directly with manufacturers to see how we could get the cost down for systems on roofs.

My proposal was to put three kilowatts on the roof of Housing SA properties in South Australia. The way I configured it, it would have been cost neutral over the life of the program. At the time, I said that the system should be battery enabled. My view was that batteries were still too expensive. But I would have to say that the virtual power plant proposal is a better proposal than the one I put to the government. It has a storage element, but the households do not get the full benefit of having a five-kilowatt system with a 13.5 kilowatt-hour battery because there is private sector investment. There will be private sector funding at the later stages, and the private sector will get a benefit from using the conglomerated storage to feed into the grid.

I know that the Liberal Party also went to the election with a battery proposal. However, the battery proposal from the Liberal Party would do absolutely nothing for people in Housing SA properties or people on low incomes who are in the private rental market. I think we have a moral responsibility to do something about that. The Liberal proposal is not a bad proposal. It is about providing the batteries, using some means testing and providing a subsidy for people who already have solar on their roofs. I think that the priority should be for those people who do not have solar on their roofs and are on low incomes and in Housing SA properties. As the government, you are now the landlord and you have a moral responsibility.

The program should be expanded to the private sector, to landlords who might be interested in enhancing their properties with solar and, potentially, batteries. It is people on low incomes who have been hit the hardest by electricity prices. On that subject, I was going to get on to the topic of the 13 remote communities who live out there and who are dependent on the Remote Areas Energy Supplies scheme. I believe that it is time to review that scheme.

Time expired.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (22:24): I rise tonight to speak to the Supply Bill 2018, which is the appropriation of \$6,631 million, or just over \$6½ billion, so that we can keep the functions of the Public Service operating, keep the functions of government operating and keep everyone paid until the budget is approved. The budget will be announced on 4 September (which personally is a significant date, but I will leave that out). This is standard practice. I heard in the contribution from the member for Lee, and from other members on the other side, the feigned shock and horror at this spending and how there is not a vast list of budget proposals for this money to go to.

Well, how short their memory is of the 16 terrible years they were in government. They cannot even remember how a supply bill works. Even those members who have been here for a couple of terms cannot remember. They know darn well how it works. This has been standard practice for decades and certainly for the 16 years under the previous Labor government. Yes, the numbers change. Of course the numbers change because in a non-election year the budget is laid down well before September, but obviously everything has to be put in place when there is a change of government, whether it is the Liberal Party or whether it is the Labor, and we did see a failed third force who thought they might be in government but over-reached by several miles. This is how it works, and I wanted to make those obvious statements.

We listened to the member for Lee and his vigorous contribution of several hours over a couple of days and he talked about transparent land deals. That is exactly what we should have in this place, but what did he and his government preside over when they were running this state? Gillman. What a disgrace that was. That was supposedly going to be some great oil and gas hub that was going to look after the interests of the Cooper Basin. Yes, I did work in the Cooper Basin, as did the Minister for Agriculture (member for Chaffey). Decades ago, I did a couple of years up there.

Yes, it is a noble aspiration to have a hub for oil and gas and to have somewhere to set up operations. They promised 6,000 jobs under this deal, this very shady deal, which fell apart. The only people who were employed in this whole operation were the lawyers who were trying to defend the previous government.

An honourable member: Pretty good jobs.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, pretty good jobs. So, so much for those 6,000 jobs that were supposedly going to come with the oil and gas industry. It does worry me when people come here trying to validate where they were in previous times.

I want to talk about health for a little while. I was on the Social Development Committee, and we looked into how regional health operated on an excellent reference put by the Minister for Energy and Mining (member for Stuart) in regard to how health advisory committees operated and the like.

The beauty of it is that we are going to change all that anyway, and we are going to put local health boards in. We are going to get health operating from the ground level because certainly from what I found from that committee and what I have heard throughout the community, health advisory councils, for whatever reason, did not know the full reach of the ambit within which they could operate, or they were purposely not told what their reach was.

There was a big claw of government with seven layers of bureaucracy, from the ground floor at the local level impacting right through to the minister. I had a classic example of that one day. A local bloke from Coomandook had lost his shaver in the Flinders Medical Centre. I thought that I would just write to Flinders to see if I could get his shaver back. Well, that was wrong.

I got a letter back from the minister at the time, the former member for Playford, and it said, 'No, you can't do that. That is a terrible thing.' I thought, 'Hell, I was hardly undermining the government by asking for a shaver.' I went through the process, wrote the ministerial and they actually put up the money for a shaver—but what a process—and we were talking about so-called transparency before with issues like Gillman.

I look at health and the lack of funding especially in regional hospitals, where we have a \$150 million backlog in maintenance funding that needs to happen, and the litany of Labor's failures especially with the building of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Someone who works for me was in there only last week and they spent three days in the emergency bay before they got to a ward.

When they got to the ward it was a nice single room, absolutely, but it was for one night. I talked about the food the other day so I do not need to repeat it—but it is disgusting.

I am not having a crack at the staff by any means. When I visited my employee the other night, a team leader caught hold of me because he could see I was trying to find the right way into emergency, because you have to go outside the main building to the car park and back through another door and it is not exactly clearly signed, and that person set me on the right track so they were very good.

The problem we have with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is that they were obviously planning it as they built it instead of spending the time to plan it appropriately, but because of their political ideals and their political aspirations they decided, 'No, we'll just rush it,' and there were so many flaws—tens of thousands of flaws. We have since found out that there is about a \$270 million blowout in health apart from other single line budgets, we have found that since coming into government.

There is a lot of work to do. I am proud of our minister in the other place, the Hon. Stephen Wade. He did an exemplary job in opposition and he is doing an exemplary job as a minister. From what I understand, in the very near future the works on the new emergency department at the Murray Bridge hospital will be under way. That was one of our election commitments, one of our 300 election commitments to this state.

I look at education where there is so much work to be done. Finally, we have got in and over time—and it will take time—we are going to bring year 7 out of primary school and into secondary school and actually catch up with the rest of the nation. For many travelling families—and we run into them even in a little town like my home town of Coomandook—they come from Western Australia, they come from Queensland and they work for local farmers and the like and travel around. They need education, but there is that blip when you are in primary school in one sector and secondary school in the other.

I acknowledge that health and education probably take up about 50 per cent of the state budget, which will be about \$19 billion this year, but it is vital that we get those services in play. I certainly understand this because in the conversations I have had in places like Murray Bridge High School (and I know I have another meeting coming up shortly) they are already concerned that they are pretty well at capacity. They are not concerned about the policy as such, they are just concerned about where they are going to fit the students. I have said to them that it is not going to happen immediately. We will work through that process, we will work through it diligently, and we will work through it appropriately so that we get the right things in place, especially the infrastructure that will have to go into place to put year 7 students into secondary school.

We have heard a bit about transport in this place over the last couple of days, as well as rural roads. Whether you are in the electorate of Flinders, Narungga, Mount Gambier, MacKillop or my electorate of Hammond, there are so many roads that have been let go. When the Labor Party was in government, instead of spending money on road funding they just dropped the speed limit. That is a great idea, especially if you are an almost outer suburban member like myself, still doing 60,000 kilometres a year, and then I look at the Deputy Speaker who probably does close to 100,000 and the member for Stuart, the Minister for Energy and Mining, who probably does 100,000 kilometres a year, apart from when he flies.

You have to get somewhere. It is all right to bring up the argument, 'We have to bring the speed down. We'll save so many lives,' and I have listened to the academics. I have seen what they have done between Murray Bridge and Mannum, between Murray Bridge and Langhorne Creek and Wellington. Those roads were slowed down about five years ago due to lack of infrastructure spending, to make sure they could sit at 110 km/h, but, 'Oh no, we'll just slow everything down because that is all the road is rated at now.'

Not long before the state election back in March there were eight specific roads across the state: two were in my electorate (for the last four years they were looked after by the member for Chaffey, the Minister for Agriculture), the Browns Well Highway and the Ngarkat Highway, and the other six roads were across the state. All of a sudden it was, 'No, we won't upgrade them. We'll just downgrade the speed limit.'

It gets more interesting because recently, before the election, and certainly in the case of the Browns Well Highway which has been a B-double route for quite a while, there was a desktop study done and, 'Oh well, we'll put it up for road train status.' I have no problem with that as far as the freight task goes. As far as the freight task goes I do not mind bigger vehicles, 36-metre vehicles taking on a load, but they have to be on roads that can handle it. I just do not agree that you can do a desktop study, with no inspection, and say, 'This is how we do it,' when not that much earlier the government had decreased the speed limit.

What happens when you have the end of a close to 36-metre vehicle? Sometimes they get up a bit of a wave and you do not have many centimetres of bitumen, and the next thing you are in the dirt. It is very dangerous for those big vehicles coming either way but also for smaller cars and four-wheel drives, etc., travelling on the road. I have written to our transport minister, the Hon. Stephan Knoll, to see if we can get shoulder sealing done, especially on the Browns Well Highway, because that is the main road train route now from Pinnaroo around to the Port. As I said, I have no problem with the freight task; it is just that we need to manage it appropriately and spend the money where we need to.

In regard to transport, we have had the great tragedy of what happened at Thomas Foods on 3 January. On this side of the house, we have kept up the commitment to make sure those workers from Murray Bridge can get transport through to Lobethal and back to Murray Bridge, especially the ones who finish at midnight. I commend Darren and Chris Thomas and their team, David McKay, for offering everyone a job bar the 417 visas, the backpackers. Everyone else, the 457s and the permanent workers, had the opportunity to still have work in Murray Bridge—and there are about 90 people working at the plant in the skin section and the rendering section—and about 400 have gone to Lobethal and quite a few have headed over to Tamworth. They have worked hard after a great industrial tragedy, and thankfully it was not a human tragedy.

The issue with getting access to Lobethal has been an interesting one for B-doubles. We have been seeking B-double access into Lobethal for seven years. It is a real tragedy that it took this industrial tragedy—a \$300 million-plus fire—to fix a problem that had been mullered over for seven years, and it was fixed in two weeks. We got B-double access into Lobethal. I acknowledge the Adelaide Hills Council and the Adelaide Hills community for embracing what had to happen so that those processing rates of sheep could be kept up.

A lot of the cattle have been shipped off to works the other side of Melbourne to try to keep up some of the Woolworths contracts, etc. But as far as I understand it, the processing of cattle is still down on those numbers, but with that double shift now at Lobethal sheep can be processed. I think it is in the Minister for Education's electorate, and it is a very good thing. I acknowledge that I have not always been friends with the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) but they got on board and got the clearances in place so that things could happen and get the building done. I praise all the workers who got the extra building in place so that those double shifts could happen.

In the few minutes I have left I want to talk about electricity supply in this state. It has been outrageous that the outlook of the previous government was all about green energy, and they forgot about the transition bit, which is absolutely serious. We saw the chaos of what happened. We were sitting in this place at 4.16pm on 28 September 2016 when the lights went out from Mount Gambier to Border Village. It was outrageous.

What was even more outrageous, as the member for Flinders, the Deputy Speaker, knows, there were issues with emergency generation in his electorate and there were issues with emergency generation at Flinders Hospital. It is sad that I have heard of similar problems at other hospitals when they have done tests recently. I think it was the new Royal Adelaide Hospital when they did a test of simple procedures like making sure that you can pump diesel through to the motor that is going to power the place.

This was outrageous. Yes, there was a storm event because of the absolute over-reliance on wind energy in this state—53 per cent of our energy is generated by renewables. Renewables are fine but we just have too many of them. For a few million dollars the government could have kept the Northern power station going. My father-in-law, who passed away a few years ago, would be

rolling in his grave. He used to work there and he would have been absolutely disgusted at what happened.

It was pleasing to hear the Minister for Energy and Mining, the member for Stuart, talk about the quotes from the former minister for energy, the member for West Torrens, in regard to interconnection. Before we came out with our policy of interconnection to New South Wales and put in the seed funding of \$200 million, the Labor Party was on board with the interconnection. They said that it is a great thing. We certainly have about 900 megawatts of interconnection through the Heywood interconnector and the Murraylink interconnector through to Victoria. It does great work. We can suck into coal in Victoria and New South Wales when we need it, and when our wind farms have stopped going and when the silo is not operating, then we can send the power back when they are operating.

The beauty of our interconnection policy will fix that up in the longer term with that mix. What we need is base load energy in the east and the overabundance of renewable energy in this state. It is a great thing to be on the side of the house and, after 12 years of being in opposition, I certainly understood when the Supply Bill came through. We were organised to speak on it. We knew what it was all about. We knew what the funding was for and we knew that the detail would come through in the budget bill. I commend the bill.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (22:44): I rise to speak to Supply Bill (No. 1) and, unsurprisingly, I support it. This is only my second address to the house and, silly me, I thought that when a government was asking me to vote for \$6.6 billion of taxpayer money that they might explain what they are going to spend it on. I do not really think it is that unreasonable, but clearly it is. That is fine, I am happy to let those opposite know how money has been wisely spent in my community in the time that I have been Labor's candidate and, of course, now the MP for Badcoe. I am happy to provide some constructive ideas of how the government might spend some of that \$6.6 billion that they are seeking.

I am very fortunate to be the first ever member for Badcoe. Badcoe covers an area that comprises 15 suburbs: Ashford, Keswick, Forestville, Black Forest (where I live), Everard Park, Clarence Park, Clarence Gardens, Glandore, South Plympton, North Plympton, Kurralta Park, Edwardstown, Ascot Park and parts of Millswood and Plympton. It is a pretty diverse area: diverse incomes, educational backgrounds, professions, ethnicities and ages and, of course, what comes with that is diverse needs.

Within its boundaries fall four separate councils and three federal electorates. While there are many differences between the people who live in this area, after doorknocking and calling a great number of the homes in Badcoe, some common themes shine through. These include improved community infrastructure, especially sporting and recreational, transport solutions to create better traffic flows and safer transport, and top quality public and private education. To that end, as a candidate I set about answering those needs.

The whole reason I left my job as a TV reporter was to put my name forward as Labor's candidate for the seat of Badcoe and to make a difference to my community not just to talk but to listen and deliver. I spoke with thousands of voters at tram and train stops, at schools, at sports games, shopping centres, at their doors and on the phone, all to glean the ideas that would make the most difference to my community. I worked in partnership with others to develop plans and cost projects and then lobby the state government to deliver what my community needed.

Chief among those projects, and among the first projects I delivered during my campaign, was the upgrade of the Goodwood Oval grandstand and clubrooms. Attending a Goody Saints game at the oval one Saturday, I checked out the facilities. What struck me most was not the ageing paint job, the worn carpet or even the musty smell, it was not the cupboard that passed for an office for the growing footy and cricket clubs and it was not even the fact that the bar had no view to the oval, meaning slow food and drink sales even on game days. It was the fact that there were no change rooms for girls and women.

I live just a few streets from Goodwood Oval and I would see girls getting dressed behind skip bins or shielded by car doors, and I remember having to do that myself in younger years when I was playing sport. There was no opportunity for them to have the locker room camaraderie that is

so much a part of footy and cricket culture. Yet there are more and more girls signing up to play sport, no doubt spurred on by seeing new heroes emerge on their TV screens—elite female athletes in the women's leagues of both footy and cricket who are every bit as tough as the boys.

So I set to work with my local clubs to devise some plans. Together, we ran petitions and surveys, doorknocked and called Millswood residents and got a good feel for the level of support among the clubs, and also the surrounding community, for upgrading this community infrastructure. We also got a good idea of some of the challenges and worked to address those, too. There had been unfunded plans to simply squeeze women's change rooms into the existing structure, but it was pretty obvious that that was not a long-term or even half decent solution. Any such funding would be a waste, with an ageing grandstand clubhouse which really needed replacing.

I am glad to say that I gained the community's support to lobby for a brand-new combined grandstand and clubhouse. All those petitions and surveys had an effect and the people in my community were heard. People like the member for West Torrens, the member for Mawson and the then premier, Jay Weatherill, realised the value of such an investment. They realised that it is not an investment in bricks and mortar so much as an investment in health, social cohesion and community building.

In this case, it is also an investment in gender inclusion. The fact that the new building will also be disability accessible for the first time means that it is also a win for sports people with a disability, including the C7 football competition, which is also played at the oval. Put simply, investing in sport is a winning strategy. With that understanding and the support of my party, \$2.5 million was secured under the Labor government for the new clubhouse.

A personal highlight of my campaign was breaking the wonderful news to the passionate and hardworking Goodwood Roos Cricket Club and the Goodwood Saints Football Club, their members, volunteers and fans, because it was something that they had long wanted but long been told was too lofty a dream. Now it was coming true. I am glad that this funding was committed by the Weatherill government in the current budget. It is an investment that will deliver for many years. Planning is now well underway and I look forward to seeing work begin at the site later this year.

The cherry on top was getting Fund My Neighbourhood funding at the oval just a few months later. The cricket and footy clubs rallied community support and online votes to get a new electronic scoreboard, a barbecue and cricket sight screens. Once again, the local community got behind the clubs and they triumphed, scoring several thousand dollars extra. I would like to acknowledge the work of Craig Scott and Jason Scroop at their respective clubs for putting their faith in me to listen to them and to deliver for our community, and the committee members who are now driving it forward in partnership with the Office for Recreation and Sport and Unley council. I would also like to recognise the efforts of all those club members and local residents who got on board.

This is just one of more than 20 projects secured for Badcoe in the past 15 months. I will take you through a few of them—not all of them, do not worry; just a few of them. We will have plenty of time over the next four years to talk about all of them. The \$9 million new sports hub at the Women's Memorial Playing Fields means that for the first time Forestville Hockey Club will be able to train and play on a competition grade synthetic pitch.

Again, I worked with one of our great local sporting clubs to gauge and then demonstrate community support for this investment at St Mary's. Although the hub itself is outside my electorate, it benefits many residents of my community who are members of the Forestville Hockey Club. I was happy to partner with the then member for Elder, Annabel Digance, and the then member for Waite, Martin Hamilton-Smith, who both worked hard over many years to achieve this new facility. I pay tribute to their efforts to get this great result for our communities. The new sports hub at the Women's Memorial Playing Fields also frees up valuable open space at Goodwood Oval for other people in Badcoe to enjoy. The City of Unley is particularly short on public space, so this is a great result.

Another idea that those opposite might like to consider when deciding what to spend that \$6.6 billion on is, in partnership with the energetic team at the Millswood Bowling Club, I managed to secure \$70,000 for new women's change rooms. Currently, the 1950s-built toilets are right next to the kitchen, and in fact members of the public need to walk through the kitchen to reach the toilets.

This is another great investment in women's sport. Both pennants and the growing and very popular social competition known as Night Owls will benefit from it.

A total of \$1.2 million was also provided to Weigall Oval for a massive overhaul of those ageing and underutilised facilities, in partnership with the City of West Torrens. That project will be delivered in three phases—so it goes into the next budget year as well—and it includes a reconfigured baseball diamond and soccer pitches, a new clubhouse and a new nature playground, which is currently under construction.

Also, under Labor's highly successful fund for synthetic pitches, which I hope those opposite might continue, Cumberland United soccer will play on a new surface soon at AA Bailey Reserve at Clarence Gardens. That fund was largely driven by the member for West Torrens, and I commend him on that work and the wonderful results it is providing for soccer, one of our most popular grassroots sports.

I am also proud that by listening to local people we managed to deliver \$8,000 for the restoration of a World War I 18-pounder gun for the volunteer-run Army Museum of South Australia at Keswick and, my favourite, two new air-conditioning units, for Active Elders and the Lions Club at Ascot Park. Those two projects cost not a lot of money, but they make a lot of difference in my community.

There are many more projects, which I would be happy to detail to members at any time and which I hope to have the opportunity to elaborate on at some point in the future. But there is a lot more to be done, and when members opposite think about what they might do with that \$6.6 billion that they are asking for, they may like to consider some of these things. I hope that they do consider them; they would be of great benefit to my community.

Had Labor been elected at the 2018 election, we would have delivered further vital infrastructure improvements to this growing and diverse community in Badcoe. There would have been the removal of three level crossings, at Plympton Park, Goodwood and Westbourne Park; the upgrade of Kesmond Reserve at Keswick; the upgrade of Dumbarton Avenue Reserve at Edwardstown to ensure it can be used by young families with kids as well as dog owners; and \$3.5 million for a new school hall for Richmond Primary School, an incredibly popular and well overdue plan.

There would have been a new children's centre at Plympton, one of several new centres—I hope those opposite have a look at that policy, which builds on the successful centres that have already been delivered by Labor—and \$25,000 for upgraded women's change rooms for the Southern Suburbs Rugby Union Club at AA Bailey Reserve in Clarence Gardens, which is a pretty small price to pay for girls and women to be able to play a sport they love in safety, security and comfort. May I mention the very long record of achievement by the women's side. They have won several consecutive premierships now.

The people of Badcoe did vote for Labor quite convincingly. Obviously they were voting for a strong local member who will listen to them and stand up for them, but they were also voting for these local commitments, too. Mums and dads were voting for the much-needed new school hall at Richmond Primary. Dog lovers and parents alike were voting for the Dumbarton Avenue Reserve upgrade at Edwardstown. Families, especially those who need a little extra support, were voting for the new children's centre at Plympton, and the Keswick community was voting for an upgrade of Kesmond Reserve, a focal point for local recreation.

As I mentioned, rugby union players and fans, and for that matter supporters of women's sport, were voting for the new change rooms at Clarence Gardens, and pretty much everyone was voting for the level crossings to be removed, especially at Plympton Park but also at Westbourne Park and Goodwood for the safety and faster traffic flow, particularly in peak hours.

Nothing I have said this evening should come as any surprise to those opposite. I have written to the Premier, outlining the concerns of my community that these important improvements, which they voted for, may go by the wayside under this government. However, I am surprised that although I wrote to the Premier over a month ago so far I have not received as much as an acknowledgement letter. I hope that this is not a sign of how the Premier and his government intend to deal with electors in Badcoe. I hope for a response, and a positive one at that, in the near future.

I would also like to see the state government release the next round of Fund My Neighbourhood funding and indeed continue that funding in the next financial year. This was a very popular funding program, and electorates represented by those opposite benefited as well. It has activated communities to build their own argument for funding their own local ideas. It was not about the government telling communities what they should have: it was about communities deciding that for themselves. There were about 30 applications pitched by individuals and community groups across Badcoe, and there were some really great, original ideas.

As I mentioned, under the Fund My Neighbourhood program the cricket and footy clubs based at Goodwood Oval achieved a new electronic scoreboard, barbecue and cricket sight screens. But I was also happy to work with people like Dana Bell, a mum in Clarence Gardens, to rally community support for a new nature play playground at the AA Bailey Recreation Ground at Clarence Gardens, a very popular spot, and I was delighted to support Edwardstown Primary School's bid for a nature playground of their own.

It was a joy to attend their very successful annual strawberry fair. Make sure you go there with an empty belly, because it is full of yummy treats. I went there to see that parents and kids had chalked just about every wall and every path, urging fairgoers to vote for their Fund My Neighbourhood project, and obviously that was successful, because they managed to score the money.

I was also delighted to help secure a new playground and veggie patch for Ascot Park Primary School. Many children in Badcoe attend that primary school. I commend the work of that school community to improve their facilities. The veggie patch will feature fruits and vegetables and herbs in cuisines from all over the world, reflecting the very diverse ethnic backgrounds of the children at that school. It will also be disability-accessible, which is wonderful for kids and adults of all mobilities. I would also like to draw members' attention to the investments in education, investing in the education of Badcoe students under Labor's \$690 million Building Better Schools fund.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms STINSON: Hear, hear! Five million dollars is being spent as we speak at Black Forest Primary School. The designs for those improvements have been completed and are very impressive. The plans propose upgrades to existing buildings to create facilities and to accommodate growth and establish a science and technology learning area. The Keertaweeta Building is also planned to be extended to provide new learning areas, and a refurbishment of the administration and reception areas is planned along with the removal of existing sheds and transportable buildings which, unfortunately, contain asbestos.

Three million dollars was secured for new buildings at Plympton International College. Planning is underway at that college as the first stage of their Building Better Schools upgrade and, again, the designs are quite impressive. The plans propose to improve the linkages between learning areas, and upgrade art and drama and general learning spaces, the resource centre and also to provide a year 12 study area. The changes will better meet the needs of students, with a focus on flexible learning, especially using digital learning resources. Other areas for proposed redevelopment include the gym.

Further plans to upgrade outdoor learning areas are underway as well, and it is also proposed to relocate the student lockers, install window shading and remove, once again, asbestos from that school. Pasadena High has received \$10 million. Their plans propose to refurbish selected core buildings, including the performing arts centre, the special education unit and all courtyards. It is proposed that the new sports, science, technology, engineering and maths centre is constructed and linked to the existing gym. New and enhanced sensory outdoor learning spaces specific to students with special needs are also planned, along with a new entry canopy to enhance the public presentation of the school.

Although Plympton International and Pasadena High fall just outside Badcoe's boundaries, hundreds of Badcoe children attend those schools, and I have a strong interest in ensuring they are well funded and equipped with the infrastructure needed for a high standard of schooling. There has been speculation that this government will pare back or divert the Building Better Schools funding, but for the sake of my constituents I hope that does not happen.

Badcoe schools have also been improved, or are currently being improved, thanks to the STEM Works program. Plympton Primary School, Richmond Primary School and Forbes Primary School have each received \$1 million for new STEM classrooms. I was happy to visit each of these schools with the then minister for education, Susan Close, and check out the work that is underway. I would of course invite our current Minister for Education to come and visit those schools and see what they are doing. There is some very innovative work at those schools.

Science, technology, engineering and maths, or STEM, is a sector where we know there will be future jobs. We want our young people to have the skills and the passion for those professions and trades; that is, both for their own career satisfaction and also, of course, for our state's economy. Sadly, there is an underrepresentation of women in STEM. The provision of these specialist classrooms to all children, as well as many other Labor initiatives to open doors for girls in STEM—which I hope those opposite will continue—will make a difference to levelling the playing field in future.

I hope that those opposite will reflect on some of these great investments in the Badcoe community and the proposals that we have put forward that still require funding. I hope that you will support them. They are good ideas and they are things that are really popular in my community. I hope that has given you a bit of inspiration as to how you might spend the \$6.6 billion that you are asking for in the Supply Bill. As I mentioned earlier, I support the bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (23:04): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for the opportunity to address the house on the issue of supply. As has already been indicated, the opposition supports the Supply Bill for a whole range of practical reasons. However, I think it provides an important opportunity for members of the opposition to be able to articulate the substantial and serious concerns that we have in regard to the conduct of this government, but, more importantly, the agenda they seem to be pursuing in some areas and the complete lack of agenda in others.

In fact, I do not think it is too great a stretch to draw the house's attention to the fact that this bill and the actions of this government thus far and their agenda, or lack thereof, speak to a bit of a crisis that is emerging within the conservative side of politics throughout the Western world. I think it is fair to say that we have seen a changing environment occur rapidly over recent years in a way that is seeing a fundamental shift in people's perception of what makes an economy work, not for an economy's sake but in the interests of the people that exist within it.

With regard to the Supply Bill, one would ordinarily hope that there would be a far greater degree of detail when it comes to the expenditure of in excess of \$6 billion, but in this instance it is sadly lacking, which leads one to speculate. I want to start with arguably the most important area of public expenditure and that is, of course, the area of health. We know all too well that health expenditure now equates to upwards of 30 per cent of the entirety of the state budget, a figure that is growing. That figure is growing for a whole range of reasonable reasons, not least of which is an ageing population.

When it comes to health policy from this government, I think it can be characterised in the following way. Health policy, on behalf of this new government, is either an act of compliance or an act of imitation. There does not seem to be too much else in there. I heard, with great interest earlier this evening, the member for Newland talking about the new government's policy with respect to Modbury Hospital. Not surprisingly, it is the case that the Modbury Hospital policy of the new government is in fact exactly the same as the former government's health policy in regard to capital upgrades. The member for Newland was right to point out that there is a planned dramatic investment in palliative care services in that area.

Why did the former government commit itself to that endeavour? Because it was an area of need that deserved additional improvement—likewise with other areas of investment that have been at Modbury Hospital in a way that is consistent with that community's interests. The only point of difference that exists in the case of Modbury Hospital is on the question of the high dependency units, something I am sure will be explored in far greater detail as clinicians start to increasingly express their views around that proposition.

There is the \$270 million commitment that the former government made regarding The QEH. Another example is the investment that was being made in Country Health. Added up, all of these investments talk to a massive overhaul of our public infrastructure within our public health system in a way that was entirely consistent with clinical advice and in the interests of the South Australian community.

What is lacking from the government at the moment, though, is a coherent policy in a whole range of other areas that South Australians are rightly concerned about. If I were to pick one example, it would be in the issue of meningococcal B. The former government took a policy to the last election to make meningococcal B vaccinations free for all South Australian families with children under the age of two. Children under the age of two were going to get access to free meningococcal B vaccinations.

This government has treated this question rather flippantly thus far. They have imitated us on some areas, but not on this one, and it begs the question why. It begs the question of what their priorities are, when it comes to not just health policy but a whole range of other health policies within the community. There is a growing body of evidence that speaks to this now becoming a substantial and important desire within the South Australian community.

It is not true to say that no South Australian families can get access to the meningococcal B vaccination. That is not true. In fact, a great number can, but only those who can afford it. It can cost a South Australian family somewhere in the order of \$500 per child to vaccinate them against meningococcal B and, of course, what we know on this side of the chamber is that that cost can be prohibitive for a lot of low and middle income South Australian families, which means that their kids do not get vaccinated against meningococcal B while others do.

We believe on this side of the chamber that one's income should not be the sole variable that determines whether or not your kid is going to be vulnerable to contracting meningococcal B, which we know has a disproportionately larger representation of incidents occurring in South Australia than in any other state within the country. This is something that is worth pursuing, and what have we heard from this government thus far? What has their action been? A committee, a committee about a policy that has already been fully costed and that is ready to be delivered. This government seems determined to take no action, maybe because, of course, they do not want to imitate the former government too much.

Then, of course, there is education policy. Education policy is probably one of the issues closest to the hearts of all members on this side of the house, myself included, because education is ultimately the most powerful lever we have to tackle growing income inequality within our community. There are other areas of policy that can be powerful in this regard—taxation policy, for instance, and I will come to that in a moment. But education is fundamental, and we know that education infrastructure in our communities, particularly in public schools, can have a material impact on educational outcomes.

We know that, which is why the former government had a substantial policy to commit over \$600 million worth of funds towards upgrading infrastructure in our public school system. We are concerned that some of that expenditure will end up being compromised going to the areas of the greatest need because of this government's policy around the moving of year 7. The movement of year 7 and the adjustments that are being proposed by the government in this regard are being talked about as being a priority to bring us in line with other mainland states, but that is not a body of evidence within and of itself.

What we want to see as an opposition, and certainly what we pursued in government, is delivering on education policies that we know make a material difference in terms of educational outcomes. A proposition that will see infrastructure being utilised in a way that achieves a political end, rather than actually achieving something that is demonstrated by evidence as being the most worthwhile investment, is a question worthy of pursuit.

Furthermore, we stand proud of our record, particularly around investment in STEM resources in our public school system. Programs are getting rolled out throughout the community as we speak, and I am sure that the new education minister will be gleefully cutting the ribbons on all the projects that Labor invested in over the years that are being rolled out.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader, excuse me. The Leader will be heard in silence, thank you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That takes me to another program because we were not just investing in infrastructure in public schools. We were also investing in infrastructure out in the community generally. Infrastructure is a fundamentally important policy of a government that is serious about not taking its hands off the wheel. This goes to the crisis that is emerging within the conservative side of politics around the appropriate actions for a government to take when it comes to economic policy.

We on this side of the house take a more modern view than the neoclassical or far right agenda, that governments actually do have a legitimate role to play within an economy, particularly an economy that wants to prioritise job growth, which has clearly been a need in this state on the back of the destructive efforts on behalf of a conservative federal government driving industry out of this town.

We took the view that it is appropriate in those circumstances to invest in the economy and government playing a role—a more traditional Keynesian approach, which we now know amongst economists is coming back into fashion at a cracking pace. We demonstrated how serious we were about infrastructure with extraordinary investments, productive investments in infrastructure that did not just provide jobs just during the course of construction but, more importantly, continued to provide jobs throughout our economy.

To give an example, I want to talk about the iconic Adelaide Oval investment. Adelaide Oval was a classic example of a piece of economic infrastructure investment which provided jobs at the time but which is continuing to provide jobs today long after that construction was completed. The most gleeful part of the Adelaide Oval example is that we know how passionately and viciously that infrastructure investment was opposed by the now government or by the conservative side of politics.

Likewise, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital was fundamentally opposed by the conservative side of politics and, despite some teething issues with that hospital, which will be ironed out in due course due to the hard work of the men and women who work within that great institution and facility, we will have a fantastic piece of capital infrastructure within the health system that will continue to see a growing number of productive jobs, particularly around research in and around that hospital.

There are a whole range of other examples of great investments in infrastructure made by the former government: duplication of the Southern Expressway; what we have already seen take place around South Road, Darlington; and Torrens to Torrens. Of course, these are the greatest examples, but there were even others before that with the Anzac Highway underpass.

Infrastructure remains an incredibly important piece of public policy. We will be an opposition that goes about holding this government to account very closely on what it is doing on infrastructure. There are a lot of people within the industry who are already raising concerns with this opposition, raising concerns with me as the Leader of the Opposition, about the lack of a coherent policy and a pipeline of work on behalf of this new government.

I want to raise one area where I am willing to applaud the new government in the event that they are able to deliver on what the new minister has committed himself to, that is, the Pym to Regency component of the South Road north-south corridor expressway. This was an investment that our former government put to Infrastructure Australia. A business case was submitted and the funds were lined up. It was work that was largely designed by the former government, but the new government has indicated that it will deliver on that. They have set a strict time line for themselves to do that on which we will hold them to account, but this is an important investment.

I want to raise Pym to Regency because it is in the electorate that is the most important in the state—that is, the seat of Croydon. I put on the record my desire for the new infrastructure minister to get back to my office with regard to a meeting request that was put in some time ago to address the issue of the Croydon Kings soccer club, otherwise known as Polonia—I suspect the new member for Waite will take an interest in this particular club as well—to make sure that their concerns

around what will happen to their parcel of land are addressed during the course of that redevelopment.

Industry policy, though, relates to infrastructure policy, and this new government has made clear what is their industry policy: do nothing. I am concerned that that is resulting in jobs and opportunities being missed out by this state, Google being a good example of this. This new government seems to think that writing a letter to Google will somehow attract them here. We believe that it takes more than that. One does not want to be sitting on their hands and not acting aggressively when it comes to an opportunity like this, yet this government seems hellbent on an industry policy that is a hands off the wheel approach, something that we do not believe in and something that we think should be contested. I dare say there are a number of other business opportunities that we are missing out on in this context.

Taxation policy is something that all Labor people care about very deeply, particularly in the context of rising income inequality within our community, which is an economic scourge that many western economies are dealing with. Taxation policy ultimately, though, is about getting a balance. We on this side of the house place a higher value on minimising the tax burden for those people who have the least capacity to pay. Capacity to pay should always be a variable when it comes to decision-makers' thought processes around how taxation policy should apply.

That is something that has contributed to the opposition's willingness to commit itself to the payroll tax reductions that have been proposed by the government. We have offered them a bipartisan approach in reducing that, because we have already demonstrated our credentials when it comes to reducing payroll tax—something that the former government did with a great degree of endeavour and delivered real results for small businesses in this state. If there is a capacity under the new budget to provide for further accommodation of small businesses, that is something that we support.

Something that has been consistently raised by the government thus far, though, in regard to tax policy is a reference to the emergency services levy. I note that the member for Giles was bang on in pointing out the fact that adjustments to the emergency services levy did not occur in a vacuum. They occurred because of a draconian act by a federal government not honouring their promises and instead deciding to cut health and education in a way that was incredibly substantial. I cannot tell you how proud I was only a few nights ago to hear the federal Leader of the Opposition committing himself to going a long way to restoring some of the funds to health and education that were cut by the Hockey-Abbott government's 2014 state budget. This is a good thing to do.

It will be very interesting to see how this new government acts in regard to that proposition. What will the new Premier and the new Treasurer do when they are faced with the opportunity of having a Labor government elected at federal level that will hand this state government more money in order to be able to deliver important health and education services? Will they support the federal Labor Party in their policy proposition to restore that funding, or will they back in Prime Minister Turnbull and his \$65 billion worth of cuts to their mates in the banking sector and the top end of town?

We on this side of the house think the choice is clear at the next federal election, which is an important one not just because of federal policy in this regard but because of the policy decisions that will be made by this new government. Are they going to be a government that sides with giving tax cuts to the big banks after everything they have demonstrated they are able to do? Or are they going to side with a federal party of government that is willing to restore some of the funding cuts that resulted in the ESL adjustments in the first place? That is a question that we as an opposition are very much looking forward to putting to the people of South Australia.

I note the limited time I have left, so I will address one last issue in regard to policy questions that are before us. It relates to the area of SafeWork and their area of jurisdiction and how money has already been expended by this new government in policing small businesses in a way that is adding to their red tape burden. It goes to the question of shop trading hours. We are going to be talking about shop trading hours a lot over coming months.

I note with great interest that the new government, despite all their fanfare, despite all the 16 years of preparation they have had around this issue, still have not brought into the parliament

the new legislation regarding shop trading hours. That begs the question: why not? Where is the legislation? Where is the bill? What are they waiting for? They have been talking about it for 16 years. They think everybody is on their side, yet we have not seen the bill.

That in itself adds a degree of intrigue. It is not as much intrigue as that around 'notegate' and 'doughnutgate' and all the other 'gates' that are being applied to all but one minister. Nevertheless, there is a degree of intrigue. I look forward to this government honouring their commitment and bringing this bill into the parliament, because it is going to provide one hell of a contest around who stands for what when it comes to small or large businesses in this state.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.A.W. Gardner.

At 23:25 the house adjourned until Thursday 17 May 2018 at 11:00.