

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 1 May 2013

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON A REVIEW OF THE RETIREMENT VILLAGES ACT 1987

**Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (11:01):** I move:

That the committee has leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: WAYVILLE RAILWAY STATION PROJECT

**Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (11:02):** I move:

That the 475<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Wayville Railway Station Project, be noted.

The committee has received a proposal to construct a new railway station at Wayville to provide improved facilities for commuters and meet necessary disabled standards. The cost of the project is \$16.5 million. The Wayville railway station project is being undertaken as part of the rail revitalisation project and will be located approximately 3.9 kilometres from Adelaide on the Seaford line.

The Wayville railway station will replace the nearby Keswick station and remove the need to construct a temporary station facility for the Royal Adelaide Show at the Wayville Showgrounds each year. The Wayville railway station will incorporate the following elements:

- architecturally-designed canopy shelters;
- platforms designed to minimise the step and gap between platforms and trains;
- overpass with lift and stairs;
- closed-circuit television surveillance;
- real-time passenger information display systems on each platform to inform customers about train arrival times;
- a central network-link public address system to facilitate real-time passenger information announcements;
- and an emergency telephone centrally located on each platform.

The project will be completed by November 2013. Given this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:05):** Whilst the opposition members of the committee, and indeed the opposition, support this project, there were some matters raised during the course of the deliberations which I think need further examination. Opposition members remain far from convinced that money was not spent on this project before it had been approved by the committee. Government officers did not convince the member for Waite, nor myself, that this had not happened; how we get to the bottom of it, I am not quite sure. There are obviously channels that can be gone down to ascertain that, and that is something we will have to think through.

The project itself is a good one, and it will be a good facility when it is finished, but I am concerned that, despite the fact that officers indicated that there had not been money spent, and given the fact that there was other funding in it, work had indeed not taken place prior to the committee meeting a couple of weeks ago. So, with those few words, I support the project but just raise those issues.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert appears to be hailing a bus, and I shall reward him with the call.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:06):** Thank you, sir. It might be a sign of the times. I just want to briefly support this report and commend the—

*The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** Well, I might be open to offers later on. You never know—I only have 10 months left in this place. Irrespective of what the member for Finnis just said, and that is a bit of concern, I still think the concept is good because there always used to be train services there, but now to have a dedicated station I think is a wonderful thing and an extra asset that the show society certainly would appreciate. As a member of the show society, I think it can only—

**Mr Williams:** You've got a conflict.

**Mr VENNING:** I could have a conflict, yes, I suppose; I have to declare that. I am a life member of the Royal Show society, and it will be one of those things I will be certainly pursuing when I leave this place. It is something to do. People have asked me, 'What are you going to do when you retire?' That will be one of them, for sure, because it is a fantastic place where the city meets the country, or the country greets the city, and it is great for the education process and keeping the two sides of our community and the communication channels open.

There is nothing better than the week of the Royal Show and all the other events that go on there during the year. It is used more and more all the time, and to have it link by the railway and—dare I say, although I have not read the report fully—there also may be an opportunity here for park-and-ride to work, as there is a lot of space in the showground that is not used all the time. As long as people realised that they could not have regular parking, because when they had functions they would have to again claim the space, there might be an opportunity for people to park their car or even heavy vehicle and catch the train into the city. So, certainly I will read this report with interest and commend the committee.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:08):** I support this project. I think it is another improvement to the current rail network and system and, despite what some people say from time to time, given our population size and the spread of housing and so on I think we have a pretty good rail system, and it is only going to get even better with the electrification of certain lines. I understand that, with the creation of this Wayville railway station, the existing Keswick suburban passenger station will no longer exist. That has always been a bit of an issue, and this new proposal will not address it.

It is not easy for people to access the Parklands rail terminal, as it is called now (the country terminal and now interstate rail terminal), and it will not be any easier under this new proposal. In fact, the Wayville railway station will be even further away from the Parklands railway terminal. The old Keswick railway station had an incredible number of steps and I do not know how anyone, certainly anyone who was getting on in years, could get up those steps with their case and then go around onto the road to access the Overland or any other interstate trains.

As the member for Schubert pointed out, I think this is a great initiative. I am also a member of the Royal Agricultural & Horticultural Society and any improved facility based on public transport is to be commended. I urge people in Adelaide to make greater use of public transport for functions such as those at the show. I think this new project will certainly help with that, and I look forward to its completion.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Ashford, whose electorate this development is in, I believe.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:10):** Yes, sir. As the member for Ashford I certainly wish to speak on this particular proposal which I think is a really important proposal. Since I have been the member for the area there have been discussions amongst the Adelaide City Council, the Unley council and the West Torrens council in particular about how we can maximise the access or the gateway into the city and also away from the city.

There has been a number of issues, particularly regarding the corner of Anzac Highway and Greenhill Road. We have had a number of meetings about people being able to not only drive cars and vehicles along those roads but also access for people in gophers—this has been a big issue—and access for people who ride bikes, pedestrians, people with different mobility problems, and also people who are pushing pushers or prams. There are a lot of difficulties with the footpaths let alone the roads on that particular corner.

As the member for Fisher has just said, there were also a number of issues raised about the Keswick access. I am really pleased to see that in the proposal for the Wayville railway station there is a lot of consideration being given to the access issue—the overpass and the lifts—and also safety. That area can be very difficult when riding a bike there because of the lack of lighting. It has improved over the years but certainly this is an area that needs to be addressed.

I am also a member of the Royal Agricultural & Horticultural Society—a very proud member—and one day, when I have enough money, I hope to be a life member. It is a very important part of the electorate. Even if I was not the member for Ashford, I would think that the Royal Agricultural & Horticultural Society plays a very important role in our community. I can only echo the comments that have been made by the member for Schubert because I also believe that it is a really important forum where the city and the country can meet.

We are very blessed now to have the farmers' market on a Sunday, which is extremely successful and very well attended. There are a number of events that now take place at the Showgrounds because of that improved venue. I think people probably know that that particular spot also has what I think is now the largest photovoltaic provision in the Southern Hemisphere. It is looking at recycled water and is as green as it can be, and there are many plans to make sure that that space is used to its full extent.

Personally, I am a big fan of the roller derby girls. There are a number of young people, in particular, who are very keen to support what would seem to be an unusual sport but the roller derby people also make sure that they sponsor live music, so there is a live music aspect connected to that particular function. Perhaps when I retire from this place, like the member for Schubert, I can spend more time with the Royal Agricultural & Horticultural Society and perhaps there is a roller derby future there for me as well.

The other point that I just wanted to make is that the functions that are being held at the Showground, like Glendi, for example, have been very successful. I know that there are a number of functions. Event management at Wayville is quite extensive. There are also some plans coming up, because as the member for Schubert said, not all the spaces are used all year, so there is a lot of consideration being given to the Royal Show committee to make sure that the spaces are maximised but, again, protecting the very wonderful time that I think Adelaide and certainly people in South Australia love, which is the actual show time as well.

It is important that this project goes ahead. I understand the comments that were made by the member for Finniss with regard to process. I am not sure if I agree with those points, but certainly at the moment Ashford is a building site. We have the rail vitalisation project going on, we have the greenways project going on, and we have got the stormwater project happening all at the same time. So, I would be very pleased, as I am sure the residents would be, if this project is finished in November this year. Although we will miss the show this year, certainly next year we should have things moving to maximise the use of the Wayville rail station project. I hope that this house sees fit to support the project and get it moving as soon as possible.

Motion carried.

## **WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT**

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:17):** I move:

That the following codes of practice made under the Work Health and Safety Act 2012, entitled Construction Work Code of Practice; Preventing Falls in Housing Construction Code of Practice; and Safe Design of Structures Code of Practice, made in July 2012 and laid on the table of this house on 19 February 2013, be disallowed.

The work health and safety legislation was a very controversial piece of legislation which eventually passed through this parliament late last year. You may recall, and I am sure members do recall, that the legislation was promoted as harmonisation legislation to give us standard legislation across the nation. The result is that nothing could be further from the truth. We have a hotchpotch of legislation in various jurisdictions. Some have passed parts of legislation and some have not done anything. In South Australia the parliament has largely passed the legislation as was presented. There were, I believe, some amendments.

Notwithstanding that, one of the significant concerns about the legislation was the adoption of codes of practice, a plethora of codes of practice around the legislation, and that is why I am bringing this matter to the attention of the house today. We know that in South Australia—and this is endemic across the nation, but it is probably even more so in South Australia—the housing industry is in the doldrums, and there are a number of reasons for that. The economy is quite flat and people have little confidence to go out and invest in new houses. One of the problems that we have seen in the housing industry in recent years is escalating costs, and it is becoming very difficult, particularly for first home owners, to go out and stump up a deposit and take on the risk of building a new home.

The Housing Industry Association informs the opposition that it believes that the introduction of these three codes will add to the cost of an average house built in South Australia somewhere between \$10,000 and \$12,000. It beggars my imagination (and I am sure other members would agree): what an amazing thing to do, when we have a housing construction industry literally on its knees. The state economy is struggling, and we would then impose an additional cost of \$10,000 to \$12,000 per house. That is why the opposition has great sympathy with the position of the Housing Industry Association and has agreed to move the disallowance of these codes in this and the other place.

I mentioned the work, health and safety legislation and its lengthy debate in this place. During the debate it is my understanding—and certainly was the understanding of the Housing Industry Association—that classes 1 and 10 buildings would be exempt from these particular codes. Class 1 is a standard dwelling, a house (in which most of us probably live), and class 10 is generally a shed, garage and/or a fence associated with a residential house. It was the understanding of the Housing Industry Association and the housing industry, I believe, that exemptions would be made for those two classes from these codes.

The exemption is because the height restrictions before which you would need to take particular measures under these codes, like having scaffolding, etc., is two metres. It was an understanding—and the Housing Industry Association believed was an agreement—that those restrictions would not come into place until the height of three metres, and that is where they believe the additional costs would come in. To provide full scaffolding on the construction site of a standard dwelling to my mind, and certainly to the mind of the Housing Industry Association and the industry, is a nonsense and flies in the face of many years of practice.

The three codes that I mentioned include not just the construction code but also the design code. The issue with the design code is that under that code the designer must prepare a report on health and safety risks, and that must be in writing and provided to the person who has commissioned the design, and generally that would be the mum and dad building the home. The Housing Industry Association believes that that in itself would add about \$2,000 to the cost of building a home. Previously the national code, to which South Australia had agreed, was to exempt classes 1 and 10 buildings from these obligations. I understand the code, as tabled, has no exemption for classes 1 and 10 buildings.

The construction code again is a code of practice, which generally is about construction on major construction sites—multistorey apartment buildings, high-rise residential and/or commercial buildings. It assumes that it is a significant construction site and it has a static workforce, that is, there will be a group of workers on that construction site who are there for maybe many months. The code would require certain amenities to be provided on the site, for example, hot and cold water, washing facilities, more than one toilet, toilets with air locks, and dining room facilities.

It requires the registration of persons onto and off the site each day, the display of evacuation procedures, emergency lighting, etc., all of which one would agree would be totally inappropriate for the average house construction site, which I think would be characterised by a group of subcontractors arriving on almost an ad hoc basis, from my observation.

You will get the electrician in one day and he might come back a couple of days later. You will get the plumber coming in to do the initial plumbing work before the foundations are poured, and then coming back and doing some further work and doing the final fix towards the end of the process. It is not the sort of project that is envisaged by the construction code and it seems a nonsense that the obligations under the construction code should be imposed on such construction work.

The Housing Industry Association has a number of concerns—as I said, the opposition is very sympathetic towards those—not the least of which is that the industry believes that it had an agreement with the government that these exemptions would be provided when the codes were tabled, following the passage of the legislation in the upper house. So, not only is the industry concerned about the cost impost, the industry and the opposition are very concerned that there was seemingly an agreement for these exemptions to be provided and yet that agreement does not seem to have been upheld or fulfilled by the government.

I urge members of the house to think on this matter and consider it very seriously. Can we in South Australia afford to impose a further \$10,000 to \$12,000 on the construction cost of an average residential home? I think we would all agree that the answer to that is no. Can we afford as a parliament to have legislation pass with the acceptance of an industry association, where they

believe that certain undertakings have been given, only to find out after the legislation has been passed that those undertakings are not fulfilled? I think the answer to that question again is no. I urge the house to seriously consider the matter I have brought before it today and to support my motion.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:27):** Just briefly, I rise to support the member for MacKillop particularly in the matter he has brought forward and it does strike a chord. I think most members of this house would agree with most or a lot of what he said. The Work Health and Safety Act passed here; that was bad enough. It did pass with some dispute between both houses, but then of course we saw the codes of practice come in, and they are really adding huge costs and are damping down a key industry vital to our state economy.

We know that when the housing industry is getting a cold, the rest of the state gets pneumonia. This instance, as the member for MacKillop very capably said, is just exactly the wrong legislation at the wrong time. We just do not need this. This is the ultimate addition to red tape, bureaucracy, and causing delays and extra cost to projects. We know that it will cost between \$10,000 and \$12,000 extra per house. No wonder that young people—first homebuyers—are having difficulty being able to afford their house. They need to be helped, not hindered.

Unions and, indeed, their inspectors have been given huge powers in this legislation, and these powers seem to get worse every day. We all talk about it; we all hear about it. We are all trying to cut red tape. We make great speeches in grand places about this matter, but what do we do about it? Nothing, and here we are just making it a lot worse.

The issue of scaffolding, particularly, affects a lot of us, particularly farmers. I am a great person for using stepladders. I have spent half my life up a stepladder, and I have fallen off one once or twice; in fact, I ended up in hospital with one, and that was my own silly fault. I think it is ridiculous to know that the rules are that, if you are living especially in a government house, if the light is further than two metres from the floor, you cannot use a stepladder; you have to go and get a scaffold.

These are the sort of stupid rules we have, and what have we done? Nothing. Good on the member for MacKillop, I say, for saying, 'This house has the capacity and the ability to say, "Hang on! You've done this by regulation; we're going to disallow these regulations.'" Yes, we do want safe workplaces, I am the first to admit, and we have to protect our workers where and if we can by being reasonable and having common sense.

We have an inquiry in this parliament, and I happen to be sitting on that inquiry, in relation to SafeWork SA, and some of the evidence coming in is exactly as the member for MacKillop has highlighted—exactly these issues that are adding costs. I might like to hear from a member of the government in a minute if they would like to give a précis of the information that is coming into the committee. Incidentally, I find that committee extremely worthwhile—it is well chaired and the information coming in is very good.

There are many other issues affecting farmers in relation to occupational health and safety which really make it impossible, or is a total deterrent, for us to employ outside labour on our properties because it is not just machinery it is also where they work, in relation to guardrails, staircases and that sort of thing. It is really becoming that we now have a lot of farmers who have a policy, 'Sorry; unless you're a contractor, we can't or won't employ you because, if we do, we have to go to huge extra costs to put in the mandatory safeguards and everything else we have to have to employ a person.'

On our operations, at home and personally, we take every precaution to protect the machinery but, as I have said, if we do not have to employ, we will not. The worst thing about this is that this law is encouraging people to ignore the law because it is just not realistic, economic or essential. I congratulate the member for MacKillop for bringing this matter to the house, and I hope that the house will support it without too much debate.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

### CHILDCARE SERVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton-Smith:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into and report upon the availability and affordability of childcare services in South Australia and, in particular—

- (a) the types of childcare services presently available across the state;

- (b) the current and future need for childcare services in South Australia;
- (c) federal, state and local government capital investment, concessions, rebates, subsidies, means testing arrangements and out of pocket costs to families;
- (d) the impact of regulation, accreditation and other quality control arrangements across each level of government upon the quality and costs of care;
- (e) the impact of workforce management and remuneration arrangements;
- (f) training requirements and capabilities;
- (g) competitive neutrality issues between private and non-private childcare providers including taxation issues, federal, state and local government charges and regulatory fairness; and
- (h) options within existing funding parameters for improving the choices available to families, reducing childcare costs and making more efficient use of taxpayer and private investment and funding.

(Continued from 20 February 2013.)

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (11:34):** The government opposes this motion from the member for Waite. Quite simply, it does nothing to improve support for families now and predominantly duplicates national initiatives that are complete or are already underway and will continue into 2014.

For example, the types of services available in South Australia as of August 2012 were stated in the member for Waite's speech in support of this motion—305 centres, 42 networks and 830 other services. The commonwealth has established the mychild.gov.au website where families can instantly search areas within 20 kilometres of any given location for vacancies across age ranges and times. For families who have trouble with the internet, there is a toll-free child care access hotline.

Predicting future needs for child care is a complex matter and the Department for Education and Child Development has recently announced a population planning approach for future services and the government established a 30-year Plan for Greater Adelaide so we can sustainably manage growth across our community. With regard to current need, the Productivity Commission's Report on Government Services also provides high-level data on demand, the latest of which shows South Australia with the lowest proportion of children aged under 12 in Australia who required care that was not available.

With regard to concessions, rebates, subsidies, means testing and out-of-pocket costs, the commonwealth also makes vast amounts of information available in Medicare, family assistance and Centrelink offices. Online estimators allow families access to details of rebates and concessions even if they struggle with the technical information.

When the Liberals first introduced the childcare rebate, it was the childcare tax rebate administered by the Australian Taxation Office. It may not have been income tested but it was income tax tested. It was capped at 30 per cent of fees. You only received it if you had paid at least that amount of income tax, and you had to wait until the end of the following financial year for payment. This disproportionately favoured high income families who paid large amounts of income tax and could afford to wait 12 months for a payment.

I am very pleased that under our federal Labor government the rebate now does much more than ever before. It is not linked to the tax system. It is a real rebate without an income test or an income tax test. It is now 50 per cent and not 30 per cent, and you can receive it weekly, fortnightly, quarterly or annually. As noted by the member for Waite, there is also the income tested childcare benefit payment for families with incomes less than around \$150,000. Even without these rebates, the latest Report on Government Services shows that Australia has:

- the lowest median fees in the nation for family day care, at \$294 per week—saving local families around \$1,500 per annum compared to the national average;
- the second lowest fees for long day care, at \$317 a week—a saving of more than \$1,000 per annum against the average; and
- preschool fees less than half the national average, at \$23 a week compared to an average of \$49—again, saving families more than \$1,000.

I also credit the commonwealth for continuing to provide specialist programs for those most in need, such as the Jobs Education Training Child Care Fee Assistance and Grandparent Childcare Benefit—the latter of which supports pensioner grandparents who are primary carers of their grandchildren by providing up to 50 hours of child care every week absolutely free.

The member for Waite's claim of \$52,000 in expenses for two children being in care makes a lot of assumptions. He states that current costs are around \$80 a day and then bases his \$52,000 claim on costs of \$100 a day. He then assumes that both children attend care all day of every weekday of every week throughout the year and that the family receives no rebates whatsoever. We need to bring some reality back to this debate.

The report on government services has vast amounts of data, and one particular table shows average attendance for South Australian children in long-day care is around 25 hours per week, less than three full days per week. Three days at \$80 a day is \$240 a week. If the family is making an average full-time earnings of around \$72,000, they would receive around \$100 in the income-tested childcare benefit. The childcare rebate would then cover half the remaining costs, leaving around \$70 for the family to pay. This equates to around \$3,500 per year for an average child, in an average family, attending for average hours. There will always be higher and lower figures, but calling for a select committee based on rubbery and extreme examples does not reflect well on those supporting this motion.

The member for Waite also wants the select committee to examine the impact of regulation, accreditation and other quality controls on the quality and costs of care, the impact of the workforce management and remuneration, and training requirements and capabilities. A national workforce review is being conducted this year that is examining the qualification requirements. There is also a South Australian component of this review that was recently completed by the Health and Community Services Board. The review examined current and future workforce requirements and strategies to ensure that we meet our training needs into the future.

In March this year I announced a program of 200 scholarships of up to \$10,000 each so that childcare workers with a diploma qualification can upgrade their skills to a four-year degree qualification, and the commonwealth announced a \$300 million grant program to increase the wages of qualified childcare workers, while restricting fee increases to families. South Australia's Skills For All program is also supporting low-cost and high-quality training for our childcare workforce. These are all practical measures that are being delivered right now.

The National Partnership on the National Quality Agenda for Early Childhood Education and Care requires a COAG review to be conducted in 2014 and that will look at all of these issues. With regard to competitive neutrality between private and non-private providers, South Australia currently has a mix of government, for profit and not-for-profit providers. The majority for long day childcare services provided directly by the state government are targeted at small rural communities through our Rural Care program, where no other local provider is viable.

The federal government offers long day care sustainability assistance funding to sole providers who often operate in smaller regional and remote areas. In our larger regional centres and Adelaide there is a high degree of competition between non-government providers that drives innovation and keeps pressures on prices down. There are different business models and operating environments and they create a variety of outcomes; however, I note that no single business type dominates the local market, which reflects a relatively level playing field.

Finally, the motion calls for an investigation of options with existing funding to improve the choices for families, reduce costs and make more efficient use of investment funds. The commonwealth recently announced a \$5 million pilot program to examine the provision of flexible services such as 24-hour long day care, extended out of hours school care and overnight family day care. This will initially be targeted at key workers, such as nurses and those in emergency services.

The government is not alone in objecting to this motion. The convenor of Australian Community Children's Services SA wrote to me on 24 January this year to state that we do not need a select committee. Unlike the motion before the house, the letter proposed specific improvements to the quality of care. Organisations such as this recognise that value is what you get for what you pay, not just how cheap you can make something.

Without responding to each and every one of the member for Waite's claims, I note that he harks back to the happy memories of unregulated child care in the pre-1972 era. By coincidence this is around the time we introduced such things as seatbelts and a long time before we stopped

people smoking in cars with children. Both of these regulations faced opposition when they were introduced, but in hindsight they have been a wonderful benefit to children and the wider community. Just because it ain't broke, doesn't mean it can't be a lot better. Another point of concern is the member's claim that:

They are taking us down the pathway of transforming child care into education. The ship has tilted too far towards the educational outcomes and moved away from the basic needs of working mums and dads to have loving, safe, high-quality care for their kids.

Let's look at the example used by the member for Waite in his speech: the two children spending all day of every weekday of every week of the year in child care. We acknowledge, as the member for Waite does, that brain development is at its peak in the zero to five age bracket. What parent, who for whatever reason has to leave their children in the care of others for 50 to 60 hours every week, would not want that time to have an educational focus?

In closing, all the practical initiatives I have outlined that are addressing affordability, availability and, most importantly, quality are on the top of the continuing rollout of our state's 38 children's centres across South Australia.

Time expired.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:45):** I generally support select committees, and I acknowledge the good intentions of the member for Waite, but in reading the terms of reference I find that they have an economic focus when I would like the focus to be on what is in the best interests of the children, what is the impact on the children, and what is best for families and the community. I think the fundamental issue is: do we need child care? I think some people have little choice; others make a choice. Some people choose to look after their children at home because they are in a position where they can do that, and that was my experience with my own children. My brother did the same: he took time off to look after their children, my nieces and nephew.

Not everyone can do that, and I accept that, but we have to be careful that we do not create a system that is purely driven by hard-nosed economics, in the sense that child care is so that people can go to work; that is fine, but sometimes it is for the convenience and the economic status of the parents. As I said, some people have no choice, but for many I think there is a choice and that some people choose to put children into child care simply because it means that they can have a more affluent lifestyle.

The minister touched on what I think is a critical issue: is child care about education or, as some people may put it in a negative context, is it simply babysitting? I think they are the sorts of questions we should be exploring in relation to whatever system we have—and when we talk about 'system' it sounds pretty impersonal because you are talking about vulnerable members of the community—young children. 'System' sounds cold and somewhat harsh, and to some extent that is reflected in the terms of reference, where the focus seems to be on economic drivers.

If there is a select committee—and it looks as though there will not be because the government will not support it—I would like to see it focus on the more fundamental issues: what care arrangements should there be for children; what are the best arrangements in the current climate, economic climate and otherwise; is the way child care is offered now serving the best interests of the children, families and the community at large; or is it primarily about economic factors for those who are involved in running or owning centres, or for those who may be the adult clients?

I believe the terms of reference need to be fundamentally restructured if we are to get a report that really zeroes in on fundamentals and does not simply look at what is an important issue, but to me it is not the only issue or the prime issue—that is, the economics that underlie the current childcare arrangements in this state.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

#### **SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: INQUIRY INTO FOOD SAFETY PROGRAMS**

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Bedford:

That the 33<sup>rd</sup> report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into Food Safety Programs, be noted.

(Continued from 31 October 2012.)

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:51):** I notice the honourable member who has leave to continue is not here, so I will say a few words. I was a member of this committee and I have



lobbied for a long time to have this issue canvassed. I was pleased that the Social Development Committee was able to look at what is a very important issue. It is not a matter that gets a lot of public attention, but it does have important ramifications for the wider community. The committee looked at a whole range of measures relating to trying to ensure that food safety and food hygiene are maintained in eateries at various levels throughout the state.

There are programs; members may have heard of some of them. One is called Scores on Doors, which is used in the UK and New York, where restaurants and other eateries are rated according to the standard that has been inspected in those premises. That approach has some value. The trouble is that someone, or some institution or establishment, might get a rating one day and then not live up to that rating the next day. That scheme has some merit.

New South Wales has a name and shame model. That has its positives and negatives as well, given that someone at an establishment may do something wrong and if that establishment is named publicly as being unhygienic then that will do tremendous damage to that business; in fact it will probably put them out of business.

There are some pros and cons for each of those approaches. Scores on Doors establishments will, I guess, aspire to get a higher rating. Of course, there is the current practice in South Australia, where you have random inspections by environmental officers, who used to be called health inspectors. That can be hit and miss, and it varies according to the resources of the councils.

Some councils in the metropolitan area and the eastern board of health share some of those officers. People involved in that inspection regime tell me that some establishments have not been inspected for years. I will not be too specific, but I have a relative who is involved in the food supply industry. He sees what happens behind the front door in some of these establishments and he has been keen to tell me which ones to avoid.

What we have in South Australia is a mixed bag. Anyone operating a food business would be foolish not to maintain proper standards because, as I say, if the word gets out that your place is dirty or people can see that it is dirty, if there is a lack of hygiene or there are rats or whatever out in the store area, I think your business has got a short life. Some councils in the metropolitan area have adopted different approaches. Several of them are trialling different methods. I think the important thing is that we have a consistent approach across South Australia so that whichever eatery you go into you know that it has a high standard.

A lot of the things that are required are very basic, such as people washing their hands before handling food. I mentioned this when the committee was conducting its inquiry, but if you go into the fast-food outlets, you will see kids come in—and by definition they eat with their hands in those places—and very few wash their hands. They are places where, if you are not careful, you can spread all sorts of viruses, bacteria and so on.

I would encourage members to read this report. Committees produce a lot of good material in this place but, sadly, much of it is left to collect dust. I know this committee spent a lot of time looking at the issues and I think its recommendations are reasonable and sensible. We do not want to put too heavy a burden on business, but we want to ensure as far as possible that, when people go out to eat or get takeaway, the food has been properly prepared and kept under refrigeration where necessary and there has been proper hygiene and proper storage standards because the consequences of poor food hygiene can be quite horrendous.

Where they have introduced very detailed food hygiene programs in New York and elsewhere, they have cut down hospital admissions for gastro drastically and that would happen here if we followed suit. I commend the committee. I think it did a good job. I would urge members to read the report and, importantly, the government to implement the recommendations.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:57):** I just rise to say thank you to the member for Fisher for his remarks. It was a long investigation. Unfortunately, we did not get to go out and eat at a lot of places—did we, member for Fisher?—but we did our very best to make sure that some sort of regime could come into place to assist diners. We, of course, urge everyone to eat out as often as possible in Adelaide to keep those businesses going.

Motion carried.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (GAMBLING REFORM) BILL**

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (12:00):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000; the Casino Act 1997; the Gaming Machines Act 1992; the Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995; the Problem Gambling Family Protection Orders Act 2004; and the State Lotteries Act 1966. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (12:00):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill seeks to amend the various acts that I have just referred to. The South Australian government is committed to maintaining the integrity of gaming operations and reducing the harm from problem gambling. Over time, the government has introduced a range of measures aimed at strengthening responsible gambling environments and eliminating regulations that are no longer required. This bill takes a holistic and consistent approach to responsible gambling environments across the Casino, clubs and hotels. It seeks to integrate advances in technology with customer care and service that are the hallmark of the hospitality industry.

South Australia is a leader in this area. In 2006, the government established the Responsible Gambling Working Party to provide advice on how precommitment could be implemented in South Australia. The working party was responsible for the evaluation of the most significant real-world trials of precommitment in Australia. This work has guided the South Australian government in addressing proposals for national gambling reform and the approach taken in this bill. I would like to take this opportunity to thank members of the working party for the work undertaken to develop an understanding of precommitment. With its fifth report on how precommitment should be implemented, the job of the working party is now complete.

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

Leave granted.

Now that the Commonwealth's proposals for gambling reform have settled, the South Australian Government is working with the industry, union and community sectors to deliver practical benefits to the South Australian community.

A Gaming Regulation Reference Group was established in February with representatives from government, community and industry organisations that have a front-line responsibility for customer care in the gaming sector.

This Reference Group is working collaboratively on implementing reforms to the gaming sector and has had significant input into the development of this Bill. I would like to thank the Reference Group for its efforts in providing many constructive comments that have improved this Bill.

This Bill contains a number of improvements to existing gaming regulation and reductions in red tape including:

- eliminating the need for gaming machine sale and disposal approvals;
- introducing consistent code of practice conditions across all sectors of the gambling industry, including wagering and lotteries;
- extending expiation fees to all licence conditions;
- extending the rights and responsibilities of licensees to landlords in possession of a gaming venue; and
- changing the tax collection arrangements for casino taxation so that they can be administered by the Commissioner of State Taxation.

The Government intends to commence these measures from 1 July 2013.

Furthermore, the Bill will:

- streamline and simplify recognised training requirements with a greater focus on responsible gambling;
- simplify and standardise barring arrangements across all sectors of the gambling industry, including wagering and lotteries;
- simplify signage requirements to provide for more effective responsible and problem gambling messaging; and

- introduce online employee notifications.

The Government intends to commence these measures from 1 July 2014.

Recognised training requirements with two levels of training, basic and advanced, will be focussed on responsible gambling. They will also equip staff with an understanding of pre-commitment and automated risk monitoring systems to assist them to identify and address potential problem gambling behaviour.

A simplified, uniform regulatory approach to welfare barring arrangements across all forms of gambling will be introduced, based on the findings of the Independent Gambling Authority's 2009 inquiry into barring. The customer will become the focus of the barring system rather than the gambling provider.

The implementation of signage requirements progressively over time has resulted in a level of signage in venues that causes replication, clutter, and reduced message impact.

Signage requirements will be improved to achieve an optimal level of signage that increases the impact of regulatory, responsible gambling and gambling help service messages, while reducing the overall number of signs in venues.

The Office for Problem Gambling, working with the members of the Gaming Regulation Reference Group, will be responsible for developing more effective in-venue signage.

In an effort to reduce red tape for hotel and club venues, the staff approvals process will be replaced with an online notification system. The venue would be required to notify the Commissioner of the appointment of gaming employees and gaming managers.

The current approvals process requires all gaming employees and gaming managers to be subject to a formal approval by the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, imposing a cost and time burden on employees. Integrity of gaming will continue to be addressed through the central monitoring system operated by the Independent Gaming Corporation and a risk based compliance and enforcement program conducted by the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner.

The Liquor and Gambling Commissioner will be provided with new powers to prohibit the appointment of specified individuals as gaming employees and gaming managers by licensees. The Commissioner, in exercising these powers, will not be limited to waiting for an application to be made, but can act on any information to make an order in a preventative way. This will be supported by administrative systems that notify licensees, before appointment, whether the candidate is subject to a prohibition order.

A number of other measures to reduce the costs and red tape associated with the development and testing of games and platforms are set out in the Bill and will commence from 1 July 2014. This includes allowing gaming machines and games approved interstate to be operated by licensees in South Australia, provided they meet requirements set out in the Bill and regulations. These measures are aimed at maintaining a modern gaming product which will facilitate the introduction of responsible gambling measures contained in the Bill that Government considers to be more effective.

This Bill will introduce the strongest responsible gambling measures in Australia, based on experience and research.

The Government intends that from 1 January 2014, gaming venues will be given a choice about the nature of the gaming services they offer.

They can choose to be a venue with a greater focus on gaming and implement advanced systems aimed at reducing the harm from problem gambling, or a venue where gaming is incidental to food and beverage service.

In the Bill, these venues are referred to as major or minor gaming venues respectively.

From 1 January 2016, the Government intends that all hotel and club venues will be required to make a decision and notify the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner whether they intend to operate as either a major or minor venue.

Major venues must be a party to a responsible gambling agreement and install both pre-commitment and automated risk monitoring systems.

Recently, at the national level, the Federal Parliament passed the *National Gambling Reform Act 2012* to implement a nationally regulated pre-commitment scheme from 31 December 2018.

This Government believes waiting until December 2018 to introduce pre-commitment is too long—action is required sooner.

Automated risk monitoring systems will build on the work undertaken in South Australia for development of systems that underlie pre-commitment and for the development of training for the identification and addressing of problem gambling behaviour.

These systems will monitor gaming machine use and identify to trained gaming employees and gaming managers potential problem gambling behaviour. Gaming employees and managers can use this information as a trigger to observe and, if required, address the situation.

The Government intends that these systems must be implemented in major venues by 1 January 2017—well ahead of the national pre-commitment scheme.

There is considerable incentive for venues to choose to become major venues and to implement these systems earlier.

The Bill proposes that major venues will be allowed to increase the maximum number of gaming machines they can operate from 40 to 60 machines, subject to approval by the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner.

If venues wish to take advantage of this from 1 January 2014, they must have implemented both pre-commitment and automated risk monitoring systems.

The Government acknowledges that the club sector may have less capacity to take advantage of the possibility to increase the maximum number of gaming machines a major venue may operate. To address this, the Government will work with Clubs SA and Club One to draft regulations that allow Club One to offer combined gaming machine entitlement and gaming machine packages to club venues on a revenue sharing basis.

Given the improved responsible gambling environment the implementation of these systems will bring to major venues, they will also be permitted to retain and implement a range of other optional features to reduce costs and differentiate their product offering.

From 1 January 2016, only major venues, which have implemented both pre-commitment and automated risk monitoring systems, will be able to retain loyalty systems and current opening hour arrangements.

From 1 January 2017, only major venues will be allowed to operate more than 20 gaming machines.

From 1 January 2020, only major venues, which have implemented both pre-commitment and automated risk monitoring systems, will be able to retain automated coin machines.

The Bill requires that major gaming venues must install better gaming machines that comply with the modern standards and which will be capable of, being remotely controlled, receiving and displaying messages on the gaming machine screen and be limited to a \$5 maximum bet. The Government intends that major venues must have installed better gaming machines by 1 January 2017.

The Bill also permits major gaming venues to offer account based cashless gaming. The Government proposes to commence these arrangements from 1 January 2017—at the same time major venues are required to have installed better gaming machines.

Account based cashless gaming can provide significant benefits to venues in terms of the cost, time and risk management associated with cash handling.

Customers who register for account based cashless gaming will have access to the full benefits of pre-commitment and automated risk monitoring. It is expected this will further increase the effectiveness of automated consumer protection measures.

The Casino will be required to introduce a similar range of new responsible gambling measures—the strongest responsible gambling measures applied to any casino in Australia.

The implementation dates for these measures at the Casino are still a matter for consideration by SkyCity and the Government.

The Bill proposes to make amendments to the *Casino Act 1997* to enable the Casino to offer, from 1 July 2013 subject to conditions to be set out in the Approved Licensing Agreement, an internationally competitive premium gaming product, comparable to interstate and overseas competitors.

From 1 July 2013 the Government also proposes to establish, for the first time, a state-wide cap on gaming machine entitlements that covers all gaming sector venues. The Government is committed to reducing the number of gaming machines operating in South Australia.

The Adelaide Casino will be required to purchase additional gaming machine entitlements it requires through the Approved Trading System.

The Government acknowledges, however, that SkyCity may require certainty as to the regulatory framework and operating capacity to underpin its investment in an expanded Adelaide Casino. This Bill assists the Government to reach agreement with SkyCity that provides that certainty.

The Bill provides that if agreed targets for the Adelaide Casino obtaining gaming machine entitlements are not achieved then the Government can provide these entitlements directly to the Adelaide Casino. The Bill imposes strict conditions. Gaming machine entitlements obtained this way are not transferable outside of the Adelaide Casino and can only be used in premium gaming areas.

The statutory target for the number of gaming machines operating in South Australia would not change as a result of entitlements provided directly by the Government to facilitate certainty for future investments at the Adelaide Casino. These additional gaming machine entitlements will be offset by additional forfeiture through the Approved Trading System over time.

The inclusion of the Casino in the Approved Trading System, combined with the other proposed changes to the structure of gaming venues, is expected to increase the demand for entitlements and accelerate the overall reduction in the state-wide gaming machine entitlements cap.

The Government acknowledges that not all venues will be in a financial position to implement the responsible gambling measures required of the Adelaide Casino and major venues, and some venues may wish to reduce their capacity and investment in gaming.

The Bill proposes to change the regulatory environment for these remaining gaming venues. These venues are referred to in the Bill as minor gaming venues.

Minor venues are characterised as venues that achieve responsible gambling outcomes by the removal of a range of automated systems along with an increased focus on staff and customer interaction.

The Bill proposes that minor venues would be prohibited from offering loyalty systems and the minimum closing hours will be extended to require that gaming areas be closed at least between 2:00am and 10:00am every day. The Government will require these arrangements to commence from 1 January 2016.

For venues that offer gaming incidentally to the service of food and beverages, it is not expected that a 40 gaming machine capacity will be required.

The Bill requires that minor gaming venues must not operate more than 20 gaming machines. The Government proposes that this will apply from 1 January 2017.

In recognition that minor gaming venues are a low cost option, these venues will be allowed to retain older style gaming machines beyond the point at which major gaming venues will be required to install or update to the next generation of gaming machines.

Gaming machines with a maximum bet greater than \$10 may be retained by minor venues, provided that when a gaming machine (new to that venue) is installed, it must be capable of limiting the maximum bet to \$5. This will apply to any gaming machines purchased by minor venues from the day this measure is assented to by the Governor.

Finally, the Bill proposes that minor venues will be prohibited from operating automated coin machines. The Government will require these to be removed from minor venues from 1 January 2020.

The Bill proposes that a landlord will not be able to have lease conditions that require the licensee to operate as either a minor or major venue. This will protect the ability of a licensee to freely choose whether they would prefer a greater focus on gaming, or that gaming is incidental to food and beverage service.

A landlord's investment will be protected. Licensees who operate as a minor gaming venue will not be required to sell their surplus entitlements (that is, they will be able to retain gaming machine entitlements above the 20 machine operating limit for minor venues).

The Gaming Regulation Reference Group will guide the implementation of these reforms over the next seven years. Key work will involve changes to regulations, codes of practice and the prescription of recognition criteria. The regulations will address key transitional issues and will be developed on a collaborative basis with the reference group.

A key measure to be included in the regulations is an exemption for club venues from the social effects inquiry process where a club and its associated sporting or community facilities are being re-located within the same locality. Clubs SA has identified a number of scenarios where it is difficult to justify the resources associated with conducting a social effects inquiry.

The measures contained in this Bill represent the most significant reforms to the gaming sector in South Australia since the introduction of gaming machines in clubs and hotels in 1994.

These reforms will improve regulation for businesses, and standardise and refine existing regulatory requirements.

More importantly, these reforms will create a better responsible gaming environment for staff, through better training and support, and for customers, by strengthening and enhancing the tools available for them to make better decisions.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

This clause is formal.

###### 2—Commencement

This clause provides for the commencement of the Act and excludes the operation of section 7(5) of the *Acts Interpretation Act 1915*, allowing the Act or parts of the Act to commence more than 2 years after assent.

###### 3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000*

###### 4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts a new definition of criminal intelligence into the Act.

###### 5—Amendment of section 6A—Codes of practice etc

This clause makes amendment to the provisions relating to codes of practice to ensure that the provisions are (so far as possible) uniform with the codes of practice provisions in the *Casino Act 1997*, the *Gaming Machines Act 1992* and the *State Lotteries Act 1966*. Subclause (2) provides requirements for signs and warning notices regarding problem gambling, provisions relating to the duty to make barring orders and the duty to identify problem gamblers. Subclause (4) provides that the Authority must give notice to representatives of licensees and authorised interstate betting operators before prescribing, varying or revoking a notice prescribed under the section. Subclause (7) allows the codes of practice under the Act to be incorporated with codes of practice prescribed by the Authority under other Acts.

#### 6—Insertion of section 6B

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

##### 6B—Criminal intelligence

The proposed section provides for the non-disclosure and maintenance of confidentiality of information classified as criminal intelligence. The section further provides that the Authority or the Commissioner is not required to provide grounds or reasons for a decision made on the basis of criminal intelligence.

#### 7—Amendment of section 20—Approval of designated persons

This clause makes the provision regarding approval of designated persons uniform with that under the *Casino Act 1997*, in requiring the Authority to forward to the Commissioner of Police a copy of any application for approval of a designated person, and for the Commissioner of Police to make available to the Authority information about criminal convictions and other information to which the Commissioner of Police has access relevant to whether the application should be granted.

#### 8—Repeal of section 50

This clause repeals section 50 of the Act as the measure proposes for barring in respect of all gambling providers to be in the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995*.

#### 9—Amendment of section 87—Confidentiality of information provided by Commissioner of Police

This amendment is consequential on amendments regarding criminal intelligence in the measure.

#### 10—Amendment of section 90—Annual report

The amendment changes the annual reporting date for the Commissioner from 30 September to 31 August in each year, and for the Authority from 31 October to 30 September, in order to implement uniform reporting dates for the Commissioner and the Authority across all the Acts they administer.

#### 11—Transitional provision

This transitional provision allows all barring orders in force under section 50 of the Act to continue after the repeal of section 50 and the commencement of the proposed barring provisions under the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995*.

#### Part 3—Amendment of *Casino Act 1997*

#### 12—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts various definitions of terms used in the measure and makes other consequential amendments to definitions.

#### 13—Amendment of section 6—Casino premises

This clause amends section 6 to make clear that subsection (2) only applies to a grant of a casino licence at premises at a different site, meaning that no part of the premises is situated on the previous site.

#### 14—Amendment of section 8—Authority conferred by licence

This amendment clarifies that section 8(1)(b) applies to the casino premises. Casino premises is defined as the premises defined in the casino licence, or by the Governor in accordance with section 6(3) of the Act.

#### 15—Insertion of section 8A

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

##### 8A—Gaming machine entitlements

The casino is authorised to operate only a number of gaming machines equal to the number of gaming machine entitlements held in respect of the gaming areas by the licensee under the *Gaming Machines Act 1992*.

#### 16—Amendment of section 9—Term and renewal of licence

The amendment clarifies that the assurance of the exclusiveness of the casino licensee's right to operate a casino for a set period under section 16(6) is not subject to approval by the Authority.

#### 17—Amendment of section 10—Conditions of licence

This amendment is consequential on the insertion of proposed section 16(1a).

18—Amendment of section 11—Transfer of licence

The amendment to section 11 provides that any gaming machine entitlements held by the licensee before the transfer of the licence are transferred to the transferee.

19—Amendment of section 14—Other transactions under which outsiders may acquire control or influence

This amendment excludes proposed Part 2 Division 6A from the application of section 14.

20—Insertion of Part 2 Division 6A

This clause inserts a new Division as follows:

Division 6A—Approval of designated persons

14B—Approval of designated persons

The new section provides for the approval by the Authority of a designated person, being a director or executive officer of the licensee, or a person of a class designated by the Authority. The section further provides:

- that an application must be in a form and be supported by information required by the Authority;
- the circumstances in which the licensee must notify the Authority if a person ceases to be a designated person or if there is a change of circumstances after the application is made but before it is determined, (with penalties applying for a failure of the licensee to notify the Authority);
- criteria for assessing the suitability of a person to become a designated person;
- that the Authority must give the Commissioner of Police a copy of any application for approval of a designated person, and the Commissioner of Police must make available to the Authority information about criminal convictions, and other information to which the Commissioner of Police has access, relevant to whether the application should be granted.

21—Amendment of section 16—Approved licensing agreement

The clause provides that the approved licensing agreement may exempt or modify the licensee's obligation to comply with requirements or conditions in the Act, or a code or requirement prescribed by the Authority, in relation to premium customers or premium gaming areas. Premium customer means a customer of the casino who falls within a class defined in the approved licensing agreement as premium customers to whom the licensee will afford special privileges (including access to gambling in premium gaming areas). Premium gaming area means a gaming area, or part of a gaming area, that is defined by the Commissioner by notice in the Gazette (in accordance with any requirements in the approved licensing agreement) as an area set aside for premium customers and that is only accessible to other customers in accordance with the approved licensing agreement.

22—Amendment of section 17—Casino duty agreement

The clause amends section 17 by inserting provisions allowing the Treasurer to delegate his or her powers and functions under the casino duty agreement.

23—Amendment of section 21—Suitability of applicant for grant, renewal or transfer of casino licence

The clause amends section 21(5)(a) to update the reference to the proposed definition of casino premises.

24—Amendment of section 27—Opening hours

The clause amends section 27(2) to make it a condition of the casino licence that only the gaming areas of the casino are not to be open for business on Good Friday or Christmas Day.

25—Amendment of section 28—Classification of offices and positions

Subclause (1) deletes reference in the definition of *sensitive position* to the position of director, secretary, officer or other person who exercises or is in a position to exercise control or substantial influence over the licensee in the conduct of its affairs. These positions are now covered by the proposed definition of *designated person* as inserted by clause 20 of the measure. The amendment in subclause (2) is consequential on the insertion of the proposed definition of casino premises.

26—Amendment of section 29—Obligations of licensee

This clause inserts a new paragraph (ac) which provides that section 29 does not apply in respect of a designated person under proposed section 14B.

27—Insertion of section 33A

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

33A—Recognition of staff training courses

This section provides that the Authority may recognise courses of training to be undertaken by staff members of the casino as basic or advanced training. Subsection (2) provides that the Authority may prescribe criteria for the recognition of courses of training, including the subjects to be covered in such

training. The section further provides for the process by which the Authority may vary or revoke a recognition or prescription notice, the application of sections 10, 10AA and 10A of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* to a prescription notice, and the requirement for the Authority to review such a prescription notice every 5 years, including public consultation and consultation with the casino licensee. The section also allows for a provider of a course recognised under the section to apply to the Minister for a review of a decision of the Authority to refuse or withdraw a recognition of a course.

28—Amendment of section 34—Identity cards

This amendment is consequential on the proposed definition of casino premises.

29—Amendment of section 35—Staff not to gamble

This amendment is consequential on the proposed definition of casino premises.

30—Repeal of sections 37A and 37B

This clause deletes sections 37A and 37B. These matters are now contained as part of new section 40A in clause 33 of the measure.

31—Amendment of section 39—Operations involving movement of money etc

These amendments are consequential on the proposed definition of casino premises.

32—Amendment of section 40—Approval of installation etc of equipment

This amendment is consequential to proposed section 40A (and in particular to the fact that approvals under that section operate for a limited time).

33—Insertion of sections 40A and 40B

This clause inserts new sections as follows:

40A—Approval of automated table game equipment, gaming machines and games

Proposed section 40A provides for the Commissioner to approve automated table game equipment, gaming machines or games. Subsection (8) provides for games, gaming machines and automated table game equipment to be approved for a certain time. Subsection (9) provides that the Commissioner may, on application, renew approvals for time periods specified in the subsection.

40B—Recognition of certain systems operated in connection with gaming machines and automated table game equipment

The proposed section allows the Authority, by notice in the Gazette to recognise account based cashless gaming systems and automated risk monitoring systems to be operated in connection with gaming machines and automated table game equipment. The Authority may also prescribe criteria for such systems—proposed subsection (2) sets out the matters that must be addressed by the Authority in relation to criteria for both systems. The section further provides for:

- the variation or revocation of prescribed criteria or the withdrawal of a recognition of a system;
- consultation to be undertaken by the Authority before prescribing a notice under the section;
- the review of prescribed criteria every 5 years and for the Authority to seek and consider written submissions from the licensee and the public in conducting the review;
- the application of sections 10, 10AA and 10A of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* to prescribed criteria;
- a notice published under this section to be incorporated with any other notices that may be published by the Authority under any other Act;
- the provider of a system recognised by the Authority to apply to the Minister for a review of a decision of the Authority to refuse or withdraw a system recognition.

34—Amendment of section 41—Interference with approved systems, equipment etc

Proposed subsection (1) makes it an offence for a person to interfere in any way with the proper operation of a system, equipment, machine or game approved or recognised under this Division with the intent of gaining any benefit or advantage. Proposed subsection (2) makes it an offence for a person to manufacture, sell, supply or possess a device designed, adapted or intended to be used for the purpose of interfering with the proper operation of a system, equipment, machine or game approved or recognised under this Division. Proposed subsection (3) makes it an offence for a person to use a computer, calculator or other device for the purpose of projecting the outcome of an authorised game being played in a gaming area. The maximum penalty for an offence against subsections (1), (2) and (3) is \$50,000 or imprisonment for 4 years. Subclause (2) amends the penalty for an offence under subsection (4) to \$5,000 or imprisonment for 3 months.

35—Insertion of Part 4 Division 4AA

This clause inserts a new Division as follows:

Division 4AA—Disposal of games and gaming machines



41AA—Sale or supply of equipment, games, gaming machines and components

The proposed section makes provision for the sale and supply of games and gaming machines which are in part consequential on the provisions in the *Gaming Machines Act 1992* permitting the casino to participate in the approved trading system. It is a condition of the casino licence that the licensee must not sell or supply a game, gaming machine or prescribed gaming machine component to a person other than the holder of a gaming machine dealer's licence, other than where the sale or supply occurs on the transfer of the casino licence.

36—Substitution of Part 4 Division 4A

This clause inserts a new Division as follows:

Division 4A—Codes of practice

41A—Codes of practice may be prescribed by Authority

The proposed section provides that the Authority may, by notice in the Gazette prescribe advertising and responsible gambling codes of practice. The responsible gambling code of practice may:

- require the licensee to provide information to patrons regarding responsible gambling and the services to address problems associated with gambling by signs, warning notices or the use of audio, visual or electronic means;
- make provision relating to the making of barring orders;
- require the licensee to have a program for intervention in problem gambling;
- make provision relating to the provision and operation of customer loyalty programs;
- make provision relating to staff training;
- include other matters designed to reduce the incidence of problem gambling.

The provisions of the codes may be of general, limited or varied application according to the classes of person, equipment or operations, or the circumstances or any other specified factor to which the provision is expressed to apply. The section provides for the revocation or variation of the codes, and the consultation that must occur before any such revocation or variation. The Authority must review the codes of practice at least every 5 years and seek and consider written submissions from the licensee and the public when conducting a review. Sections 10, 10AA and 10A of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* apply to the codes. The codes may be incorporated with other codes of practice prescribed by the Authority under other Acts.

41B—Compliance with codes of practice

This section makes it a condition of the casino licence to comply with the provisions of the advertising and responsible gambling codes of practice.

37—Amendment of heading to Part 4 Division 5

This amendment is consequential.

38—Amendment of section 42—Gambling on credit prohibited

This amendment is consequential on the proposed definition of casino premises.

39—Substitution of sections 42A and 42B

This section deletes existing sections 42A and 42B and substitutes the following:

42A—Prohibition of ATMs

This section makes it a condition of the casino licence not to provide an automatic teller machine in a gaming area.

42B—Provisions relating to gaming machines and automated table games

This proposed section sets out several conditions on the casino licence which include:

- that the licensee must not provide any gaming machine or automated table game equipment that may be operated in connection with a cashless gaming system or automated risk monitoring system other than a system recognised by the Authority under proposed section 40B(1)(a) or 40B(1)(b) as the case requires;
- that the licensee must not provide any gaming machine or automated table game equipment that may be operated otherwise than in connection with an approved pre-commitment system. An approved pre-commitment system is defined in the measure as a system to be approved under, or in accordance with the regulations. This condition expires on 31 December 2018 or a later date as prescribed by the regulations;
- that the licensee must not provide any gaming machine or automated table game equipment that is not capable of displaying on-screen messages;

- prohibiting the use of note acceptors on gaming machines or automated table game equipment;
- prohibiting the use of a device on a gaming machine or automated table game equipment which allows the playing of a number of successive games by an automatic process;
- gaming machines not to allow a maximum bet of more than \$5.

#### 42C—Prohibition of gambling outside of gaming areas

Proposed subsection (1) makes it a condition of the licence not to permit gambling in the casino premises other than in a gaming area, except as provided by the approved licensing agreement. Proposed subsection (2) provides that if the approved licensing agreement permits gambling in areas other than a gaming area, that it is a condition of the licence that the licensee will take all reasonably practicable measures to ensure that no child is able to engage in gambling.

#### 40—Amendment of section 43—Exclusion of children

These amendments are consequential on the proposed definitions of casino premises and gaming area, and provide that children are to be excluded from gaming areas. The clause also inserts a new subsection (7a) which provides that the regulations may prescribe circumstances in which section 43 or provisions of section 43 do not apply.

#### 41—Substitution of heading to Part 4 Division 7

This amendment changes the reference in the heading from 'power of exclusion' to 'barring powers'.

#### 42—Amendment of section 44—Licensee's power to bar

The amendments in subclause (1) replace the term 'excluded' with 'barred' in the section. The amendments in subclauses (2), (5) and (6) reflect that there is now a distinction between 'gaming areas' and 'casino premises', allowing the licensee to bar a person from gaming areas only. The amendment in subclause (3) limits the grounds on which a barring order may be issued by excluding welfare barring, which is now to be undertaken pursuant to proposed Part 4 of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995*. Subclause (4) amends section 44(4) to limit the term of the order to up to 3 months, and removes the option for a different period to apply with the agreement of the barred person.

#### 43—Amendment of section 45—Commissioner's power to bar

The amendments in subclause (1) replace the term 'excluded' with 'barred' in the section. The amendments in subclauses (2) and (5) update the references to the proposed definition of gaming areas consistently with the proposed amendment to section 44. The amendments in subclause (3) and (4) delete provisions which are now to be undertaken pursuant to proposed Part 4 of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995*.

#### 44—Amendment of section 45A—Commissioner of Police's power to bar

The amendments in subclause (1) replace the term 'excluded' with 'barred' in the section. The amendments in subclauses (2), (3) and (4) update the references to the proposed definition of gaming area consistently with the proposed amendment to section 44.

#### 45—Amendment of section 46—Summary exclusion in case of intoxication etc

This amendment is consequential on the proposed definition of casino premises.

#### 46—Amendment of section 49—Licensee to supply copy of audited accounts

The amendments to this section provide that a copy of the audited accounts of the casino are to be provided to the Treasurer as well as to the Authority.

#### 47—Amendment of section 50—Duty of auditor

The amendment inserts a new section 50(3) to provide an exception to the requirement that the Authority keep information obtained under section 50 confidential, to allow the Authority to divulge information to the Minister, the Treasurer or the Commissioner, on written request, and as otherwise authorised by law.

#### 48—Amendment of section 52—Evasion and underpayment of casino duty

The amendment in subclause (2) clarifies that the Treasurer may make an estimate of duty where there has been an underpayment of duty, and removes the provision for such an assessment to be made within 4 years after the liability for duty arose. The other amendments in the clause are of a minor technical nature.

#### 49—Insertion of section 52AA

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

##### 52AA—Investigatory powers relating to casino duty

The proposed section makes it a condition of the casino licence for the licensee to provide information on the written request of the Treasurer about any matter relevant to the payment of casino duty or the casino duty agreement. It also provides that an authorised officer under the *Taxation Administration Act 1996* may, for a purpose related to the payment of casino duty or the casino duty agreement, do any of the following:

- enter and remain on premises;
- require any person on the premises to answer questions or otherwise furnish information;
- require production of any instrument or record in the person's custody or control;
- require the owner or occupier of the premises to provide the authorised officer with such assistance and facilities as is or are reasonably necessary to enable the authorised officer to exercise powers;
- seize and remove any instrument or record on behalf of the Treasurer.

#### 50—Amendment of section 55—Powers of inspection

The amendment in subclause (1) is consequential on the proposed definition of casino premises. The amendment in subclause (2) provides that a staff member must facilitate an examination at the request of an authorised officer of accounts, records or other documents relating to the operation of the casino. The amendment in subclause (3) inserts a new subsection (2a) which provides that an authorised officer may retain such accounts, records or documents for as long as is reasonably necessary for the purposes of copying or taking extracts from any of them.

#### 51—Amendment of section 65—Review of decisions

This amendment is consequential on the proposed definition of casino premises and gaming areas.

#### 52—Insertion of section 68A

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

##### 68A—Minister may issue certain directions to Authority

The proposed section allows the Minister to issue a direction to the Authority if a requirement imposed by the Authority on the licensee has the effect of requiring a pre-commitment system in connection with a gaming machine or automated table game equipment. This is to prevent the Authority from implementing a pre-commitment system (by the issue of a direction, under a code of practice or otherwise) other than that approved under or in accordance with the regulations.

#### 53—Amendment of section 70—Prohibition of gambling by Commissioner and authorised officers

This amendment is consequential on the proposed definition of casino premises.

#### 54—Amendment of section 71—Annual report

Subclauses (1) and (2) amend the annual reporting date for the Commissioner from 30 September to 31 August in each year, and for the Authority from 31 October to 30 September, in order to implement uniform reporting dates for the Commissioner and the Authority across all the Acts they administer. Subclause (3) amends section 71(3) to require the annual report to include any directions issued by the Minister under proposed section 68A.

#### 55—Amendment of section 72—Regulations

The clause amends section 72 to permit the regulations to be of general, limited or varied application according to the classes of person, equipment or operations, the circumstances or any other specified factor to which the provision is expressed to apply. The regulations may also provide that specified provisions of the Act will not apply, or may modify provisions of the Act in relation to the licensee or the casino premises for transitional purposes.

#### 56—Repeal of Schedule

This clause repeals the Schedule to the Act which is now obsolete.

#### 57—Transitional provision—designated persons

The clause provides that a person who falls within the definition of *designated person* at the commencement of proposed section 14B, is taken to have been approved as a designated person by the Authority in accordance with that section.

#### 58—Transitional provision—barring orders

This clause provides for the continuation of barring orders made under repealed or amended provisions.

#### 59—Transitional provision—approval of automated table games, gaming machines and games

The clause provides that any automated table game equipment, gaming machine or game already installed, or that may be used in the casino premises in accordance with the Act and the conditions of the licence, is taken to have been approved on the commencement of proposed section 40A.

#### Part 4—Amendment of *Gaming Machines Act 1992*

#### 60—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

The clause amends, deletes and inserts new definitions for a number of terms used in the measure, including:

- a new definition of *gaming machine*, which reflects the definition used in the Commonwealth *National Gambling Reform Act 2012*;
- an amended definition of *licensed person* or *licensee* or *holder of a licence* to include the holder of a temporary licence, a person authorised under the Act to carry on the business of a licensee, and a trust, if a licence is held by a trustee;
- a definition of *monitoring system* being the approved computer system referred to in section 14(1)(d) of the Act;
- definitions of *gaming employee* and *gaming manager*, being a person appointed as such by the holder of a gaming machine licence, or in the case of a gaming manager, also the holder of a gaming machine licence;
- definition of *major gaming venue* and *minor gaming venue*. Licensed premises in respect of a gaming machine licence are a major gaming venue if the licensee has notified the Commissioner that the premises are to be a major gaming venue for the purposes of this Act (either by specifying it in the application for the licence or by notifying the Commissioner under proposed section 76B), has not subsequently revoked that notification, and is a party to a responsible gambling agreement. Any venue which is not a major gaming venue in accordance with the definition is a minor gaming venue for the purpose of the Act.

#### 61—Amendment of section 4—Application of Act

The clause amends section 4 which currently provides that the Act does not apply to gaming machines operated in the casino. The amendment allows the Act to apply to the casino when specifically provided.

#### 62—Amendment of section 10A—Certain matters prescribed by Authority

Subclause (1) provides that the Authority may, by notice in the Gazette prescribe criteria for the recognition of courses of training for staff (basic training and advanced training) and for the recognition of an account based cashless gaming system and an automated risk monitoring systems recognised under proposed section 10B(1)(c).

Subclauses (2) to (5) amend the provisions relating to the content of the responsible gambling codes of practice as follows:

- subclause (2) provides that the code may require the holder of a gaming machine licence to provide information to patrons regarding responsible gambling and the services to address problems associated with gambling by signs, warning notices or the use of audio, visual or electronic means. This replaces the requirements currently in section 57 of the Act;
- subclauses (3) and (4) are consequential on other amendments in the measure;
- subclause (5) provides that the codes may require gaming machine licensees to comply with requirements regarding the training of gaming managers and gaming employees specified in the measure, as well as make provision relating to customer loyalty programs.

Proposed subsection (3a) provides that the provisions of the prescribed notices may be of general, limited or varied application according to the classes of person, gaming machine or gaming operation, or the circumstances or any other specified factor to which the provision is expressed to apply. The amendment in subclause (8) provides that sections 10, 10AA and 10A of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* apply to the prescribed notices. Proposed subsection (10) provides that the prescribed notices may be incorporated with other notices prescribed by the Authority under other Acts.

#### 63—Amendment of section 10B—Recognitions

The amendment provides that the Authority may recognise, by notice in the Gazette, the following matters in addition to those already provided in section 10B:

- courses of training required to be undertaken by a gaming manager or gaming employee as basic or advanced training;
- systems to be operated in connection with approved gaming machines, or classes of approved gaming machines being an account based cashless gaming system and an automated risk monitoring system.

All recognitions under section 10B are to continue in force for a period of 5 years, or a period specified by the Authority in the notice of recognition, or until the notice is withdrawn by the Authority.

#### 64—Amendment of section 12—Criminal intelligence

This amendment is consequential on proposed Part 4AA, which replaces approved gaming machine managers and employees, who were approved by the Commissioner, with gaming managers and employees who are appointed by the holder of a gaming machine licence. The amendment allows the criminal intelligence provisions to apply to a person prohibited by the Commissioner from carrying out the duties of a gaming manager or gaming employee.

#### 65—Amendment of section 14—Licence classes

These amendments are consequential.

#### 66—Amendment of section 15—Eligibility criteria

This amendment is consequential on the insertion of proposed section 17B(4)(ab).

**67—Amendment of section 16—Number of gaming machines to be operated under licence**

The clause amends section 16 to allow the Commissioner to approve not more than 60 gaming machines for operation under a gaming machine licence.

**68—Amendment of section 17B—Social effect certificate**

The proposed new subparagraph provides that in assessing the social effect of the grant of a gaming machine licence, the Commissioner must have regard to the scale of the proposed gaming operations relative to other operations to be conducted at, or in connection with, the premises. The proposed subparagraph would replace the requirement under section 15(5)(a)(v) for an applicant for a gaming machine licence to satisfy the Commissioner that size of the proposed gaming operations on the premises would not be such that they would predominate over the undertaking ordinarily carried out on the premises.

**69—Amendment of section 18—Form of application**

The clause amends the criteria for an application for a gaming machine licence to require an applicant to notify the Commissioner if the premises are to be a major gaming venue for the purposes of this Act.

**70—Amendment of section 27—Conditions**

The clause amends section 27(7)(b)(ii)(A) regarding the opening hours able to be fixed by the Commissioner, and is consequential on the different requirements for major and minor gaming venues.

**71—Amendment of section 27AA—Variation of licence**

This clause inserts a new subsection (7) to require an applicant for a variation of a gaming machine licence to satisfy the Commissioner of any relevant matters contained in section 15(5) of the Act.

**72—Insertion of sections 27AAB and 27AAC**

This clause inserts new sections as follows:

**27AAB—Gaming machine entitlements in respect of casino**

This proposed section requires the Commissioner to assign the holder of the casino licence 995 gaming machine entitlements in respect of the gaming areas (within the meaning of the *Casino Act 1997*).

**27AAC—Application of Division to casino**

Proposed subsection (1) provides that Division 3A applies in relation to the casino. Proposed subsection (2) provides that the approved licensing agreement under the *Casino Act 1997* may make provision in relation to participation by the holder of the casino licence in the approved trading system and, in particular:

- may specify targets relating to the obtaining of gaming machine entitlements (other than the entitlements assigned under proposed section 27AAB) by the holder of the casino licence;
- may impose requirements on the holder of the casino licence in relation to meeting such targets;
- may provide that if the casino satisfies the requirements but does not meet a target by a specified day, the Commissioner must, on payment of an amount determined in a manner agreed, in writing, by parties to the agreement, assign the holder of the casino licence a specified number of gaming machine entitlements. However, any such entitlements are not transferable under section 27B of the Act and must only relate to a premium gaming area within the meaning of the *Casino Act 1997*.

**73—Amendment of section 27A—Gaming machine entitlements**

These amendments are consequential on the casino's participation in the approved trading system.

**74—Amendment of section 27B—Transferability of gaming machine entitlements**

These amendments allow the holder of a temporary licence or a person who is an authorised person under Part 3 Division 4A to carry on the business of a licensee, to trade gaming machine entitlements in the approved trading system.

**75—Amendment of section 27C—Premises to which gaming machine entitlements relate**

These amendments delete an obsolete provision, and are otherwise consequential on the casino's participation in the approved trading system.

**76—Amendment of section 35—Cessation of gaming machine monitor licence**

This amendment is consequential on the proposed definition of monitoring system.

**77—Repeal of section 37**

This clause repeals section 37 which enabled the Commissioner to approve gaming machine managers and gaming machine employees. Gaming managers and gaming employees are to be appointed by a licensee and notified to the Commissioner as a condition of the gaming machine licence (see proposed paragraph (ma) of Schedule 1 in this measure).

## 78—Amendment of section 39—Approval of form of supply contract

These amendments are consequential.

## 79—Amendment of section 40—Approval of gaming machines and games

Proposed subsection (2) provides the circumstances under which the Commissioner must not approve a gaming machine. Proposed subsection (3) provides that the Commissioner may determine that a gaming machine complies with a requirement under proposed subsection (2) if the machine, when used with other equipment, complies with the requirement (and, in such a case, the machine and the other equipment will together constitute the approved gaming machine for the purposes of the Act). Proposed subsection (4) provides the circumstances under which the Commissioner must not approve a game. Proposed subsection (5) provides for gaming machines and games to be approved for a certain time. Proposed subsection (6) provides that the Commissioner may, on application, renew approvals for a time specified in the subsection.

## 80—Amendment of section 42—Discretion to grant or refuse approval

The amendments in subclauses (1) and (2) are consequential on amendments regarding gaming managers and gaming employees no longer being approved by the Commissioner. The clause inserts proposed subsections (7) and (8) which allows the Commissioner to grant the approval of a game or gaming machine which can be lawfully played in another jurisdiction and is prescribed by the regulations. In the case of a gaming machine, the Commissioner must also be satisfied that the machine is compatible with the monitoring system.

## 81—Insertion of Part 4AA

This clause inserts a new Part 4AA as follows:

Part 4AA—Prohibition notices—gaming managers and gaming employees

44AA—Commissioner may give prohibition notice

The proposed section allows the Commissioner to prohibit a person from carrying out the duties of a gaming manager or gaming employee either permanently or for a specified period by notice in writing. The notice must be given to the person, and may be given to the licensee for whom the person works, and to any other licensee for whom the person may work. The prohibition has effect from the day on which the notice is given to the person, or such later date as may be specified in the notice.

## 82—Amendment of section 44A—Prohibition of links between dealers and other licensees

These amendments are consequential on the casino's participation in the approved trading system.

## 83—Amendment of heading to Part 5 Division 1

This amendment is consequential.

## 84—Amendment of section 45—Offence of being unlicensed

These amendments are consequential.

## 85—Substitution of sections 46 and 47

The clause deletes current sections 46 and 47 and substitutes the following:

46—Offence of breach of licence conditions

Proposed section 46 provides 4 categories of offences and 4 categories of expiable offences for a contravention of a licence condition by the holder of a gaming machine licence. The maximum penalties are as follows:

- for a category A offence—\$20,000;
- for a category B offence—\$10,000;
- for a category C offence—\$5,000;
- for a category D offence—\$2,500.

The expiation fees are as follows:

- for a category A expiable offence—\$1,200;
- for a category B expiable offence—\$315;
- for a category C expiable offence—\$210;
- for a category D expiable offence—\$160.

A contravention of or failure to comply with, a gaming machine licence condition specified in Schedule 1 (other than a condition imposed under paragraph (o) of that Schedule) is taken to be a category A offence only. A contravention of, or failure to comply with, any other gaming machine licence condition will be taken to be a category A offence and a category A expiable offence unless the Commissioner specifies that it is to be an offence or expiable offence of some other category at the time of imposing the condition.

## 47—Offence of breach of mandatory provisions of codes

The proposed section updates the amount of penalties and expiation fees for a contravention of, or failure to comply with a mandatory provision of the advertising code of practice or the responsible gambling code of practice to match those for contravention of, or failure to comply with a licence condition set out in proposed section 46.

## 86—Amendment of section 47A—Offence of selling or supplying games, gaming machines or components without approved contract or with inducement

These amendments are consequential.

## 87—Amendment of section 48—Offences relating to management or positions of authority

The clause inserts a new offence requiring a licensee to ensure that a gaming manager is present on the licensed premises at all times when gaming operations are conducted on the premises, with a maximum penalty of \$10,000.

## 88—Amendment of section 49—Offences related to carrying out duties in gaming areas

The clause makes consequential amendments, and prescribes the following new offences in addition to the offence already prescribed under section 49:

- proposed subsection (2) makes it an offence for a person to carry out prescribed duties in connection with the gaming operations conducted on licensed premises in contravention of a prohibition notice issued by the Commissioner under section 44AA(2), with a maximum penalty of \$35,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.
- proposed subsection (3) makes it an offence for a licensee to cause or permit a person to carry out prescribed duties in contravention of a prohibition notice issued by the Commissioner under section 44AA(2), with a maximum penalty of \$35,000 or imprisonment for 2 years;
- proposed subsection (4) makes it an offence for a person who is an employee of the holder of a gaming machine dealer's licence to carry out prescribed duties in connection with the gaming operations conducted on licensed premises, with a maximum penalty of \$35,000 or imprisonment for 2 years;
- proposed subsection (5) makes it an offence for a licensee to knowingly cause or permit a person who is an employee of the holder of a gaming machine dealer's licence to carry out prescribed duties in connection with the gaming operations conducted on licensed premises, with a maximum penalty of \$35,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

## 89—Amendment of section 50—Offence related to personal performance of work on games and gaming machines

This amendment is consequential.

## 90—Amendment of section 50A—Gaming managers and employees must carry identification

These amendments are consequential.

## 91—Amendment of section 51—Person who may not operate gaming machines

These amendments are consequential.

## 92—Insertion of section 51AA

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

## 51AA—Minor gaming venue not to operate more than 20 gaming machines

The proposed section provides that holder of a gaming machine licence in respect of a minor gaming venue must not operate more than 20 gaming machines pursuant to the licence (regardless of the number of gaming machine entitlements held in respect of the licensed premises). The maximum penalty for the offence is \$35,000.

## 93—Amendment of section 51A—Cash facilities not to be provided within gaming areas

The clause deletes obsolete provisions.

## 94—Substitution of section 51B

This clause deletes existing section 51B and substitutes the following:

## 51B—Cash facilities limitations

Subsection (2) provides that the holder of a gaming machine licence must not provide, or allow another person to provide, cash facilities on the licensed premises that would allow a person to obtain cash otherwise than in accordance with the limitations able to be prescribed by the regulations under subsection (1), with a maximum penalty of \$35,000.

## 95—Amendment of section 52—Prohibition of lending or extension of credit

This amendment is consequential.

## 96—Substitution of section 53A

This clause deletes current section 53A and inserts the following:

53A—Prohibition of certain gaming machines

Proposed section 53A creates a number of new gaming machine licensee offences, all with a maximum penalty of \$35,000 including:

- an offence to provide a gaming machine that may be operated in connection with a cashless gaming system other than that recognised by the Authority under section 10B(1)(c)(i);
- an offence for a major gaming venue to provide a gaming machine that may be operated otherwise than in connection with an automated risk monitoring system approved by the Authority under proposed section 10B(1)(c)(ii);
- an offence for a major gaming venue to provide any gaming machine that may be operated otherwise than in connection with an approved pre-commitment system. An approved pre-commitment system is a system to be operated in connection with approved gaming machines or classes of approved gaming machines, that is approved under, or in accordance with processes prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this definition (subject to any conditions prescribed by the regulations). This offence provision expires on 31 December 2018 or on a later date prescribed by the Governor by regulation;
- an offence for a major venue to provide any gaming machine that is not capable of displaying on-screen messages;
- an offence for a major gaming venue to provide any gaming machine on the licensed premises that allows a maximum bet of more than \$5;
- an offence to provide any gaming machine on the licensed premises that returns winnings to players at a rate that is not less than 87.5% of the total amount of all bets made on the machine;
- an offence for a minor venue to provide a gaming machine that may be operated without the insertion of a coin or token or by the electronic transfer of credits or tokens to the device, or that allows a maximum bet of more than \$5 (unless, in relation to a machine allowing a maximum bet of more than \$5, the machine was being lawfully provided by the licensee immediately before the prescribed day);
- the offences of prohibiting the provision of a gaming machine that is fitted with a device or mechanism designed to allow the playing of successive games by an automatic process, and of providing a gaming machine on the licensed premises that may be operated by the insertion of a banknote, are retained as part of this proposed section.

97—Insertion of sections 53AB and 53AC

This clause inserts the following sections:

53AB—Prohibition of coin machines in minor gaming venues

The proposed section creates a new offence for the holder of a gaming machine licence in respect of a minor gaming venue to provide any coin machine on licensed premises, with a maximum penalty of \$35,000.

53AC—Prohibition of customer loyalty programs in minor gaming venues

The proposed section creates a new offence for the holder of a gaming machine licence in respect of a minor gaming venue to cause, suffer or permit a customer loyalty program to be offered or operated at the licensed premises, with a maximum penalty of \$35,000. A customer loyalty program is defined as a marketing or promotional scheme under which a person may become entitled to a benefit as a result of continued gaming machine play.

98—Repeal of section 54

This amendment is consequential on signage requirements proposed to be included in the responsible gambling code of practice.

99—Amendment of section 56—Minors not permitted in gaming areas

These amendments are consequential.

100—Repeal of section 57

The repeal of section 57 is consequential on signage requirements proposed to be included in the responsible gambling code of practice.

101—Repeal of Part 5 Division 4

This amendment is consequential on the barring provisions in proposed Part 4 of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995*.

102—Amendment of section 62—Interference with machines or games

This amendment is consequential.



103—Amendment of section 63—Interference devices

This amendment is consequential.

104—Amendment of section 64—Sealing of gaming machines

This amendment is consequential.

105—Amendment of section 66—Machines not to be operated in certain circumstances

These amendments are consequential.

106—Amendment of section 68—Certain profit sharing etc is prohibited

This amendment is consequential.

107—Amendment of section 71—Powers of authorised officers

The amendment in subclause (1) inserts a new requirement to allow a period of not less than 7 days for a licensee to comply with a requirement to produce documents or other material relating to staff training. The other amendments are consequential on changes in the measure.

108—Amendment of section 72A—Gaming tax

This amendment removes the requirement for gaming tax to be paid in equal monthly instalments. The proposed amendment will allow for the payment of tax at a time or times determined by the Treasurer.

109—Substitution of section 74

This section deletes existing section 74 and substitutes the following:

74—Annual reports

Proposed subsections (1) and (3) amend the annual reporting date for the Commissioner from 30 September to 31 August in each year, and for the Authority from 31 October to 30 September, in order to implement uniform reporting dates for the Commissioner and the Authority across all the Acts they jointly administer. The report of the Authority should include any directions issued by the Minister under proposed section 74A. The proposed section reinstates those provisions in existing section 74 regarding the report of the Commissioner and the requirement for the Minister to cause a copy of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

74A—Minister may issue certain directions to Authority

The proposed section allows the Minister to issue a direction to the Authority if a requirement imposed by the Authority on the licensee has the effect of requiring a pre-commitment system (by the issue of a direction, under a code of practice or otherwise) other than that approved under or in accordance with the regulations..

110—Amendment of section 76—Power to refuse to pay winnings

This amendment is consequential.

111—Insertion of section 76B

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

76B—Major gaming venue notifications

The proposed section provides that the holder of a gaming machine licence may at any time, by notice in writing given to the Commissioner, specify that the licensed premises are to be a major gaming venue for the purposes of this Act, or revoke a major gaming notification.

112—Amendment of section 77—Certain agreements and arrangements are unlawful

Subclause (1) amends section 77 by inserting a new subsection (2) to clarify that a gaming machine, game or prescribed gaming machine component may be moved from 1 licensed premises to another (subject to the Act and the conditions of the gaming machine licences relating to those premises) if each of the gaming machine licences is held by the same licensee. The new provision also clarifies that the existing subsection (1) does not apply in relation to a supply to, or acquisition by, the transferee on a transfer of a gaming machine licence in accordance with Part 3 Division 4. The insertion of proposed subsection (4) provides that any provision of a lease relating to licensed premises that purports to require the lessee to operate as a major or minor gaming venue for the purposes of this Act (however the requirement is expressed) is void and of no effect. The provision would not, however, affect lease requirements relating to gaming machine entitlements only (providing they do not impose operational requirements).

113—Amendment of section 79—Bribery

This amendment is consequential.

114—Amendment of section 82—Service

The amendments allow for service of notices or documents by the Authority or the Commissioner in a manner not specified in current subsection 82(1).

## 115—Amendment of section 85—Vicarious liability

The amendments in subclauses (1) and (2) are consequential. Subclause (3) makes a consequential amendment to proposed section (3a) in the *Statutes Amendment (Director's Liability) Bill 2013*.

## 116—Amendment of section 86—Evidentiary provision

These amendments are consequential.

## 117—Amendment of section 87—Regulations

The amendment to section 87(2)(d) provides that the regulations may grant or provide for the granting of conditional or unconditional exemptions from the Act or any provision of the Act (where currently the exemption power rests with the Minister). Proposed subsection (5) allows the application of the Act to be exempted or modified for transitional purposes by regulation.

## 118—Repeal of sections 89 to 91

This clause repeals obsolete provisions.

## 119—Amendment of Schedule 1—Gaming machine licence conditions

This clause makes several amendments to the gaming machine licence conditions, including:

- removing the requirement for a licensee to obtain the approval of the Commissioner before the sale or disposal of a gaming machine or gaming machine component;
- removing the requirement for gaming equipment to be inspected and sealed before commencing gaming operations pursuant to the licence;
- providing a requirement that the licensee will (in a manner and form to be determined by the Commissioner):
  - notify the Commissioner of the appointment of a person as a gaming manager or gaming employee;
  - keep a record of the appointment of each gaming manager and gaming employee;
  - within 14 days of a gaming manager or gaming employee ceasing to be appointed as such, notifying the Commissioner of that fact;
- providing that the Commissioner may not impose additional conditions on the licensee of a kind prohibited by the regulations;
- other amendments consequential on other provisions in the measure.

## 120—Repeal of Schedules 3 and 4

This clause repeals obsolete provisions.

## 121—Transitional provision—approval of gaming machines and games

The clause provides that a gaming machine or game that was, immediately before the commencement of this section, approved under section 40 of the *Gaming Machines Act 1992* will be taken to have been approved under section 40 of the *Gaming Machines Act 1992* as amended by this Act (and such approval is, for the purposes of that section, taken to have been granted on the day on which this section commences).

## 122—Transitional provision—licence condition offence categories

The clause provides for the assigning of licence condition offence or expiable offence categories by the Commissioner to licence conditions of a kind referred to in proposed section 46(3)(b) that were imposed before commencement.

## 123—Transitional provision—barring orders

This clause provides for the continuation of barring orders made under repealed provisions.

Part 5—Amendment of *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995*

## 124—Insertion of heading

This clause makes a technical amendment.

## 125—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This amendment is consequential on the insertion of proposed Part 4.

## 126—Insertion of heading

This clause makes a technical amendment.

## 127—Insertion of section 11B

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

## 11B—Delegation

The proposed section gives the Authority power to delegate certain of its powers and functions to a member, deputy member, the Secretary of the Authority or the Commissioner, other than:

- the conduct of an inquiry by the Authority;
- a reconsideration by the Authority of a decision that was made by the Authority;
- a review or appeal that is to be conducted by the Authority (other than a review under proposed section 15G or a review of a decision made under section 45 of the *Casino Act 1997*).

128—Insertion of heading

This clause makes a technical amendment.

129—Amendment of section 12—Proceedings of Authority

This clause inserts a new subsection (1a) which amends the quorum provisions of section 12. For the purpose of conducting an inquiry, a reconsideration of a decision by the Authority or a review or appeal under the Act or a prescribed Act, the presiding member (or his or her deputy) and 1 other member of the Authority constitutes a quorum of the Authority.

130—Amendment of section 14—Powers and procedures of Authority

This clause amends section 14(1), to provide that the Authority may exercise the powers and procedures set out in the subsection if the Authority thinks it reasonably necessary for the purpose of performing its functions.

131—Repeal of section 15A

This amendment is consequential on proposed section 11B.

132—Insertion of heading

This amendment is technical.

133—Substitution of section 15B

This clause deletes current section 15B and inserts new sections as follows:

15B—Interpretation

The proposed clause inserts a number of definitions of terms to be used in the Part, including authorised person, barred person, barring order and gambling provider.

15C—Barring orders

The section provides that the Authority or a gambling provider may make a barring order in relation to a person at the request of that person, or if:

- there is a reasonable apprehension that the person may suffer harm, or may cause serious harm to family members, because of problem gambling; and
- the Authority or gambling provider is satisfied that the making of the order is appropriate in the circumstances.

If no decision is made within 14 days after the making of a request for an order, the Authority or the gambling provider is taken to have refused the request. A barring order made by a gambling provider may only relate to the premises of, or the business conducted by that gambling provider, and remains in force for 3 months from the date on which the order is made. The gambling provider must make a record of the barring order or request and notify the Authority within 7 days after making a decision in relation to the request, and a maximum penalty of \$2,500 applies for a failure to comply with this provision. A barring order made by the Authority may remain in force for a period of not more than 3 years from the date on which the order is made. A barring order must be in writing in a form determined by the Authority.

15D—Variation or revocation of barring order

The proposed section sets out the circumstances under which the Authority may vary or revoke a barring order.

15E—Notice of barring order etc

The proposed section requires that a barred person must be given notice of a barring order, or an order varying or revoking such an order, and the order has no effect until notice has been given to the barred person. The Authority must also give written notice of a barring order to the owner or occupier of each place to which the order relates.

15F—Contravention of barring order

The proposed section creates a number of offences for contravention of a barring order:

- for a barred person who contravenes or fails to comply with a barring order, the maximum penalty is \$2,500;

- for a gambling provider, or another person of a class prescribed by the regulations who suffers or permits a contravention of a barring order, the maximum penalty is \$10,000. It is a defence to this offence for the defendant to prove that he or she took reasonable steps to prevent the commission of the offence;
- For the purposes of disciplinary or enforcement action as defined in this proposed section, it is taken to be a condition of the licence or authorisation issued to a gambling provider under the relevant Act that the provider must not suffer or permit a contravention of a barring order (subject to the defence above).

#### 15G—Review of barring order by gambling provider

This proposed section provides that the Authority must undertake a review of the decision by a gambling provider to make or refuse to make a barring order.

#### 15H—Reconsideration of barring order by Authority

The proposed section provides that a gambling provider who is dissatisfied with a decision by the Authority to refuse to make a barring order, or any other person who is affected by a decision by the Authority to make, or refuse to make a barring order, may apply to the Authority to undertake a reconsideration of the decision. The section details the form and manner of lodgement of the application. On reconsidering a decision, the Authority may undertake consultation, confirm, vary, revoke or reverse the decision, and make recommendations to persons involved with or affected by the making of the decision that the Authority thinks appropriate. If the Authority has not completed reconsidering a decision within 8 weeks after the day on which the application was made, the Authority will be taken to have confirmed the decision.

#### 15I—Powers to remove etc

This proposed section permits an authorised person to require a person to leave a place if they suspect on reasonable grounds that the person is barred from that place. The regulations may prescribe procedures to be observed by authorised persons (other than police officers) in or in connection with the exercise of powers under the section.

#### 15J—Liability

The proposed section provides that a licensee or authorised person is not liable to pay damages or compensation to any person for a failure to exercise powers under Part 4.

#### 15K—Delegation

The proposed section allows a gambling provider to delegate powers or functions under Part 4.

#### 15L—Service

The proposed section provides for the service of a document required to be given to a person under Part 4.

#### 15M—Register

The proposed section provides that the Authority must maintain a register of barring orders, requests for barring orders that are refused, problem gambling family protection orders, any information required to be included on the register under another Act, and any other information that, in the opinion of the Authority is relevant to barring or exclusion.

#### 15N—Winnings still to be paid

The proposed section provides that a contravention of, or failure to comply with, a barring order does not constitute grounds for refusing to pay any winnings to a person.

#### 134—Insertion of heading

This clause makes a technical amendment.

#### 135—Amendment of section 19—Annual report

This clause amends section 19(1) to change the date on which the Authority must prepare and submit its annual report each year from 31 October to 30 September.

#### 136—Insertion of section 20

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

#### 20—Regulations

This proposed section allows the Governor to make regulations.

#### 137—Transitional provision—existing voluntary barring orders

The clause provides that a person who is barred under current section 15B of the Act is taken to be barred under proposed section 15C for a period of 3 years or until a review of the order is completed (whichever occurs first).

## 138—Transitional provision—review of existing barring orders

The clause provides that the Authority must, within 3 years after the commencement of this clause, undertake a review of relevant barring orders, being all those taken to be made under proposed section 15C of the Act, by virtue of the transitional provision.

Part 6—Amendment of *Problem Gambling Family Protection Orders Act 2004*

## 139—Amendment of section 11—Conduct of proceedings

The clause inserts a new subsection 11(7) to provide that an order may be made under proposed Part 4 of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995* instead of, or in addition to an order under the *Problem Gambling Family Protection Orders Act 2004*.

## 140—Amendment of section 13—Notification of making, variation or revocation of problem gambling family protection orders by Authority

The amendment inserts a new subsection 13(3) to allow the Authority to enter particulars of prohibitions of a kind found in an order under the *Problem Gambling Family Protection Orders Act 2004* or the *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009* on the register maintained under Part 4 of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995*.

## 141—Substitution of section 15

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

## 15—Removal of respondent barred from certain premises

The proposed section extends the powers under Part 4 of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995* requiring a person to leave or removing a person from a place from which they have been barred, to a person barred from a place by an order under the Act.

Part 7—Amendment of *State Lotteries Act 1966*

## 142—Substitution of sections 13B to 13E

This clause substitutes existing sections 13B to 13E regarding codes of practice with the following:

## 13B—Codes of practice etc

The proposed section provides that the Authority may prescribe advertising and responsible gambling codes of practice and requirements for systems and procedures designed to prevent the purchase of lottery tickets, and participation in lotteries by children using the telephone, Internet or other electronic means. Proposed subsection (2) provides matters which may be addressed in a responsible gambling code of practice, including:

- requiring the licensee to provide information at offices, branches and agencies of the Commission regarding responsible gambling whether by signs and warning notices or the use of audio, visual or electronic means;
- making provisions relating to the duty to make barring orders under Part 4 of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995*;
- make provision relating to the duty to identify and assist problem gamblers;
- dealing with staff training;
- requiring accounts to be kept for persons who participate in lotteries or purchase lottery tickets by telephone, Internet or other electronic means;
- other matters designed to reduce the incidence of problem gambling.

## 13C—Compliance with codes of practice

This section provides that the Commission must ensure, in the performance of its functions, that the Commission conforms with the matters prescribed under proposed section 13B(1).

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Griffiths.

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (FINES ENFORCEMENT AND RECOVERY) BILL

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (12:03):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982; the Courts Administration Act 1993; the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988; the Cross-border Justice Act 2009; the Expiation of Offences Act 1996; the Fisheries Management Act 2007; the Magistrates Court Act 1991; the Motor Vehicles Act 1959; the Summary Procedure Act 1921; the Victims of Crime Act 2001; and the Young Offenders Act 1993. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (12:03):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill amends the Criminal Law (Sentencing Act) 1988 and the Expiation of Offences Act 1996, as well as making consequential amendments to a number of other acts, to change the present system for the collection and enforcement of unpaid pecuniary sums and expiation fees as well as debts owed to the Crown under the Victims of Crime Act 2001. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

In the Government's view, the present system of enforcing these debts is not working as effectively as it could. As at 22 March 2013, the state of South Australia had \$275 million under management with the Fines Payment Unit within the Courts Administration Authority. Of this amount, approximately:

- \$132 million is subject to active time-payment arrangements or is not yet due.
- \$103 million is overdue as it has not been paid within the time set by law and for which the debtor has not entered into a time payment or deferral arrangement. Of this, approximately \$45 million relates to the original fine and \$58 million relates to additional fees and charges (including the Victim of Crime levy, reminder notice fees and enforcement fees). Of the \$103 million overdue, over \$91 million is the subject of enforcement action pursuant to the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act*.
- \$40 million is currently subject to an outsourced pilot arrangement with a specialised debt recovery organisation.

To address this problem, the Government previously established a working party to look at options to improve the system. An options paper was duly published for consultation in September 2011. The present Bill is the final result.

The Bill removes the function of fines enforcement from the Courts Administration Authority's Fines Payment Unit and instead confers it on the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit. This is a business unit to be established within executive government. It makes changes to the present fines collection process to reduce delays and increase flexibility.

The key expected benefits to Government of this reform include:

- A favourable budget impact.
- An ability to manage some debts earlier—to enable more proactive collections activity to motivate payment.
- The government's ability to declare amnesties from the whole or part of costs, fees and other charges and to increase the likelihood of recovery by running targeted amnesty campaigns from time to time.
- Expanded enforcement options—to increase the likelihood of collection, enhanced enforcement measures will include:
  - clamping and impounding of vehicles (in addition to the present power of seizure and sale);
  - sale of a debtor's primary place of residence if the debt amounts to \$10,000 or more, including where enforcement action is taken on debts that precede the passing of the new Bill;
  - publishing of debtor names on a website to publicise who is subject to enforcement action and as a means to locate and/or to fulfil the service of certain notices (with some exceptions); and
  - indefinite suspension of a debtor's driver's licence.

The Bill allows for greater flexibility in applying enforcement actions – the Bill removes existing restrictions on the sequencing of enforcement actions providing the ability to execute the most effective enforcement treatment path of action for a particular debtor in the first instance.

The Bill establishes the role of the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer (the Officer) and provides the Officer with various powers.

One of those powers is to negotiate with debtors to enter into a time payment plan. A person who receives either a court fine or an expiation notice will have the option of instalment payments, without needing to prove hardship. There will be a right to enter into an instalment plan that will see the fine paid off within 12 months. This right, however may not be available to a person who has previously defaulted on an instalment plan or who is bankrupt. It will be at the discretion of the Officer to refuse to enter into any such payment arrangement. The instalment plan must provide for payment of the debt by a direct debit arrangement. For persons on Centrelink benefits, this could be a Centrepay arrangement. Alternatively, there will be the option of entering into some other arrangement with the Officer, such as payment by instalments over a period exceeding 12 months, giving a charge over real estate, a combination of payment arrangements such as a lump sum payment plus instalments, garnish wages or relinquishing property to the Officer to be sold. Such alternative arrangements are in the discretion of the Officer.

This will be easier to access for debtors with arrangements able to be made over the phone or online and reducing reliance on over-the-counter services.

When entering into an instalment arrangement, the debtor may be required to give an irrevocable authority for the disclosure of financial information by any Commonwealth, State or Local Government agency or employer at the Officer's request.

The present procedure whereby the Manager cancels the broken instalment arrangement and the debtor can then seek a review of that decision is abolished. Likewise, the procedure whereby the Manager makes an enforcement order and the debtor can seek a review of that order is also abolished. Instead, if a debtor fails to comply with an arrangement and the failure has endured for 14 days then the arrangement terminates. Once the default occurs, it is up to the Officer to pursue enforcement or to negotiate some other arrangement with the debtor.

Debtors will be able to apply to the Officer for a review of an enforcement determination in relation to an expiation notice on limited procedural grounds and an administrative application fee will be payable. The Officer may refuse to entertain an application if the Officer considers the application is frivolous or vexatious or is not made in good faith. Where an enforcement determination is revoked, management of the debt will be returned to the Issuing Authority. The Bill also allows for applications for a merits based review by the Magistrates Court where the alleged offender claims he or she did not commit the offence to which the expiation notice relates, for example the offender claims they were not the driver at the time but had allowed a relative to drive the vehicle.

If the Officer does decide not to take enforcement action, or to waive payment of any part of a debt that includes a component of victims' compensation, the Officer must notify the victim. The victim is then entitled to recover the compensation awarded as a debt from the debtor. This is considered to be fairer to the victim than the present system, whereby the court can remit or reduce the pecuniary sum, which includes the compensation, or convert it into community service, without reference to the victim.

The Bill abolishes the present hierarchy of enforcement options open for the collection of the debt. Under the present law, the Manager, Penalty Management, must normally seek to enforce the debt first by a 60-day suspension of a debtor's driver's licence or a ban on certain transactions between the debtor and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, or both. If these sanctions do not result in payment, the Manager can then take action to sell the debtor's property. Only if that is also unsuccessful does the option of garnishment of a source of funds arise. The Bill would abolish this hierarchy of options. Instead, the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer would have a free hand to select the option most suited to the particular case. If, for instance, the debtor owns land, the Officer might take enforcement action by registering a charge over the land immediately. If the debtor is working, or is due an award of compensation, the Officer might garnish the wages or the award.

The Bill also adds some new enforcement powers and options and enhances some existing options. The Officer will have power to require any person to produce documents relevant to the debtor's financial affairs. For example, the Officer might ask the Public Trustee or a private administrator to disclose records about the funds of the debtor that are under management. The Officer will also be able to require state government agencies to disclose contact details for the debtor, other than agencies that are excluded by regulation. The Officer can also require a person reasonably suspected to be the debtor to produce proof of identity and where a person, without reasonable excuse refuses to comply with such a requirement can be found liable to prosecution.

The Bill allows the Officer to require information from public sector agencies relevant to the debtor—to assist in locating debtors. Public sector agencies must, on request from the Officer, provide debtor contact details if the agency is in possession of those details.

The option of suspending a driver's licence is amended so that the suspension can be indefinite, rather than limited to 60 days as at present. That is, unless the Officer is persuaded otherwise, the debtor will need to make arrangements to pay his debt if he wants to become entitled to drive again.

The power to bar transactions with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles is expanded so that it includes the transfer or re-registration of the debtor's vehicle, except for a transfer to a bona fide purchaser for value. If a debtor can afford to re-register his car or renew his driver's licence, then, in the Government's view, he can afford to put money towards his debt to the state.

The option of sale of personal property allows the sale of non-essential household items such as a games console or a television could be sold, although it is intended to protect essential household items such as refrigerators by regulation. The option of sale of land is expanded so that the debtor's residence can be sold, if the debt reaches \$10,000. Currently, a debtor's house cannot be sold, no matter how much he owes and no matter what the value of the house or the equity in it.

The power to garnish wages or some other source of funds is amended so that it is not mandatory to investigate the debtor's means first and to exclude hardship. If there are funds belonging to the debtor in a bank account or in the hands of a third person, or money owing to them from any source, the Officer can attach those funds to pay the debt.

It will also be possible for the Officer to clamp or impound a vehicle. This includes a vehicle owned by the debtor or a vehicle the debtor is accustomed to drive or a vehicle that was used in the commission of an offence even if he does not own it. Clamping or impounding is available whether or not the offence was a driving offence. Currently, and perhaps surprisingly, the law allows the Manager, Penalty Management, to sell a person's car but not to immobilize it without proceeding for sale. The Officer will have additional powers in relation to clamping and impounding a vehicle, from requiring a person to stop the vehicle; causing a locking device or other feature of the vehicle to be removed, dismantled or neutralised to also requiring a person to surrender the keys to the vehicle, or starting the vehicle by other means or towing or pushing the vehicle away.

There is a new power to publish the name of a defaulting debtor on the internet. Again, this is taken from the Tasmanian law. As a result of the Commonwealth Privacy Act, a credit report obtained by a prospective lender does not include criminal penalties. It is thus possible for a person to appear to be a reliable payer but in fact to owe a substantial sum in unpaid court fines. A prospective lender or a landlord is at risk of lending money or letting premises to a person who, in fact, has not paid their debts. The Bill proposes that the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer could publish the names of debtors subject to enforcement action on a website which would be publicly accessible. Names would, however, have to be promptly removed if full payment was made.

As well as collecting court fines and expiation fees, the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer will be able to collect debts owing by offenders to the Victims of Crime Fund as a result of payments made to injured victims of crime. At the moment, these debts are collected by the Crown Solicitor's Office. Routine debt collection work is not considered a good use of the resources of that office.

The Bill allows the Officer to charge a lodgement fee to issuing authorities for lodgement of expiation fees for collection or enforcement by the Officer—the Bill provides for the ability to charge a fee to issuing authorities for the purposes of partial cost recovery for accepting the debt into the system.

The Bill also permits the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer in future to take on debt collection work for other government agencies by arrangement and on a cost-recovery basis.

As under the present law, the cost of enforcement action will be added to the amount owing and collected through the same processes. However, the Bill permits the Minister to declare an amnesty, during which if the debtor pays the fine in full, the accrued costs, fees and/or other costs can be waived.

Under the transitional provisions, for debtors who have made instalment payment arrangements under the present law, those arrangements continue under the new law. Where a default has already occurred and an enforcement order has been made under the old law, that order continues unless the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer revokes it. Where a default occurs, and no enforcement order has yet been made under the old law, all of the new enforcement options will become available.

The Bill makes consequential amendments to several other Acts reflecting the abolition of the office of Manager, Penalty Management.

The Bill also amends the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* to increase the penalties for two offences. The penalty for driving an unregistered vehicle increases from \$2,500 to \$7,500 and that for driving an uninsured vehicle increases from \$5,000 to \$10,000. As a corollary, the Bill also amends the maximum amount of an expiation fee under this Act from \$1,250 to \$2,500. This will permit proposed increases in the expiation fees for these two offences, set by regulation, which the Government intends to increase from \$315 and \$582 respectively to \$1,000 and \$1,500. This is intended to ensure that there is no financial incentive to commit these offences. That is, it should never be cheaper to drive unregistered than to register the vehicle.

This Bill is intended to deliver a more effective fines collection system, not only by being tougher, although in some respects it is, but also by being more flexible and more practical in its approach than the present law. The collection process is removed from the courts and will become largely administrative. The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer will have wide discretion to decide whether and how to pursue a debt. The new process is expected to be quicker and more effective in recovering debts, and at the same time not to waste money pursuing those debts that are plainly unrecoverable. It is also intended to give debtors more payment options at the start of the process, to maximise the opportunities for those able and willing to pay to do so and, for debtors who for good reason are unable to pay, to divert them to other options at an early stage.

The Government believes this Bill is a practical measure to address a problem that, under the present law, has become intractable.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Correctional Services Act 1982*

4—Amendment of section 74AA—Board may impose community service for breach of conditions

Section 74AA currently provides that if the Parole Board of South Australia imposes a parole condition requiring performance of community service, the person subject to the order cannot, except in circumstances approved by the Minister, be required to perform the community service for a continuous period exceeding 8 hours. This clause amends the section by reducing the maximum continuous period to 7.5 hours.

##### Part 3—Amendment of *Courts Administration Act 1993*

5—Amendment of section 21A—Non-judicial court staff

This amendment is consequential.



Part 4—Amendment of *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*

6—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This amendment inserts and amends definitions for the purposes of the measure.

7—Amendment of section 13—Order for payment of pecuniary sum not to be made in certain circumstances

This amendment is related to the substitution of Part 9 Division 3.

8—Amendment of section 47—Special provisions relating to community service

Currently, under section 47, the number of hours of community service to be performed by a person under a sentence or condition imposed by a court must not be less than 16 or more than 320. Under the section as amended by this clause, the number of hours must not be less than 15 or more than 300.

The section also currently provides that a person subject to such a sentence or requirement may not, except in circumstances approved by the Minister, be required to perform the community service for a continuous period exceeding 8 hours. This clause amends the section by reducing the maximum continuous period to 7.5 hours.

9—Amendment of section 56A—Appointment of authorised officers

This amendment allows the Minister to appoint a person as an authorised officer and makes consequential amendments.

10—Insertion of section 56B

This amendment inserts definitions for the purposes of Part 9 Division 2 that are related to the proposed substitution of Part 9 Division 3.

11—Substitution of Part 9 Division 3

This clause substitutes a new Part 9 Division 3 as follows:

Division 3—Enforcement of pecuniary sums

Subdivision 1—Preliminary

60—Interpretation

This section provides definitions for the purposes of the Division.

61—Amounts due under expiation notices may be treated as part of pecuniary sum

This section provides for the making of a determination by the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer, on application by a debtor, that an amount due under an expiation notice will be taken to be part of the pecuniary sum owed by the debtor.

62—Enforcement against youths

This section relates to enforcement against youths.

63—Service of notices etc

This section provides for the service of notices generally under the Division.

Subdivision 2—Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer

64—Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer

This section establishes the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer.

65—Delegation

The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer may delegate powers or functions.

Subdivision 3—Payment of pecuniary sums

66—Pecuniary sum is payable within 28 days

This section provides for the payment of pecuniary sums within 28 days.

67—Payment of pecuniary sum to Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer

This section provides for pecuniary sums to be paid to the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer.

68—Payment by credit card etc

This section allows payment of a pecuniary sum by credit card, charge card or debit card.

69—Amounts unpaid or unrecovered for more than certain period

If any part of a pecuniary sum imposed by court order is unpaid or unrecovered in accordance with the provisions of Subdivision 3 or 4, an amount determined under the regulations is added to the pecuniary sum. The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer may waive the payment of the whole or part of an amount payable by a debtor under this provision.

70—Arrangements as to manner and time of payment

This section provides that a debtor may enter into an arrangement as to the manner and time of payment of a pecuniary sum, and provides for procedures relating to such arrangements.

70A—Minister may declare amnesty from payment of costs, fees and charges

The Minister may declare an amnesty from the payment of costs, fees and charges.

70B—Investigation of debtor's financial position

The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer may investigate a debtor's means of satisfying a pecuniary sum.

70C—Power to require information

The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer may require certain information from a public sector agency.

70D—Disclosure of information to prescribed interstate authority

The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer may disclose prescribed particulars of a debtor to a prescribed interstate authority.

70E—Power to require identification

This section provides for an authorised officer to require identification evidence in certain circumstances.

70F—Publication of names of debtors who cannot be found

This section provides for the publication of names of debtors who cannot be found.

70G—Charge on land

The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer may register a charge over land owned by a debtor for the amount of a pecuniary sum outstanding.

70H—Reminder notice

This section provides for a reminder notice to be sent to a debtor who has not paid a pecuniary sum or entered into an arrangement within 28 days after the pecuniary sum is imposed.

70I—Enforcement actions

This section provides for the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer to take enforcement action if a debtor has not, within 14 days of (and including) the date on which a reminder notice relating to a pecuniary sum was served on the debtor, paid the sum or entered into an arrangement under the Division in respect of the sum or an arrangement under the Division has terminated.

Subdivision 4—Powers relating to enforcement action

70J—Aggregation of pecuniary sums for the purposes of enforcement

This section provides for the aggregation of pecuniary sums for the purposes of enforcement.

70K—Seizure and sale of assets

This section provides for the seizure and sale of assets of a debtor to satisfy a pecuniary sum.

70L—Garnishment

This section provides for the garnishment of money to satisfy a pecuniary sum owed by a debtor.

70M—Suspension of driver's licence

This section provides for the suspension of a debtor's driver's licence.

70N—Restriction on transacting business with Registrar of Motor Vehicles

This section provides that the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer may prohibit a debtor from transacting any business with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles.

70O—Clamping or impounding of vehicle

This section empowers the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer to clamp or impound a motor vehicle that a debtor owns, or is accustomed to drive, or that was used in the commission of an offence to which action under this Division relates.

70P—Power to dispose of uncollected seized vehicles

This section empowers the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer to dispose of a motor vehicle if no person who is entitled to custody of the vehicle that has been seized and clamped or impounded applies to the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer for release of the vehicle within 28 days of the vehicle ceasing to be liable to be so clamped or impounded.

## 70Q—Publication of names of debtors subject to enforcement action

This section provides for the publication of the names of debtors subject to enforcement action.

## 70R—Costs

This section provides that any costs incurred by the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer in relation to the exercise of powers and functions under the Subdivision are added to and form part of the pecuniary sum owed by the debtor.

## 70S—Liability

This section makes provision relating to the liability of the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer or a delegate of the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer in respect of the exercise, or purported exercise, of powers and functions under the Subdivision.

## 70T—Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer may be assisted by others

This section provides that the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer or an authorised officer may, in the exercise of any powers or functions under the Subdivision, be assisted by others.

## Subdivision 5—Failure of enforcement process

## 70U—Community service orders

This section provides that the Court may, on application by the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer, make a community service order in relation to a debtor, if the Court is satisfied that the debtor does not have, and is not likely within a reasonable time to have, the means to satisfy a pecuniary sum without the debtor or his or her dependants suffering hardship.

## 12—Amendment of section 71—Community service orders may be enforced by imprisonment

This clause amends section 71(2) to provide for a 12 month limit on the term of imprisonment that may be imposed in enforcing community service orders made under Part 9 Division 3 Subdivision 5 (as distinct from other community service orders, in relation to which the existing 6 month limit continues to apply). The other amendments are consequential.

## 13—Amendment of section 72—Identification of authorised officers

## 14—Amendment of section 72A—Hindering authorised officer or assistant

## 15—Amendment of section 75—Regulations

These amendments are consequential.

## 16—Transitional provisions

This clause provides for transitional provisions for the purposes of the measure.

Part 5—Amendment of *Cross-border Justice Act 2009*

## 17—Amendment of section 120—Terms used in this Part

This amendment is consequential.

Part 6—Amendment of *Expiation of Offences Act 1996*

## 18—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This amendment inserts and amends definitions for the purposes of the measure.

## 19—Amendment of section 6—Expiation notices

This amendment is consequential.

## 20—Amendment of section 7—Payment by card

This amendment is technical.

## 21—Amendment of section 8—Alleged offender may elect to be prosecuted etc

## 22—Amendment of section 8A—Review of notices on ground that offence is trifling

These amendments are consequential.

## 23—Substitution of sections 9 and 10

This clause deletes the existing sections 9 and 10 and substitutes a new section 9 as follows:

## 9—Arrangements as to manner and time of payment

This section provides that an alleged offender who has been given an expiation notice may at any time during the expiation period, enter into a written arrangement with the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer for payment of the amount due under the notice by direct debit instalments or some other kind of written arrangement with the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer for payment of the amount due under the notice.

The section makes provision for procedures and other matters relating to arrangements.

24—Amendment of section 11—Expiation reminder notices

This clause deletes subsections (2) and (4) and makes consequential amendments.

25—Amendment of section 11A—Expiation enforcement warning notices

This clause deletes subsections (3) and (5) and makes a consequential amendment.

26—Substitution of sections 12 to 14

This clause substitutes sections 12 to 14 as follows:

12—Late payment

This section provides for late payment of expiation fees.

13—Enforcement determinations

This section provides for the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer to make an enforcement determination in relation to an expiation notice given to a person if an issuing authority has sent a certificate under subsection (1) to the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer. The section provides for procedures and other matters relating to the making of a determination, including as to how the alleged offender will be treated in relation to the offence or offences to which the determination relates.

14—Review of enforcement determinations by Court

If an enforcement determination has been made, the alleged offender may apply to the Court for a review of the determination. An application may only be made on the ground that the alleged offender did not commit the offence or offences to which the expiation notice relates.

14A—Enforcement actions by Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer

This section provides for the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer to take enforcement action if an enforcement determination has been made in relation to an expiation notice to secure payment of the amount due under the notice. Enforcement action includes entering into an arrangement under section 9 or taking enforcement action under the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*.

14B—Amounts unpaid or unrecovered for more than certain period

If any part of an expiation fee remains unpaid, or unrecovered from, the alleged offender at the end of the expiation period, an amount determined under the regulations is added to, and forms part of, the amount due. The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer may waive payment of the additional amount in such circumstances as he or she thinks fit.

27—Amendment of section 15—Effect of expiation

28—Amendment of section 16—Withdrawal of expiation notices

29—Amendment of section 17—Application of payments

These amendments are consequential.

30—Substitution of sections 18, 18A and 18B

This clause deletes sections 18, 18A and 18B and substitutes new sections as follows:

18—Provision of information

This clause requires issuing authorities and the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer to agree to provide relevant information to each other.

18A—Minister may declare amnesty from payment of costs, fees and charges

The Minister may declare an amnesty from the payment of costs, fees and charges.

18B—Investigation of alleged offender's financial position

The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer may investigate an alleged offender's means of satisfying a pecuniary sum.

18C—Power to require information

A public sector agency that is in possession of the contact details of an alleged offender must provide the details to the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer on request.

18D—Disclosure of information to prescribed interstate authority

Prescribed particulars of an alleged offender may be disclosed by the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer to a prescribed interstate authority.

18E—Power to require identification

The Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer may require a person to produce evidence of his or her identity if the Officer has reasonable cause to suspect that the person may be a person to whom an expiation notice has been issued.

31—Amendment of section 20—Regulations

This clause amends the regulation making provision of the Act so that the regulations may—

- prescribe, or provide for the calculation of, costs, fees or charges for the purposes of the Act;
- exempt a person or class of persons from the obligation to pay prescribed costs, fees or charges;
- prescribe penalties, not exceeding \$5,000, for breach of, or non-compliance with, a regulation;
- be of general or limited application;
- make different provision according to the persons, things or circumstances to which they are expressed to apply;
- provide that any matter or thing is to be determined, dispensed with, regulated or prohibited according to the discretion of the Minister, the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer or another prescribed person;
- provide that a specified provision of the Act does not apply, or applies with prescribed variations, to a person, circumstance or situation (or person, circumstance or situation of a prescribed class) specified by the regulations, subject to any condition to which the regulations are expressed to be subject.

The regulations may also make provisions of a savings or transitional nature consequent on the commencement of a provision of the Act.

32—Transitional provisions

This clause sets out transitional provisions for the purposes of the measure.

Part 7—Amendment of *Fisheries Management Act 2007*

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

The amendments made by this clause are consequential.

34—Amendment of section 108—Disqualification etc and discounting of demerit points

Section 108 currently refers to a person having been convicted of offences. The section as amended by this clause will refer instead to a person having been found guilty of offences.

Part 8—Amendment of *Magistrates Court Act 1991*

35—Amendment of section 7A—Constitution of Court

Under section 7A as amended by this clause, the Magistrates Court may be constituted of a special justice for the purpose of hearing and determining applications for review of enforcement determinations under the *Expiation of Offences Act 1996*.

36—Amendment of section 9A—Petty Sessions Division

37—Amendment of section 12—Administrative and ancillary staff

The amendments made by these clauses are consequential.

38—Repeal of section 13A

This clause repeals section 13A. The section, which sets out the responsibilities of the Manager, Penalty Management, will be redundant on the establishment of the position of the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer.

Part 9—Amendment of *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*

39—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

The amendment made by this clause is consequential.

40—Amendment of section 9—Duty to register

This clause increases maximum penalties for offences under section 9.

41—Amendment of section 85—Procedures for suspension, cancellation or variation of licence or permit

Section 85 applies if the Registrar of Motor Vehicles decides to exercise a power to suspend, cancel or (otherwise than on the person's application) vary a person's licence or learner's permit and requires the Registrar to give the person written notice of certain matters. This clause inserts a new subsection that makes it clear that the section does not apply if the Registrar is required to exercise a power to suspend, cancel or vary a person's licence or learner's permit.

42—Amendment of section 93—Notice to be given to Registrar

Section 93 as amended by this clause will require the Commissioner of Police, a prescribed issuing authority or the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer to give written notice of the expiation of an offence to the

Registrar. The provision also provides for notification of a revocation of an enforcement determination where appropriate.

43—Amendment of section 98B—Demerit points for offences in this State

The amendment made by this clause is consequential.

44—Amendment of section 102—Duty to insure against third party risks

This clause increases maximum penalties for offences under section 102.

45—Amendment of section 145—Regulations

This clause amends the regulation making power to increase the maximum amount that may be fixed by regulation as an expiation fee for an offence against the Act or the regulations.

Part 10—Amendment of *Summary Procedure Act 1921*

46—Amendment of section 189A—Costs payable by defendant in certain criminal proceedings

The amendment made by this clause is consequential.

Part 11—Amendment of *Victims of Crime Act 2001*

47—Amendment of section 28—Right of Attorney-General to recover money paid out from offender etc

Section 28 is concerned with the right of the Attorney-General to recover amounts paid under the Act in certain circumstances. Under the section as amended by this clause, if a debt arises from a judgment in favour of the Crown and against an offender in accordance with the section, the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Officer is permitted to take action on behalf of the Crown to recover the debt.

48—Amendment of section 32—Imposition of levy

The amendments made by this clause are consequential.

Part 12—Amendment of *Young Offenders Act 1993*

49—Amendment of section 49A—Restrictions on performance of community service and other work orders

Section 49A currently provides that a youth cannot be required to perform community service for more than 8 hours in any one day except in circumstances approved by the Minister. This clause amends the section by changing the maximum period to 7.5 hours.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Griffiths.

### **POLICE (GST EXEMPTION) AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (12:05):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Police Act 1998. Read a first time.

**The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (12:06):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

South Australia Police (SAPOL) currently provides a number of services to the public for which it charges fees. Some of these charges are imposed in accordance with legislation (for example, the impounding or clamping of vehicles; the issue of firearms licences) and some are provided under individual contract (for example, police escorts of over dimensional vehicles; police aircraft hire). However, there are some services that police carry out that are under neither the authority of any legislation nor specific contract. These relate solely to requests from the public for access to information from certain police records, namely, national police certificates, fingerprint reports, fingerprint and history checks, police incident reports, vehicle reports, antecedent reports and apprehension reports.

Amendments were recently made by the Commonwealth Government to the *A New Tax System (Goods and Services Tax) Act 1999* (Cth). The amendments state in part that a fee charged by a Government agency to supply information that is not required to be provided under an Australian law will be subject to GST. These Commonwealth amendments will come into operation on 1 July 2013. As the aforementioned requests for access to SAPOL records are not subject to any legislation, they will be liable to GST payments from that date, unless they can be brought under South Australian law in the meantime.

As the South Australian Government does not want the public to have to pay GST on these particular fees, this Bill seeks a necessary amendment to the regulation making power in the *Police Act 1998*. The amendment will provide authority for regulations to be made as soon as practicable after the enactment of this Bill specifying that particular services and respective fees may be charged by SAPOL. This will formally bring the imposition of such

fees (being fees for the provision of information that is of a regulatory nature by a government agency) under the authority of South Australian legislation thereby allowing the payment of such fees to continue to be GST exempt under the Commonwealth Act.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

#### Part 1—Preliminary

##### 1—Short title

##### 2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal. There being no provision included in this measure, it will come into operation on the day on which, once enacted, it is assented to by or on behalf of the Governor.

#### Part 2—Amendment of *Police Act 1998*

##### 3—Amendment of section 76—Regulations

It is proposed to amend section 76 of the Act to include a new paragraph that will enable regulations to be made to fix fees and provide for the payment, recovery, refund, waiver or reduction of such fees.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

### **RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's alternative amendment.

(Continued from 30 April 2013.)

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's alternative amendment be agreed to.

On 21 March 2013 I urged the house to agree to all but one of the amendments made to this bill in the Legislative Council. I returned the bill to the Legislative Council urging members to reconsider the amendments that created clause 5A. Clause 5A of the bill was an amendment moved by the Hon. Mark Parnell incorporating an amendment moved by the Hon. Stephen Wade. It provided for a consultation process for the appointment of all tribunal members. Specifically, the minister would be required to consult with a panel consisting of a nominee of the Law Society of South Australia, the Attorney-General, the House of Assembly, the Legislative Council and the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment before any tribunal member could be appointed or reappointed.

I strongly opposed the amendment under clause 5A of the bill in the interests of ensuring that the tribunal's efficiency would not be decreased. The government filed an alternative amendment to replace clause 5A, which provides for an alternative consultation process. The amendment requires the minister to consult with the Law Society of South Australia before appointing the presiding or deputy presiding member of the tribunal. This is considered to be appropriate since both the presiding and deputy presiding members are the only tribunal members required to be legally qualified.

Members of the Legislative Council supported this amendment in the interests of preventing the appointment process for tribunal members from becoming unnecessarily complex. I therefore commend the bill to the house without further amendment.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** I recognise that there is a long history to this and that indeed considerable debate has occurred in not only this chamber but in the other place. I spoke to the Hon. Mr Wade this morning and he told me that in the spirit of bipartisanship and in recognition of the need to move this bill forward, the modified amendment proposed does have support from the opposition and I indicate that we will vote for it.

Motion carried.

### **TAFE SA (PRESCRIBED EMPLOYEES) AMENDMENT BILL**

In committee.

(Continued from 30 April 2013.)

Clause 1.

**Mr PISONI:** There are two questions I asked yesterday that the minister was going to bring back to the chamber, so I am hoping we can revisit those.

**The CHAIR:** Minister, the member for Unley is referring to two questions he allegedly asked you yesterday.

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** Thank you, sir. I apologise for the delay; we were just gathering our advisers. If I recall correctly, the member for Unley asked questions about how TAFE has been operating since last year. I can report that TAFE has been operating effectively since being established as a statutory corporation on 1 November. There are some matters related to employer and employee rights that need to be resolved and will be through this legislation.

TAFE has been addressing questions of employment rights, terms and conditions, through statutory interpretation and within existing policy and procedure. TAFE SA is relying on developed policy and procedure for the management of complaints and other things. The legislative base now being relied on—which is the point—to discipline prescribed employees is the common law and the Fair Work Act 1994.

**Mr PISONI:** Has the minister had crown law advice as to how reliable that system is at the moment and whether it will stand any test or challenge by a disgruntled employee or someone who feels as though the process has not been dealt with properly or who disputes the fact that that is a process suitable for purpose?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** The fact the member for Unley does not want to acknowledge is that the Fair Work Act does not of itself provide disciplinary procedure but rather gives recourse to employees who have been dismissed or have a grievance regarding an industrial matter as defined by section 4 of the Fair Work Act 1994. I made it very clear to the member for Unley and other members in a conference recently that this is not the sector's, or even TAFE SA's, preferred method for dealing with this process. As I said, the system was not broken. It is simply an opportunity that has been taken by the opposition, and we have been managing on an interim basis but our preferred position is that which is represented in this legislation.

**Mr PISONI:** Have you had crown law advice as to the legal standing of the operation, the way you are managing staff and grievances at the moment?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** This was the same matter more or less that the member for Unley raised in the conference of managers, and again he tried to bring in the crown here. This is a policy matter, and it is my preference as the minister responsible for this policy area of government that we manage this in this way.

**Mr PISONI:** Has the minister had crown law advice as to whether managing this matter in the way she has described is sound?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** There is no problem with going forward with this piece of legislation as presented here in this parliament. What we are dealing with today was never envisaged as part of the TAFE reforms, so we are back to square one in that sense. We have been managing but it is not our preferred position and what we are proposing here is completely doable.

**Mr PISONI:** I do not think the minister understood the question. The question is about the interim arrangements you have in place. Have you had crown law advice about the legal standing of the interim arrangements you have in place for dealing with staff while this bill is going through the parliament and while the previous bill has been laid on the table?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** Whether or not I have had crown law advice is beside the point. The fact is that we have managed the interim arrangements we have—and they are interim arrangements, and we have been managing. However, they are not our preferred position. TAFE SA will tell you that they prefer the status quo which we had last year.

**Mr PISONI:** Can the minister then guarantee to the house that the method being used at the moment to manage employee grievances is a legal process and that it is sound?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** We are relying on the Fair Work Act, and I think I made that clear a moment ago. The Fair Work Act is a proper piece of legislation. I am not in any way suggesting that it is not; it is simply not our preferred method to go forward.

**Mr PISONI:** What advice have you received that the interim methods you have in place are, in fact, legally sound?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** Sorry, sir, could the member repeat his question?



**Mr PISONI:** My question is: on what advice are you relying to make the claim that the interim measures that you have in place to deal with employee grievances are in fact legally sound?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** My departmental advisers have just advised me that of course we are relying on the Fair Work Act, and that is a sound process; but this is a policy decision, and the policy preference of the government is that we go back to what was always intended. We did not envisage a change of this kind. The sector did not envisage a change of this kind. The fact is that we have been managing on the basis of what I described earlier, but that is not our preferred position.

**Mr PISONI:** I will just get back to the question: so, you have not sought any legal advice whatsoever as to whether the interim measures you have in place at the moment are a sound and legally safe way to manage your employees?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** My advice is that we did get advice that suggests that the interim arrangements that were devised in response to this, which occurred last year, are sound. Again, I repeat the point that it is the preference of the government that we proceed on a different path to that which you are envisaging.

**Mr PISONI:** On whose advice, minister?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I am advised that the Crown provided advice, and the department.

**Mr PISONI:** Can the minister advise on the point that Mr Garrand made about the decision to use the Teachers Appeal Board for managing staff grievances—why that decision was made when the department's recommendation to the minister was that the Industrial Relations Commission handle those complaints?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I do not have the benefit of Mr Garrand's comments; can you read them to me? Can you read to me his precise comments?

**Mr PISONI:** Well, the *Hansard* is a public document, minister, and it is available to you.

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I am aware of that, member for Unley, but I am also well aware of the fact that you often present material in a completely different way to that which has been presented.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order, sir. I ask that that be withdrawn; 127, impugning improper motives on members. Unless you can present evidence of that claim, I ask for that to be withdrawn.

**The CHAIR:** Would the minister be happy to withdraw those remarks for the sake of the committee?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** For the sake of progressing this piece of legislation, I am prepared to withdraw that. All I am simply suggesting is that it would be helpful for the passage of this legislation to know exactly the comments to which the member for Unley is referring.

**The CHAIR:** I think that is legitimate. The member—

**Mr PISONI:** Mr Garrand told the Budget and Finance Committee on 15 April that:

Our position in the initial drafting would be to use the Industrial Relations Commission, and that is through a process of consultation as we went out and consulted on the draft legislation. There was a strong view by others to maintain the Teachers Appeal Board, but the initial advice by the department would be to use the Industrial Relations Commission.

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** Was that so hard, member for Unley? He gave me the comments by Mr Garrand. What he is obviously reflecting is the fact that there was a proposal, as there often is, in policy development and inner proposals were put out for consultation. There was consultation and there were adjustments to those proposals.

**Mr PISONI:** Who was consulted and who made the decision to use the Teachers Appeal Board?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I cannot comment on that because I am pretty sure I was not the minister then. I cannot comment on that, but I just understand it would have been the standard departmental policy process for consultation.

**Mr PISONI:** Can the minister bring that information back to the house?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I can advise that consultation took place more than a year ago—from 17 February 2012 to 11 March 2012—and feedback was received from a number of organisations. In total, 28 written submissions were received, including submissions from Business SA, the Australian Industry Group and the University of Adelaide. We obviously received feedback from the Australian Education Union. The department also held consultation sessions with TAFE SA staff.

**Mr PISONI:** Mr Garrand told the Budget and Finance Committee that:

We are going through the process with TAFE at the moment, where that shared service agreement expires at the end of June. We are going through, with TAFE and the TAFE board, and looking at those shared services, and some of those staff will be devolved back to TAFE so that TAFE can run their own corporate services.

How many additional staff are still to move into TAFE from DFEEST?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I am very keen to see the passage of this bill but I do not see how that particular question is directly relevant to this.

**Mr PISONI:** I have asked the question. This bill is all about employees and this question is about employees.

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** The bill is about education employees. The member refers to the much broader issue of TAFE reforms—and the government at the time was very grateful to the opposition for supporting those reforms. However, in the interests of openness, I am happy to take that question on notice and bring back a response.

**Mr PISONI:** Minister, I asked questions about TAFE board fees, are you able to answer them now?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** Do you mind just repeating what your question was yesterday?

**Mr PISONI:** Mr Royle told the Budget and Finance Committee on 15 April that the basic remuneration was set out at \$24,000 per annum per board member and \$37,000 per annum for the chair of the board. Mr Garrand then expanded on the answer to that question and told the committee that there was a retention payment of \$48,000 for the chair on top of the \$37,000 and a retention payment of \$23,000 for each board member on top of their \$24,000, taking the chair's total remuneration to \$85,000 and the total remuneration for members of the TAFE board to \$47,000. Mr Garrand was asked whose direction it was to make a retention payment to board members, and he answered that it was a cabinet decision. It was the cabinet's decision for retention allowances, confirmed by the chair. Mr Garrand said:

As a department, we had nothing to do with the appointment of the board or the setting of board fees. They are decisions for cabinet.

Can the minister advise on what grounds a retention payment was established or paid to board members and the board chair, and for how long that retention payment applies? What is the process for implementing retention payments or even establishing or determining the value of retention payments in this instance?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I think Raymond Garrand is correct. This was a cabinet decision, because we think that training is very important, and this was a very big reform, supported by the opposition. So, we believe that that board, which is a completely new commercial expertise-based board, needs to attract the very best people we could. I would have thought that the member for Unley would generally favour that. We think they are worth it. We think training in this state is worth it.

**Mr PISONI:** The question was about the establishment of the retention payments. I have asked the minister if she could explain why it was necessary and on what basis retention payments were made. For example, why was it not announced that board chair would be paid \$85,000 as a board fee? Why is there a retention payment and a board fee? Why is there the split? Why did that happen and whose decision was it to pay the board in this manner?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** It was the usual cabinet process. There was nothing unusual about that. Cabinet appointments and remuneration associated with those appointments go through cabinet. I do not think there was anything in particular that was extraordinary. As I said, we think that the reforms that the government has embarked upon are significant. This is an area of great complexity. We wanted the best people for the board. We think we have a very good board with Peter Vaughan as the chair. I think he is worth the fees, as are the members of the board, but it was the standard cabinet process.

**Mr PISONI:** The minister did not answer the question. Why was there a retention payment plus a board fee paid to board members and the chair; and if it is a standard cabinet process or a standard process for board payments, can the member give some examples of other boards where retention payments are paid on top of a board fee? The question I am asking is: why was a retention payment developed on top of a board fee, and why was not simply \$85,000 offered and \$47,000 offered as straight board fees? Why is there a difference? Why is there a retention payment and why is there a board fee?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I am not in a position to comment on other similar board arrangements, but this was a standard—

**Mr Pisoni:** You said it was a standard practice.

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** It is a standard practice. The remuneration of the new TAFE SA board has been agreed in line with the standard boards and committees remuneration outlined by the Department of Premier and Cabinet. The cost has been offset in part by the savings in abolishing the councils within TAFE SA and the fact that there is a significant reduction in the number of members. TAFE SA has seven board members and a chair as opposed to what were the 35 council members.

**Mr PISONI:** So why is there retention payment and a board fee?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** Look, I think we have to agree to disagree here. They were given a very, very big job. There were a number of savings achieved simply from going to the one board. We believe that we value training in this state. We are undertaking a significant reform in relation to TAFE, and the opposition was happy to support that. I think that the opposition would support adequately remunerating these people, many of whom have outstanding private sector experience. It had to stack up; we had to stack up in line with the standard for boards and committees—and it did. I do not think there is anything extraordinary about what has occurred here.

**Mr PISONI:** Can the minister explain to the house why it is that the chairman was paid a retention allowance as well as a board fee and why board members were paid a retention allowance as well as a board fee, and why they were not simply paid a board fee of an equivalent value of those two fees? In other words, why was the chairman not paid \$85,000 as a board fee and why were the board members not paid \$47,000? Why is it split into a retention payment and a board fee?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I cannot explain why what you are suggesting was not done at the time. I believe the original fees would have been done towards the end of last year. I believe that there is nothing other than something very ordinary going on here. As I have outlined before, any proposals for committees and associated remuneration needs to be approved by cabinet, and that was done. Why a larger fee in the first place was not done I am not sure, but I do not think there is anything magical or particularly relevant about that. We have been very open about the fact that we have done it in this way.

**Mr PISONI:** Is it because the board and committees remuneration framework that was approved by cabinet on 10 December 2007 has strict criteria for the board fee and chairman's fee for members? For example, the criteria for a level 1 chairman's fee is that a chairman would receive \$70,758 for the following:

- Boards of management overseeing revenue or assets over \$1 billion, profit over \$100 million or a combination of these criteria.
- Boards of statutory authorities exercising critical governance or regulatory functions at such a high level that the Premier or Cabinet considers payment at the very highest level to be appropriate.

Does the TAFE board oversee revenue or assets of over \$1 billion and a profit of over \$100 million?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** The TAFE reforms and the job given to the new TAFE board are very significant. The task to take us to a competitive market has been a very significant one. The member need only look at other states where similar transitions have perhaps not been as successful as they should have. We are very clear about the fact that this is a significant reform. It is a significant reform in policy terms. We are very keen on getting it right. We know that you support the reforms because you supported them in this place. I am very surprised that you do not support the retention allowance being given to the chair, Peter Vaughan, and other members.

**Mr PISONI:** Minister, I am simply asking questions about the process. What were the board fees established based on the boards and committees remuneration framework that was approved by cabinet on 10 December 2007? Is that the framework that was used to establish the board fees and the chairman's fees for the TAFE board?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I said that it went through cabinet and had to comply with the rules for appointing members to committees and remunerating them adequately. Cabinet made a decision, as it is perfectly entitled to do, that we wanted the very best people. We can stay here and argue until the cows come home, but we think the reforms are significant enough to warrant attracting the very best people we can. Quite frankly, I am a bit surprised and disappointed that the opposition sees it differently.

**Mr PISONI:** Is the minister able to tell the house that the board fees that were established for the TAFE SA Board were based on the board and committee's remuneration framework and, if not, to what framework is the minister referring?

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** It's a cabinet decision.

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** That is right; it is a cabinet decision and cabinet made a very proper decision. Like I said, we can keep on arguing about this until the cows come home. Cabinet made a decision based on the fact that we think the TAFE reforms are very significant.

**Mr PISONI:** Does the board of TAFE oversee management of revenue and assets worth over \$1 billion, or a profit of over \$100 million, or a combination of this criteria?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I will get back to the honourable member in relation to those details.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** In terms of what the assets are.

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** Yes, in terms of what are the assets. The fact is that the nature of the reforms that were supported by the opposition are so significant that it goes beyond buildings. They are so significant, and we are so determined to make sure we get it right (and other states have struggled in this area), that we believe in properly remunerating people. We feel very strongly that we are heading in the right direction with these TAFE reforms, and we are very pleased the opposition supported them.

As a consequence of that we have appointed a very strong board, chaired by Peter Vaughan. I do not have their names in front of me, but the board is comprised of people with significant commercial expertise. We value their contribution; we think it is the right team to take forward this reform and it is significant. I know that that board is working hard, and I take the opportunity to thank them for the work they are doing.

**Mr PISONI:** Minister, I get back to a question you still have not answered: why is there a retention payment as well as a board fee?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** Because we think the reforms are so significant, and we think there should be a board with significant commercial expertise overseeing these reforms. We think they are worth the allowance.

**Mr PISONI:** How long will the retention allowance be in place for board members?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I will take that question on notice.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 4), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (12:44):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### SUPPLY BILL 2013

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 April 2013.)

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:44):** It is a pleasure to contribute on behalf of the opposition to the Supply Bill and, indeed, recognise the provision of funds that it makes available to carry forward until the budget has been formally adopted as part of this rather interesting process that occurs. A lot of words are said; there is no doubt about that. As a person who follows the numbers and has done so for the last seven years while in this place, and for some time before I came in, and who has a deep interest in numbers, I am interested in how the budget stacks up and the effort that goes into it.

I am respectful of the amount of time that departments put into that, the effort of ministers, the level of review that takes place, the level of debate about priorities and, indeed, the decisions that are eventually made and how that impacts on taxation policy and services. It is the full conclusive argument that comes forward.

While at this stage we are only talking about 22 per cent, or thereabouts, of what the total budget might be, they are very important dollars and they impact very seriously on what the future will be for the state. In that regard, it is a great pleasure to make some small contribution. I am going to try to recognise some things that are done well, some things that are not done quite so well, some frustrations, some issues that are raised in the community and some general issues too.

I have always come from a background where there is a need to live within means. As a humble person raised within a single-parent family, really responsible budgeting was needed in our household, and it has been something that I have tried to live my life by too, and in organisations that I have worked for. I do recognise, though, that there is a need to invest to make an economy grow and invest to give a chance for an economy to do well. When an economy does well, individuals do well as do businesses that exist in communities too. So the framework around which we operate is an absolute key for me.

That is why I understand that, in difficult times—and from early 2008 onwards, the state and the nation has faced a great challenge—what we do in terms of the levels of expenditure that have been estimated, where revenue has come from, monies that have been borrowed, the challenge that it represents to people paying bills, the difficulties for businesses and the cost of living pressures that people are under really all come into this complete mix. We try and make it right every year and there will be lots of debates about the appropriateness of that, but an enormous effort goes into it. When you look at the figures, though, you really have to be a little bit concerned in some ways.

There will be other members in this chamber who will focus really seriously on numbers and the dollars. I want to talk about the impact on people too, but there are some numbers and dollar figures that need to be emphasised and respected. The level of deficit in this financial year's budget is a great concern to anybody and I know when you look at what the initial projection was four years ago and what this year's case was going to be, the scenario is very different because of circumstances around that, but there is also a recognition of where expenditure control comes in. That, I think, comes down to a ministerial level of responsibility.

When we look at Public Service numbers, I know that there are a lot of figures that can be quoted about budget numbers that allow for increases and other excess numbers that have been brought into it in recognition of schoolteachers, doctors, nurses and police officers, and when you discount that out, you still come back to a number in the region of about 13,000 but they are still real people too. Those people rely on that employment opportunity, but the cost of employing those people is the responsibility of the taxpayer, so there has to be the balance between them.

I am a person who has believed quite seriously in the AAA credit rating, which the state has had the benefit of for a few years after some very challenging economic times, and the opportunity that that presents. It is a great chance to market a state when it enjoys a AAA credit rating. It shows a level of responsibility, a level of buoyancy, a level of belief in the society that the government in control is managing things very well and the AAA credit rating is there. No matter what the circumstances have been before, it relies upon disciplines to be in place, so the decision made to forgo to some degree the AAA credit rating and the subsequent decision by the rating agencies to take that away from South Australia has come at a cost.

There was an effort made to retain it—an effort that involved forward leasing of rotations of the South-East forests and also the betting opportunities that are provided through newsagencies—but it has still been lost. There is a difference in the figures regarding what the potential impact in financial cost will be as a result of additional loan repayments, but this overall

impact also concerns me. Every dollar is important—I will never deny that—but it is the perception by which South Australia is judged that causes some great concerns.

When the economy is right, business takes chances and, when business takes chances, people benefit from that. Chances are gained through hard work, enterprise, skill and initiative, but the reward can be immense because people recognise that. It provides opportunities for the next generation of employment to come through and for some of our older workers who are struggling in industries to have a second chance when those chances might not have otherwise been there, but it has to be right.

There will be a lot of challenges over the next 10½ months in policy work certainly, from both of the major parties and every potential politician, to put forward their initiatives that will help the economy because that is the absolute key thing you have to try to do, no matter what level of representation you want to achieve in your life.

There is a lot of talk also about the desal plant. I was lucky enough to be part of a group of people who went to Western Australia to look at their desal plant—a desal plant costing \$300-plus million and about \$67 million for the interconnector pipe. I was excited by the opportunity it brought to South Australia, in a much smaller scale than what has been built.

When we announced our policy and asked whether it was appropriate to have a desal plant in place, I remember, Mr Deputy Speaker, the reply you gave, which I will not put on the record—but others probably have already reported that. It is important for the community to have that technological water solution, but the great debate will always be about its size. I am glad that it has rained in recent years. I wish that it had rained a lot earlier this year; it would have been much better than having to wait for the rain being presently forecast.

However, having that level of security through a guaranteed water supply will make an enormous difference, but it comes at a cost. The very significant increases in the cost of water in recent years is putting even more pressure upon ordinary South Australians, no matter what level their income, to pay their water bills. That in turn impacts cost of living pressures on them and what they can provide for their family and the communities in which they live, too.

As an adjunct to water costs pressures, in terms of agricultural production, in the community in which I live on Yorke Peninsula there is an intensive animal-keeping opportunity. I have had contact from people who have expressed great concern about their ability to continue to do that because of the water costs. I am not suggesting any form of radical concessions for agricultural production, but there has to be a balance there so that, when there is an associated economic activity, with an important service and an important set of infrastructure, you look at the fees that are applied on that in order to ensure that it gives that associated industry a chance to be successful.

No matter what side of the chamber you sit, you probably have been approached about the cost of living. I constantly have people coming to me about the cost of electricity, their water costs, their council rates, their vehicle registration issues and what it is costing them for insurance on their property and the cost of education. It is the collective of that that causes a lot of concern for all individual members of parliament. We try to get it right. There are those on your side of the chamber, Mr Deputy Speaker, who have dealt with this intimately for years, and I respect that. They must feel the pressure in exactly the same way we do. The issue that is facing our state and our nation is trying to get it right.

Electricity costs are getting a bit scary. It is rather interesting that policy work which has encouraged people to take up photovoltaic cells has resulted in an uptake far in excess of what was originally intended. There was great dilemma when that debate was happening about what the appropriate level of the feed-in tariff was going to be and about what the social impact would be upon people, many of whom cannot afford photovoltaic cells.

My understanding is that about 15 per cent of electricity consumers have the PV cells and that the 85 per cent who do not—and indeed the other 15 per cent—are paying more in electricity charges to compensate for the feed-in tariff, which does not come, as some people seem to think, from a magical bucket of government funds but comes from the fees that everybody pays, and that is creating pressures.

No matter how conservative you are in your business or in your home, the electricity issues are causing a lot of worry. There are members who will stand up and say that they are aware of people who are using candles, instead of turning on the lights, because they feel as though they

cannot afford to pay for that, so they are looking at every opportunity to keep their costs as low as possible. That is a pressure we all feel, no matter whether you are in charge of the Treasury or part of an opposition that would love to have the opportunity to be in charge of the Treasury. To get that right will be the key issue the election next year will be fought on. It will be what people pay, it will be the appropriateness of what they pay and it will be what they feel is the value they get for what they pay. All of us will be announcing many things over the next 10½ months to get that right.

I have looked at some of the responses to the Mid-Year Budget Review in anticipation of what is going to come in about five weeks' time when the Treasurer and the Premier present the budget to South Australians. It is interesting when you look at the deficit periods that have existed in recent years, other than the one surplus, which was in the 2009-10 financial year. I looked at the finances very closely in that financial year and there were some exceptional circumstances that created an opportunity for a surplus to be recorded. Most of that was as a result of money transfers from the federal government to the state government.

Indeed, I remember a telephone call not long before the 2010 election, when the very strong belief in increased GST revenue to the state made an enormous difference to the financial projections put out by both parties during the 2010 election campaign. It has shown what the challenge is. Deficits and surpluses are measured by the ability to create a strong environment to bring about a revenue opportunity through transactions and, indeed, the ability to manage expenses. That is where my great concern has always been in the seven years that I have been here, that is, management of expenditure control being in place. That is why I have referred briefly in the past to the Public Service numbers, and that is where it comes from.

I do not criticise the people who have been given the employment opportunities for that. They have taken what is legally available to them. My concern has always been about the level of unbudgeted number of public increases that, I think, has been total ministerial responsibility, because it is those people, through the controls they have in their organisations and departments, who have said yes to positions being created when it should have been obvious to every person that there was no money to pay for those positions.

Then you have these situations in mid-year budget reviews. I vividly remember one about 3½ years ago when, within six months of a budget coming down, there was a mid-year budget review and over the next 3½ years on the wages liability South Australians were going to be up for another \$500 million from what was budgeted for only six months before that. I wonder how you can control things at that level and expect the finances to add up at the end of the financial year and expect the forward capacity of the state to pay for things such as infrastructure when the controls are not there. It bothers the life out of me.

I have looked for a long time at state taxation, too. The Commonwealth Grants Commission has provided us with some very interesting details which refer to a lot of the increases across payroll tax, conveyance duties, land tax, property taxation, gambling taxes, insurance taxes and motor vehicle taxes. It is interesting that from 2001-02 through to the 2012-13 mid-year financial review that there has been an 85 per cent change in taxation revenues. In that time, CPI has been evident, there is no doubt about that, of about 36 per cent, so it is that difference where it is purely the government's decision to put in place taxation that it wants, and it is that decision which has created a lot of the challenge associated with business success and financial return to people and the ability of people to live with the cost of living pressures.

Taxation is the absolute key to me. From a state taxation policy point of view, it represents about 25 to 30 per cent of the total budget of this state, but it is the absolute driver of it, and that is the bit that has to be right. It has to reflect the ability of the community to pay, but the value attached to the services that are provided are weighed against the ability to ensure that an economy is strong. It has to be a strong one because, without that, we do not get the chances.

We know that the baby boomer generation bubble is going to create a lot of challenges for us. There was a Training and Skills Commission report probably about five or six years ago that referred to 200,000 jobs being lost as a result of retirement but also an opportunity to create another 100,000 jobs on top of that through the success of the economy. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*[Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00]*

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:02):** I bring up the 25<sup>th</sup> report of the committee.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:03):** I bring up the 476<sup>th</sup> report of the committee entitled Adelaide Festival Centre and Her Majesty's Theatre Sustainment Works.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr SIBBONS:** I bring up the 477<sup>th</sup> report of the committee entitled Hawker Desalination Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr SIBBONS:** I bring up the 478<sup>th</sup> report of the committee entitled Mount Barker Development Water Supply Scheme.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** In the gallery today we have the Mount Barker Waldorf School, who are guests of the member for Kavel.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** A very rowdy member, as you will see. Also in the gallery we have Pulteney Grammar School, Adelaide University DIAC and the Rotary Club of Walkerville, who are guests of the member for Adelaide.

**QUESTION TIME****DEFENCE INDUSTRY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house if he is aware why prominent defence company Saab Systems is cutting 30 jobs, 12 per cent of its Adelaide workforce?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:06):** Yes, I can inform the house about that matter. Saab Systems is obviously a defence company that is based here in South Australia, down in Edinburgh Parks. It is a key player in South Australia's defence landscape and integral to the achievement of our state's defence ambitions. Saab operates at the high end of the defence space, delivering complex systems and engineering projects which are often mission critical for the particular projects in question. In the maritime field, Saab develops and supports the Anzac combat systems and the manoeuvring and platform systems controls of the Collins systems subs. Inland it delivered the Battlefield Command Support System, and it continues to work on a number of sensitive force protection matters.

Saab employs about 340 staff, largely in Adelaide, and the planned workforce reduction represents about 10 per cent of the company's workforce. The reductions flow from restructuring activity as a result of the normal wind-down of projects. For example, Saab Systems' key role in the land and helicopter dock project is nearing completion. The company has provided the combat management system for the two amphibious ships under construction at Williamstown BAE.

Affected staff in relation to the redundancies are predominantly from the largely highly skilled and experienced software engineers, an occupation which is in extraordinarily high demand across the nation. Obviously, we continue to advance South Australia's efforts to attract defence contracts. Defence SA does an extraordinary job in that regard. We have attracted about 25 per cent of the nation's defence procurement. We continue to win projects. Some projects come to an end and others then ramp up. Obviously, this brings into sharp relief the importance of our having a continual pipeline of projects. The Future Submarines project—

*Members interjecting:*



**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, you can do something about this. The Future Submarines project, which is a critical project that the current federal Labor government is committed to, has—

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms Chapman:** What rubbish! Don't mislead the house!

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will be seated. The deputy leader will withdraw that remark forthwith. It is unparliamentary and may only be made by substantive motion.

**Ms Chapman:** I am happy to withdraw it.

**The SPEAKER:** I am glad you are happy. Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Thank you. I detect a bruise that I've accidentally touched.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** A mote in their eye.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That's right, a mote in their eye.

**The SPEAKER:** I call the Minister for Transport to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Because these are project driven employment outcomes in the defence sector, it is crucial that we have a continuing pipeline. Defence SA is regarded as a national leader in the attraction of defence procurement. Future Submarines, which has many of the high-end jobs that Saab would be pitching into, is precisely the sort of thing that will allow us to sustain and indeed grow jobs into the future.

#### **PREMIER'S COMMUNITY EXCELLENCE AWARDS IN MINING AND ENERGY**

**The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (14:09):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about the 2013 Premier's Community Excellence Awards in Mining and Energy?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:09):** I was pleased to attend the awards just last evening together with the Minister for Transport and, indeed, the Leader of the Opposition and the deputy leader, who were in a much better mood last night than they seem to be today. I don't know why that is, but they were happier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Don't pull a face; it's unattractive. Last night, I had the pleasure to announce the winners of the Premier's Community Excellence Awards in Mining and Energy—the third time these awards have been presented. I would like to congratulate SACOME on the fantastic work they've done in developing these awards. The awards acknowledge and celebrate the contribution of resource companies to our community and environment. The contribution is an important part of building a durable relationship within the community that acknowledges the respective interests of the community and the mining sector.

This year's entries showcase an impressive breadth and depth of initiatives. The entries received show the ways in which companies ensure the social benefits derived from resource exploration development add another dimension to the cultural life and wellbeing of South Australians. There is a very broad range of projects: targeted employment and mentoring programs, breaking the cycle of social disadvantage, through to supporting sporting and cultural events.

In addition to the categories of Excellence in Social Inclusion and Excellence in Supporting Community Participation, the 2013 awards were expanded to include two new categories: Excellence in Leadership—Women in Resources, and Excellence in Environmental Management. I would like to congratulate Beach Energy and OZ Minerals, who were the joint winners of Excellence in Leadership—Women in Resources, for their cross-industry partnership through the Leading My Career program.

The winner of the Excellence in Environmental Management was Flinders Logistics for its new technology to address the whole question of dust at ports. They've created an Australian first right here in South Australia with the innovative use of containers along the pit to port supply chain to maximise dust suppression. The Excellence in Social Inclusion was awarded to Iluka Resources for their working partnership with Aboriginal people.

The final award—Excellence in Supporting Community Participation—was awarded to Pepinnini Minerals and Royal Resources. They went to extraordinary lengths to engage their communities, even though they are relatively small companies, in what they are planning to do, and that will build great confidence. If they move to the next phase of the development of their resource, that relationship they've formed with their communities will stand them in very good stead.

I congratulate all of the nominees. They've all demonstrated that, in South Australia at least, resource companies understand they need a social licence to operate. They are reaching out. It's becoming a part of the way in which they do business. It makes our job as regulators easier and, of course, the benefits accrue to the broader community.

#### **ADVANCED MANUFACTURING STRATEGY**

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13):** My question is to the Premier. As growing advanced manufacturing is one of the Premier's four pillars in his economic statement, why have job cuts been announced at Broens SA, Priority Engineering and now Saab Systems, all in the last few weeks?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:13):** I thank the honourable member for his question, but the observation doesn't match up with the point we made about advanced manufacturing needing to be the focus. The reason advanced manufacturing has to be the focus is precisely because of a number of changes in our manufacturing sector; that is, the high Australian dollar, created in part by the resources boom, is placing pressure on traditional forms of manufacturing.

Cheaper imports come in and exports become more difficult to sell if price is the only means by which you seek to compete, so you have to compete on the basis of value. The way you compete on the basis of value is that you go up the technological chain in terms of your product innovation. You innovate with new business models, you innovate with new marketing techniques and you find new ways of reaching customers in new places.

**Mrs Redmond:** So, these people weren't advanced manufacturing.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That's precisely the challenge that I did set out in the economic statement—

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Heysen to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —and it's precisely the matter about which there has been absolutely no response from the opposition, not even a comment about whether that was the correct—

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** I anticipate that the member for Stuart's point of order is going to be that the Premier is not responsible to the house for Her Majesty's opposition.

**An honourable member:** Loyal opposition.

**The SPEAKER:** Loyal opposition. I uphold that point of order, before I have even heard it.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. So, the cause of a decline in manufacturing is the very question that we set out in detail. We acknowledge the challenge in this sector and we set out the pathway to get there. We've published a detailed advanced manufacturing strategy for the future in South Australia and we are methodically working our way through that very document.

The truth is that the mining sector and the defence sector, which were the early economic strategies of this government—and they remain important strategies of this government—are necessarily only transitional strategies, because the truth is that every defence contract is subject to the whim of a national government, and we might find this very soon, if there happens to be a change in the federal government. It is one contract decision away. It is not a market decision: it is basically a federal government decision-making process.

In much the same way, mining is very much held captive to the price of commodities, the fluctuations in commodity markets, and mines do deplete. So, that is why our strategy does move to this next phase where we seek to imbed the opportunities that are being created in defence and mining and create an advanced manufacturing culture that draws on them, for instance, mining

services that supply the answers to the very questions these mines are posing so that they can go on supplying those services long after those mines are depleted.

In the case of defence, we are not just pitching for a defence contract, but a particular component of the defence contract that might have applications in the civil area and might have applications all around the world. We're beginning to see this. We are seeing companies like SAGE Automation that are pitching into mining and defence, but they're finding that they're getting a niche there in advanced manufacturing processes that they're using across a whole range of sectors. So, that is what the advanced manufacturing strategy is about, and the fact that from time to time there are businesses that close and those that open does not affect the overall strategy.

That is what we must focus on. It is not about one individual project, and this is the point that I have been seeking to make. We shouldn't be analysing one individual project and, from that, declaring that the world is at an end or that the streets are going to be paved with gold. It is the long-term strategy that we're focusing on—the strategy we have laid out in detail, about which there should be a serious public debate.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier's time has expired. For multiple offending, I call the member for Morialta and the deputy leader to order, and I warn the member for Heysen for the first time.

### DEFENCE INDUSTRY

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17):** My question is again to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by Labor's 2010 election policy which stated, and I quote, 'More jobs will open up in the defence industries in South Australia over the next five years', or is this another example of over-spruiking?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:18):** No, we do stand by our commitment and, indeed, we have continued to pursue the very substantial contracts that exist in the defence sector for the benefit of the South Australian defence sector and, by reference, our advanced manufacturing ambitions. What could be a more important contract to pursue than the Future Submarines contract? We've already seen, in relation to the Future Submarines contract, the 12 new submarines which will be the largest defence procurement, indeed, the largest procurement of any sort, undertaken by the commonwealth.

We've already seen that the current commonwealth government has made a commitment to a design centre, which will be based in South Australia, and has made a commitment to a land-based testing site, which will be based in South Australia; and we are continuing to advocate for further steps to be taken by the federal Labor government which cement South Australia as the home for the Future Submarines Project. It is a natural decision to be taken. Those opposite have chosen to resist the opportunity to call upon their federal colleagues to confirm that South Australia will be the home of Future Submarines, so they have a role to play in this regard.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** This is not just something that falls to the government: this is something that the opposition can assist this state with by putting state ahead of party and by ensuring that we secure these Future Submarine projects for South Australia. It's become an urgent proposition because the pace of change for our state is rapidly increasing. So, we must change more quickly than the world around us, and that means ensuring that we have a solid base. The truth is that we are in transition. We have seen that. That is at the essence of the deal we have done in relation to Holden's. It was a deal about transition, accepting that we were going to have change, but wanting to make sure that our workers were equipped with the skills and the capacities to move into jobs that we are creating, away from the jobs that were shrinking. That's the support we need from an opposition, if it is truly to be a loyal opposition to this state—not to this government but to this state.

**Mr Gardner:** What are you implying?

**Mr MARSHALL:** A supplementary.

**The SPEAKER:** Before the supplementary, I warn the member for Morialta for the first time.

## DEFENCE INDUSTRY

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20):** Given that the Premier has said that he does stand by their 2010 election policy that more jobs will open up in defence industries in South Australia, can he explain where these jobs are actually going to come from, given that the federal government has cut in excess of \$5 billion out of defence spending in their recent budgets?

**The SPEAKER:** I'll allow that as a supplementary.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:21):** The simple truth is that the cuts that have been proposed by the commonwealth government have had a relatively small effect in relation to South Australia.

**Mr Marshall:** Are you joking?

**The SPEAKER:** The leader will come to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Our opportunity is to win an increasingly greater slice of the defence procurement that exists. We already achieve 25 per cent of the nation's defence procurement. We are only 7.3 per cent of the nation's population, and so we are already batting well above our averages there. We will continue to seek a larger share of a necessarily shrinking pie, but can I say this, that the—

**Mr Marshall:** A necessarily shrinking pie?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well it is necessarily shrinking because the commonwealth government control defence spending.

**Mr Marshall:** You sound like you're endorsing it.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Now, Mr Speaker, those opposite would be better spending their breath—the federal opposition can make the single biggest decision that will rest all of this. We could have a bipartisan commitment to Future Submarines and the thousands of jobs—high-end jobs, jobs that will allow us to promote advanced manufacturing in South Australia—if it simply chose to join with us and get Tony Abbott to commit with Julia Gillard, the Prime Minister of Australia, to the future of the submarine project.

It is a very simple matter. It allows us to not only grow the defence sector in the way in which we anticipate it but actually take it to a whole new level. It's not just these 12 submarines: it's all of the other jobs that flow around it. It's the capabilities and the skills that are brought then into this state. These defence contractors, when they come from overseas to base themselves in South Australia, as they have done, are not just looking for defence contracts: they are looking for mining industry contracts.

They are very inquisitive about all of the opportunities that exist in South Australia. That's why they base themselves here, and Future Submarines will allow many more of them to come to this state in ways that will allow our economy to grow in this area. There is a very simple solution: if those opposite are concerned about defence spending, ask Tony Abbott to join with Julia Gillard and ensure that Future Submarines are locked and loaded for South Australia.

## ROYAL DISTRICT NURSING SERVICE

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23):** My question is again to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house if he is aware why 50 RDNS nursing positions are being cut today?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:23):** The Minister for Health is not available for question time today, so I will take it on notice and the answer will be brought back forthwith.

## SOUTH ROAD UPGRADES

**Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:24):** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and happy May Day. My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure.

**Mr Pisoni:** Comrade.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is called to order. Member for Mitchell.

**Mr SIBBONS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection. Can the minister inform the house about factors it considers when determining upgrades on South Road and the state government's response to the proposal by the federal opposition?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:24):** Thank you for the question, member for Mitchell. It is this Labor government that has put up the north-south corridor as a priority. It is this government, together with industry groups like SARTA, the South Australian Freight Council, Business SA and the RAA, that lobbied the commonwealth to ensure that all of South Road was on the national network.

Right now, we are constructing the biggest road project in the history of South Australia—the \$842 million South Road Superway. We are building this because it helps reduce freight times for the part of South Road that has the largest number of trucks on it. Last Saturday, Mr Abbott proposed a \$500 million contribution and demanded a state contribution of \$250 million for works on South Road at Darlington.

Mr Abbott and the Leader of the Opposition announced a \$750 million project—the Leader of the Opposition and Mr Abbott standing shoulder to shoulder on the side of the road. The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has advised my office that the half of the Darlington transport plan, which is what Mr Abbott promised—that is, just the cost of the road component—is just over a billion dollars. They have got it wrong; the project cost is wrong.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Would the Minister for Transport please be seated? The leader is warned for the first time. The member for Heysen is warned for the second time and there will be no further warnings. The minister will be heard in silence. Minister for Transport.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It is not enough, and under this proposal Mr Abbott needs to contribute more or the state needs to contribute more, but it gets better. Under the proposal of Mr Abbott, which is already underfunded, he conveniently decided to ignore the public transport component—

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order—this is clearly a debate about the cost of a road.

**The SPEAKER:** No, it is germane to the question and, accordingly, I warn you for a frivolous and vexatious point of order that obstructs the business of the house. The Minister for Transport.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The Darlington transport plan was all about integration of rail connecting Flinders Medical Centre and Flinders University to the city. DPTI has advised my office that the rail component is estimated to cost in the order of \$800 million. To do this project properly in Nation Building 2, the projected future cost is approximately \$1.82 billion. This would mean that the state government would have to contribute \$1.3 billion.

Mr Abbott has either proposed a scheme that is massively underfunded or he intends to build a cheap and nasty version. His contribution might even jeopardise any chance of a rail extension in the future. To build only parts of the Darlington transport project is like building another one-way expressway.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Would the Minister for Transport be seated? The member for Chaffey is called to order. The Minister for Transport.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** True to form, the Liberal Party has released a half-baked policy with costings done on the back of a postage stamp again.

**Mr PENGILLY:** Point of order, sir—this is clearly debate.

**The SPEAKER:** No, it is a reply to the question that was asked, which I listened to carefully. I do think government ministers are responsible to the house for the assessment of policy proposals at the federal level. They are not responsible to the house for the state opposition's policies but they are responsible for assessments made of proposals originating at another level of government. The Minister for Transport.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Available publicly is a Darlington Transport Study of the north-south corridor which is online, and hopefully members opposite can use a computer. The DTS—a study which calls for the upgrade of the Darlington interchange—proposes the following. It calls for duplicating and extending the Tonsley rail line to a new terminus at Flinders University with new stations also servicing the Sturt Triangle and Flinders Medical Centre—not included in their proposal; providing a 15-minute frequency weekday tram/train service on the Tonsley rail line; providing a park-and-ride facility and new public transport interchange within Sturt Triangle for bus, tram and train services; and establishing a greenway (bicycle and pedestrian paths) adjacent to the Tonsley rail line to connect to the Seaford rail line at Woodlands Park Station and to the Patrick Jonker Veloway adjacent to the Southern Expressway.

None of that was included in that weekend announcement. They have not included enough money to make this project work. They have announced a dud, and either the opposition needs to stack up more money to make this work or it means that we have to pick up the slack that the federal opposition has not included in the funding. It is a dud deal.

**The SPEAKER:** A supplementary.

### SOUTH ROAD UPGRADES

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30):** Thank you. Could the minister update the house on precisely how much his government has provided for this very important project in the forward estimates? Is the answer to that zero?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:30):** Well, as much as you have.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** It's your question time.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** You idiot!

**The SPEAKER:** I think the Minister for Transport ought to withdraw the suggestion that the Leader of the Opposition is 'you idiot'.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I wouldn't want to offend him, sir; he's very sensitive.

**The SPEAKER:** I'm sorry, I didn't quite catch that.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I wouldn't want to offend him, sir; he is very sensitive.

**The SPEAKER:** No; what I would like is an unreserved withdrawal. Could I have that?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I unreservedly withdraw, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Mr Gardner:** What does 'unreservedly' mean?

**The SPEAKER:** I won't abide pedantry from the member for Morialta.

**Ms Chapman:** What about the one you're hiding in your department?

**Mrs REDMOND:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is warned for the second and final time, and the member for Heysen has a point of order. It would be a pity if it were frivolous and vexatious, because then I would have to—

**Mrs REDMOND:** Eject me.

**The SPEAKER:** —require her to leave the house.

**Mrs REDMOND:** You would. It's a point of clarification rather than a point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** That won't get you off.

**Mrs REDMOND:** I understood the Speaker to say that he wouldn't abide pedantry on the part of the member, and I just wanted to clarify that—

**The SPEAKER:** Yes; it was a joke, Joyce.

**Mrs REDMOND:** —that was indeed what you said.

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

### PETROL PRICE BOARDS

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:32):** My question is to the Minister for Business Services and Consumers. What plans are there to increase transparency and consumer protection in relation to petrol price boards?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:32):** I thank the member for Colton for his question. There is going to be the introduction of an industry code to regulate the operation of petrol price boards before the end of this year. I have received a number of representations from individuals, either directly or through the Consumer and Business Services department, and also, might I add, from the RAA. The nature of the complaint is that there are many petrol sign boards around the place in Adelaide at the present time where the price of the fuel that is advertised on the price board is actually the discounted price, not the bowser price of fuel.

What this means is that a person driving by that service station does not have the opportunity to assess the actual bowser price of the fuel in that service station compared with other offerings that might be nearby and, therefore, cannot compare apples with apples, and this of course brings us into the whole question about voucher schemes and so forth. Many people have found this confusing. I know that a very prominent person who joined the ABC does not seem to find it confusing and tweets constantly that he is not confused; but there are other people out there, many of them elderly people, who are confused by this process.

So, what we are going to do is to say that bait pricing in the form of misrepresentative advertising of the bowser price of fuel will have to cease and that the non-discounted price of the fuel will be the only price which can be the headline price appearing on these signboards. However, there is no reason that a discount cannot be offered, for example, to voucher holders, but that would have to be conveyed to the consumer in a way other than representing the discounted price as being the price for fuel available to anybody who drives into that station.

Members of parliament would be aware that some of the larger retail chains have, of course, their own service stations, and these chains regularly advertise their price with 4¢, 5¢ or 8¢ off the actual bowser price. That means that, to the uninformed consumer or the person trying to make a swift split-second decision, they appear to be selling fuel at a price which is cheaper than that of the independent retailers who, of course, are not involved in the same process.

What is going to have to happen is that the price boards will not have to change but the numbers on them will have to be changed to be representative of the bowser price. There will be significant penalties for noncompliance and I am confident, as a result of the feedback we have had, that this will be well supported and appreciated by the community.

### EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier still stand by Labor's election promise to create 100,000 new jobs or was the Premier's recent recommitment to this promise just another example of over-spruiking?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:35):** As I have said before, we continue to have this as our objective. This is something we announced at the last election and we will continue to pursue it. Essentially, the heart and the purpose of our party is to create employment. That is what drives us. The pursuing of jobs—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** No, this is the objective we set ourselves at the last election, and we will continue to drive towards that objective.

### BUDGET FORECAST

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier sought an update of state revenue projections after federal revenue projections for this year were revised down by \$12 billion and, if so, are revenues on track to meet the current budget?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:36):** I thank the honourable member for his question. Perhaps for his information, it is a regular matter for Treasury to update the state government from time to time in relation to how the government and the Treasury are plotting against forecasts. That is something that happens on a routine basis. That information is plotted on a regular basis. The most recent data will be incorporated, announced and published in the budget. That is when you will have the answer to your question.

A fundamental input into the revenue coming into South Australia will, indeed, be the revenue coming in from the commonwealth budget, either directly through specific purpose payments—and we will have to see how the commonwealth addresses the write-down in its revenues in terms of how it responds in terms of state government financial arrangements—or there is another element of the federal budget which is not directly a matter of the federal budget but, indeed, estimates that come from the Commonwealth Grants Commission, which are estimates of future projections of GST and then the distributions of the GST to the various states.

That will also be known in the federal budget and that has the most material effect on our future revenue projections. The short answer is that our state forecast of state-owned revenue will be contained in the budget. Budget night for the commonwealth will contain projections of commonwealth funding into South Australia, so that will be apparent on that night; and on that federal budget night there will also be GST projections which will allow us to be clearer about what will be coming into the state budget through GST distributions.

#### BUDGET FORECAST

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38):** Has the Premier had any discussions with the federal government about cuts to federal funding to South Australia, given the downward revisions to federal revenue announced by the Prime Minister?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:38):** No. If I understand the member's question correctly, is he suggesting that the commonwealth has proposed reductions in commonwealth expenditure in South Australia as a consequence of their revenue rejections and, therefore, have I become aware of them? No, I have not become aware of them through any discussions that have been had with the commonwealth.

The only caveat I would put on that is something that we are all aware of, and that is that there are a number of expiring national partnership arrangements that exist between the commonwealth and the state governments, and this has been the topic of regular agitation between all the states and territories and the commonwealth government, most recently at COAG. A number of those have been resolved favourably to the states and territories, so a continuation of those arrangements has meant that a number of those key risks no longer exist.

There are still, though, some national partnership agreements which we are looking to see how the commonwealth will treat on budget night to see whether that money still will flow into South Australia. We have not been advised of what the intentions are about those matters, but budget night will reveal how the commonwealth has treated those matters.

#### BUDGET FORECAST

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39):** Just a supplementary, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, if it is a supplementary.

**Mr MARSHALL:** I think it is a supplementary, because we are talking about the federal government updating the people of Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** A question would be good.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Okay. Will the Premier update the public regarding the state's revenue outlook before the state budget as the Prime Minister has to the Australian people regarding her upcoming budget?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:39):** No, we will be waiting until the budget to supply that. In the ordinary course, how the commonwealth seeks to communicate—



*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, she obviously had something very significant to say, which was an extraordinarily large writedown in the revenue arrangements for the budget. She made a choice about how she wished to communicate. We make our own decisions which are consistent with past practice; that is, there is a budget announcement, a Mid-Year Budget Review. They are the occasions on which the community is updated about the projections. It is sensible to wait until those times because there are fluctuations over the course of the year. It is sensible to wait until all the information is in so that we can make sensible forecasts—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I am not responsible to this house for the decisions that are made by the federal government.

### BUDGET FORECAST

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40):** Final supplementary on this topic, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** If it be a supplementary.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Can the Treasurer at least update the people of South Australia with regard to the final position and can he rule out any further deterioration in the projected deficit of \$1.2 billion this year?

**The SPEAKER:** Okay, that is clear, thank you. Treasurer.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:41):** These are matters for the budget. They have always been matters for the budget.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, you will have to wait and see. We can do this all the way to budget day, but it is consistently never done. We never reveal the final position until budget day, because we are still collating information, in particular, some pretty important information that will flow from the federal budget, which could have a direct bearing one way or the other on the way in which the final forecast result occurs in South Australia. So, we wait until the federal budget and then we reveal those matters in a complete way to the South Australian community. This is how it has always been done; it is how it is going to be done this year.

### PORT PIRIE MAGISTRATE

**Mr BROCK (Frome) (14:42):** Can the Attorney-General tell us who or what is holding up the appointment of a resident magistrate in Port Pirie, for which I put in a submission in 2011?

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I am sorry, I did not quite catch the deputy leader.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:42):** She was advising the house that she was responsible for the failure.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you for assisting me, Attorney-General.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I am grateful to the member for Bragg for assisting me in answering the question from the member for Frome, and I thank him for the question. I can confirm that it is indeed the member for Bragg who is responsible. Aside from that, can I just explain a little by way of background, because it might assist the member for Frome and other members.

The government in the budget process each year provides a certain amount of money to an outfit called the Courts Administration Authority. The Courts Administration Authority is quite independent of the Attorney-General's Department and is not subject to any direction by me. It is subject to the direction ultimately of a council, which is chaired by the Chief Justice of South Australia. It is a matter for the Courts Administration Authority to determine what within its budget it will allocate its funds toward.

My understanding, having pursued this matter, is that the Chief Magistrate, who is a member of the council, is of the view that there is a case to be made, or indeed to be put, for

supporting regional magistrates, including in Port Pirie. So, there is no lack of appreciation of the merit of the proposition that is being advanced by the honourable member.

Also, I am advised through the Chief Magistrate that the Courts Administration Authority has indicated that there is currently insufficient capacity for redirecting funding to accommodate the request. Inasmuch as we do not yet know because we have not yet had the budget—we do not know what will or will not occur in the budget in respect of the Courts Administration Authority's annual budget—I do need to make something very clear.

In the event of any change in the funding of the Courts Administration Authority, any increase in money that might or might not go to the Courts Administration Authority, it is not within the capacity of the Treasurer, the Premier, the Attorney-General or anyone else to tell the Courts Administration Authority that that increased money must be applied to a particular task, such as putting a resident magistrate in Port Pirie.

None of us have the capacity to do that. I think we will just have to see whether anything emerges in the budget but, if it does, I have to say to the member for Frome, the ultimate decision is a matter for the courts to determine how they will allocate their funds amongst their various competing internal priorities.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary, member for Frome.

#### **PORT PIRIE MAGISTRATE**

**Mr BROCK (Frome) (14:45):** If I understand that correctly, if I approach the Chief Magistrate and put a case to them, they may make a decision yes or no?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:45):** I thank the honourable member again for that question. At the risk of providing what might be seen as advice or whatever on this to the house, it seems to me that, seeing as the actual allocation of moneys within the budget for the Courts Administration Authority is a matter for the Courts Administration Authority, it would probably be useful, if the honourable member has not already made a representation to the authority, to make a representation not only to the Chief Magistrate but possibly also a representation to the Chief Justice and other members of the governing council of the Courts Administration Authority, because ultimately—

**Mr Marshall:** Why didn't you tell him that two years ago when he wrote to you? That would have been helpful.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** We wouldn't have been able to have this question, would we? If I might make a suggestion to the honourable member, that would be a good way to advance the matter, and I would be happy to facilitate that in any way that I might.

#### **BUILDING INDEMNITY INSURANCE**

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna) (14:46):** My question is to the Minister for Finance. What is being done to maintain confidence in the building industry following the withdrawal of QBE from the warranty insurance market?

**The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:47):** I thank the member for Kaurna for the question. I am able to inform the house that last week the government announced building indemnity insurance will continue to be offered after QBE withdraws from the market in June. Building indemnity insurance protects home owners in the event of incomplete or defective residential work in circumstances where the builder has died, disappeared or become insolvent. Under South Australian legislation the defects liability period is five years from the date of completion of the residential building work.

Given that building indemnity insurance is required by legislation, in the absence of private insurers offering this cover, the state government will manage this risk in the short term at least to ensure continuity of cover for home owners. The government is currently in discussions with QBE Insurance. The company has indicated its willingness to act as an agent for the government from 1 July of this year to 30 June 2014. The terms of the proposed agency arrangement are presently being negotiated and a formal agreement is expected to be signed in coming weeks.

QBE indicated earlier this year its withdrawal from the market was because of significant increases in builder insolvencies and subsequent home owner claims. I will also add that a similar

set of circumstances in Western Australia has also led to QBE announcing its withdrawal from the Western Australian market. QBE raised premiums by 50 per cent in March, in line with their actuarial valuation in the light of increasing insolvencies.

There are a number of options available to the state government to address QBE's withdrawal from the building indemnity insurance market, as evidenced by the different approaches adopted interstate, particularly in Victoria and New South Wales. These options are currently being considered and we have received a great deal of assistance from the governments of both of those states.

A preferred long-term insurance model will be developed and implemented as a priority. I have met with the Housing Industry Association and the Master Builders Association to update them on the government's intentions. Both have welcomed the proposed agency arrangement as providing surety for the next 12 months while a longer-term solution is developed. In a statement on 23 April, the Regional Director of the HIA, Mr Robert Harding said:

HIA welcomes the South Australian Government's announcement of the arrangements to underwrite the continuation of Builder Indemnity Insurance in South Australia. The most important point to note is that it is business as usual for the South Australian home builders and our Builder Members can move forward with confidence while a new model is developed.

End of quote: end of answer.

### HISTORY FESTIVAL

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:50):** My question is to the Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts. Can the minister inform the house about South Australia's History Festival, About Time?

**The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts) (14:50):** Last—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.C. FOX:** That's alright. I'll give it a whirl. Last Monday I was lucky enough, with the Leader of the Opposition and a few other people, to be present at the launch of About Time, which is the beginning of the South Australian History Month. It used to be a history week, but in 2011 it became a history month, such was the popularity of this particular festival.

Across South Australia, in the regional areas as well as the metropolitan areas, there are some 300 events in about 500 different locations; obviously, they move around. In a number of areas there are very interesting tours of places like local cemeteries and local stately homes. It really is something which is worthwhile getting involved in.

As I said, it goes for a month, and the reason that it goes for so long is the immense popularity that has been shown because of this particular area. South Australia has a very rich, very vibrant history, one which is quite extraordinary. We have a number of social firsts in this state which we are very proud of. The history festival itself ranges from, obviously, pre-colonial era history right up until very recently.

One of the things I can particularly recommend is a visit to Holdfast Bay, to the castle, a beautiful old house which has been opened for the first time. Talking about old houses, Governor Scarce and Mrs Scarce have been very gracious in opening up their house, as always, for various different tours. For those of you who would like an opportunity, every single Sunday during that time there will be a tour of Parliament House; if you don't know enough about it already, perhaps you can come back. I would urge all those people who have events going on in their areas, as I said, both metropolitan and regional, to get involved. It really is a great festival.

### CHILD PROTECTION

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. When was the minister made aware of the new indecent assault charges filed today against the after-school care worker at the western suburbs school at the centre of the Debelle inquiry?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:52):** I was alerted to the fact that he was in court today facing additional charges, as I understand it, in relation to his first victim. This government is committed to doing what we can, as best we can, to protect children. We have undertaken a lot of

steps since we have been in government to provide better protections, importantly, having all our teachers have criminal history checks.

I understand that it was the former Liberal government that brought in criminal history checks for teachers, but that was only for new teachers. We invested funds for the Teachers Registration Board to backdate checks for something like in excess of 30,000 teachers, and then again, under this government, legislation was passed to oblige those people who are working in environments where they work with children to have criminal history and background screening checks.

This person has breached a fundamental trust that we all give when we allow our children into schools, kindergartens and after-hours school care, with people whom we expect to honour that trust. I think our teaching profession feels betrayed, I think parents feel betrayed and certainly I think we in this house feel betrayed.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:54):** I have a supplementary question, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, a supplementary, if it be a supplementary.

**Mr PISONI:** Can the minister then confirm that it is only today that she has been made aware of new charges against a new child laid on—

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

**Mr PISONI:** Well, that's what you said.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley will ask a question rather than make an impromptu speech.

**Mr PISONI:** Can you advise the house when you were made aware of the new indecent assault charges—

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, that's clear.

**Mr PISONI:** —filed today?

**The SPEAKER:** That's clear. Minister.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:55):** I can tell the member for Unley that my understanding is that this is about the first victim that was identified by the police, and the police do not regularly advise me about charges that they are laying.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Bragg.

**Mr Pisoni:** We'll see you later on this afternoon in the parliament.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned for the second time. Member for Bragg.

#### PARTIYA KARKEREN KURDISTAN

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:55):** My question is to the Premier. What information has the Premier now received to accept ASIO's advice that PKK is a terrorist organisation?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:55):** This is a bit of a tedious line of questioning which emerged from a false report in *The Australian* some time ago. If you read the media conference, you would have realised it was what one might describe as a bit of tete-a-tete between one of the journalists at *The Australian* and myself—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Can we guess?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —yes, insert name herein—about this whole question of the Minister for Multicultural Affairs attending a community event, which she had committed to do, to be with a community group which has no allegations made against them. They are just a simple community group in South Australia that wished to have the relevant minister along with them as they were commemorating the deaths of certain people that had occurred in another place. They

were mourning their deaths and the minister decided it was appropriate to be with them in that situation.

I was given a line of questioning by the relevant journalist which sought to suggest that I somehow or the minister somehow had endorsed the activities of a terrorist group by simply attending that commemoration. The minister said she didn't, I said we didn't, the government certainly doesn't and never would support the activities of any terrorist group.

Never at any time did I suggest that we disagreed with ASIO's advice that another organisation—not the community group that the minister attended—was a terrorist organisation, yet it was reported in a way that suggested that I had. It's simply a false report that has now been leveraged up with a further false report today. It does no credit to the journalist in question to continue to repeat a false report, and we will be taking the matter further.

#### **PARTIYA KARKEREN KURDISTAN**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:57):** I have a supplementary.

**The SPEAKER:** If it be a supplementary.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** So does the Premier accept ASIO's advice that PKK is a terrorist organisation?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:57):** I don't know what that's got to do with anything except, yes, of course we do. We don't have any reason to doubt ASIO's advice and never question ASIO's advice about this matter.

#### **MINING INDUSTRY**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:58):** My question is to the Minister for Finance. Can the Minister for Finance explain why he thinks South Australia has effectively missed the mining boom?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:58):** The government's position in relation to this matter is consistent. Different of us express ourselves in different ways, but the simple truth is this: the Reserve Bank, in March, have published an analysis about how they see the mining boom and how it has developed in this country. It has three phases: the first phase is the terms of trade price hike, the second phase is the investment phase and the third phase is the production phase.

The first of those phases is over. Some people call that the mining boom and that's certainly the characterisation that the Minister for Finance placed on it in his public remarks. I don't necessarily share that same analysis about that being the mining boom. I think the whole of it can fairly be described as the mining boom in this nation, and that's, I think, the generally accepted understanding.

Let's get to the gravamen of it. Leaving aside the question of what we call this, the central issue is that there is a heightened level of activity in the mining sector in this nation and, increasingly, in this state, and that's the issue that we address. The reason we need to address that issue is, one, we need to make sure we capture our fair share of it and, secondly, we need to make sure that the benefit we do capture is shared by more South Australians. So, that is why we describe one of our key priorities as realising the benefits of the mining boom for all South Australians.

That's the issue at stake. What's the challenge? Well, that same mining boom is driving up the Australian dollar. Now, it's doing that because of the relative prosperity of our nation in terms of our natural resources and the massive demands for those natural resources. But that is not all upside. Of course it's driving the economies of the resource states, but it's creating real dislocation in even those states and, certainly, in places like South Australia where there's a manufacturing industry that needs to actually trade with the world.

So, the essential issues are the same: that there is an extended, increased and heightened level of mining activity in the nation and increasingly in South Australia, and all of the policy options that flow from that are canvassed at length in our economic statement. Rather than simply play a bit of gotcha politics, which is the very thing that people are completely sick of about the way

politics works, why don't you grapple with the real issues about the mining sector, about contributing some policy developments, about realising the benefits of the mining services sectors—all of those things that count—rather than trying to make some cheap point and trying to drive some difference between the language that is used by different ministers? Why don't you engage in decent public policy debate for once? Why don't you come up with a single positive idea for the future of this state?

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order; the Premier is debating.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier has finished his answer and, if I anticipate the member for Unley's point of order, I think I would have upheld it.

#### **MINING INDUSTRY**

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:02):** Can I ask a supplementary, Mr Speaker?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I suppose you could, member for MacKillop.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Given the Premier's expansive answer to the previous question, can he explain why the reputable Canadian-based Fraser Institute has dropped our ranking from number 7 only a few years ago as a place of preference for the mining sector, to currently number 20 in the world?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:02):** Thank you very much.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** A point of clarification, please.

**The SPEAKER:** No, if you're going to ask me why the Minister for Mineral Resources is answering the question instead of the Premier, I am going to have to call you to order because it is a frivolous and vexatious point of order.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** No, it is a genuine point of clarification. I thought if a supplementary was asked to the person who provided the first answer, then that person should answer.

**The SPEAKER:** No, that's not correct and, so, accordingly, I call you to order. The Minister for Mineral Resources.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am surprised that the member for MacKillop has raised the Fraser Institute, because every time the government gets up and lauds our ranking in the Fraser Institute in terms of our regulatory approach in the nation, compared to the rest of the nation, and how we compare to the rest of the world, we usually get groans from the opposition benches about how the Canadian Fraser Institute is not always the best mark to be counted against.

**An honourable member:** So you were over-spruiking, were you?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Were we over-spruiking? We are passionate about South Australia and, if you want to talk about how well we're doing in terms of mining, I think members opposite should take a look at the actual basic figures. South Australia is continuing to grow in the mining sector. Adelaide Resources yesterday demonstrated that, as exploration targets, we are a very good place—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order, member for MacKillop.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** There appears to be no relevance to the answer that the minister is giving to my supplementary question.

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen carefully. Minister.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** In the calendar year 2011, production reached a record \$6.5 billion, increasing by \$1.6 billion from \$4.9 billion in 2010.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** If the member for MacKillop takes a point of order of relevance, I shall have to call him to order. Does he wish to take that point?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I do, indeed, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Then I call you to order.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** My question was about the Fraser Institute's ranking. It was nothing to do with the production figures it was about the Fraser Institute's ranking.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for MacKillop is warned a first and second time. The Minister for Mineral Resources.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Just to educate members opposite, the Fraser Institute does a series of anonymous surveys. They speak to people who conduct business within South Australia and they speak to people who are producers, explorers, speculators and minerals service providers, and they take surveys. They ask them about their interaction with government, the commonwealth government, the EPA, DMITRE, and they ask them about how their production and exploration targets are being met. But, when I try to talk about how exploration and exports are going, which a lot of the rankings are based on, members opposite say, 'You can't use that.' Well, that's how the Fraser Institute bases its rankings.

So, on that, we have increased our production by 31 per cent more than the previous year. Growth in our mineral sector continues as a result of mine development and expansion, rapid growth production and on-going exploration efforts. In 2002, we only had four mines; today we have 20 major mines operating, approved or under construction. That's a five-fold expansion in the number of major mines in the last decade. In the 2011 calendar year, production for the minerals sector reached a record \$5.5 billion. That's up \$1.5 billion from 2010. That's an increase of 38 per cent.

Now, that means the state is on track to meet the challenging target of \$10 billion, set out in our State's Strategic Plan for mineral production and processing by 2020. In the last financial year, the mining industry increased its contribution to South Australia's gross state product by \$1.059 billion, taking it to over \$3.8 billion per year. The breakdown of the state's commodity production highlights—you're leaving. You don't want to hear the rest of the answer and the good news? You're walking out. You're walking out—it's typical, Mr Speaker. It is typical of members opposite. They mock question time; they don't take it seriously. He asks a question; now he walks out of the chamber.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order, Mr Speaker. You have time and time again pulled members up or called points of order yourself when other members have discussed the movements of members in the house.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the member for Unley is quite right, and he needn't present standing orders to me, because it actually isn't in standing orders. It's in Erskine May and the tradition of the house. I was distracted from the minister's breach of that practice by the Opposition Whip giving me the grievance list, and so we'll leave it there.

**Mr GARDNER:** I fear I must ask a question of clarification. Are you not yourself then talking about my position in the house, and is that appropriate?

**The SPEAKER:** It's entirely appropriate that you give me a list of opposition questions and entirely appropriate that you give me a list of projected opposition grievances and that I give it due attention, which I did, and which distracted me from the breach of the minister.

**Mr GARDNER:** I feel suitably assisted by that.

**The SPEAKER:** Good. Happy to assist.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

### CEDUNA, ALCOHOL ABUSE

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:08):** I rise today to speak on an issue that has been highlighted in the media over the last couple of weeks, and it is a very difficult issue to put into the public arena and discuss, but it is a rather sad and tragic tale of continual and devastating alcohol abuse amongst a relatively small number of people living on the far west coast of this state.

Unfortunately, it would appear that there are about 75 hardcore drinkers in and around the township of Ceduna. These people are not necessarily locals to the town of Ceduna but certainly

have found themselves within the district, and are invariably unemployed, reliant upon welfare and ultimately are chronic alcoholics and indeed spend a good part of their day either seeking out or consuming alcohol.

The reason that it has been highlighted is that it has become such a social issue that the community and town of Ceduna are having to take drastic steps in an attempt to deal with this. I would like to congratulate the local council in their efforts to manage this problem. I would like to congratulate their local mayor, Allan Suter, in leading his council and his community in an effort to address this. I would also like to congratulate and thank the police who are involved at Ceduna for their efforts in attempting to maintain some sort of social structure in a very difficult situation. I also acknowledge the various government departments who are responsible for accessing government funding streams and also for delivery of service.

I would suggest that sometimes the focus is on inputs rather than outcomes with regard to government funding. That has been a challenge and a difficulty over many years. In fact, my comment often has been that a number of governments, of both persuasions, over many years have put much money towards addressing the problems relating to chronic alcohol abuse within remote and isolated communities. Despite those best intentions and vast amounts of money, it would seem that in 2013 things are coming to a head once again and, in fact, nothing has changed.

In the township of Ceduna, things came to a head once again about two years ago when a pedestrian unfortunately became a road victim. A person was walking along Goode Road, if my memory serves me correctly, and was unfortunately knocked down and later died. That brought about a Coroner's inquiry and that Coroner's inquiry ultimately handed down some findings. One of the findings was that the sobering up clinic that existed in Ceduna and was adjacent to the Ceduna hospital should be upgraded and the number of beds increased.

In fact, that did come to pass. Originally the sobering up clinic consisted of some five beds. It has been increased in number to 21 beds but, of course, what has happened is that it is often running at nearly full capacity. No matter how many beds were there, the capacity would be nearly full. Sadly I read in the press that people who are attending the sobering up clinic regularly blow around .3 into the breathalyser. That particular machine has a maximum reading of .4 and occasionally those who come into the clinic blow the maximum of .4. Anecdotal evidence is rife. One particular attendee at the sobering up clinic, when asked for his address, in fact gave the sobering up clinic as his address.

My job here today is really just to highlight and put on the public record our concern for the situation in Ceduna. The plight is for the entire community. The plight is not just for those people who are chronically abusing alcohol; there is also the social despair and discord that it brings with it. The spiral is only too well known to members here. There is alcohol abuse, family breakdown, violence and apathy towards those involved. It is a difficult situation and one that needs consideration, and I would implore governments in the future to take a bipartisan approach and make a really serious, concentrated effort in addressing this problem.

Time expired.

### COMMEMORATIONS

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:13):** Today I would like to speak about recent commemorations I have attended. On ANZAC Day, along with the members for Newland and Makin. I attended the Tea Tree Gully RSL's Dawn Service and, as has been the case each year in the past few years, the crowd was bigger than last year's. We are indeed fortunate to have the services of the Tea Tree Gully Redbacks band, a fine group of musicians all under the baton of David Gardiner. They appear at our function before they go off to the city for the ANZAC Day parade. We also now have a wonderful choir to lead us in the singing.

President Jim Thomson welcomed the gathering after the honour guard under the command of Michael Sherlock marched into the purpose-built memorial garden. I would like to commend councillor Kevin Knight from the City of Tea Tree Gully, who unfortunately took ill during the ceremony, for it was his foresight and commitment that made sure that the garden concept became a reality, although it seems with such large crowds gathering every year, we have already outgrown this site.

Salvation Army Captain Howard Trendell leads the service and later everyone goes up to the clubrooms for a 'gunfire breakfast' which is waiting for us, prepared with the aid of the SES and



CFS volunteers under the watchful eye of the Tea Tree Gully RSL Ladies Auxiliary, with our local legend Lois Ramage and her family still integral parts of that wonderful morning activity.

On Sunday 28 April it was an honour and a privilege to attend the ceremony at the Vietnam War Memorial at the Torrens Parade Ground held under the auspices of the Vietnamese Veterans Association and Friends of the Vietnamese Invalid Veterans Association. We were blessed with fine weather on a beautiful day, with a large crowd gathered to commemorate some very important dates. Firstly, the anniversary of 50 years of the Royal Australian Armed Forces Support for the Freedom and Democracy of the Republic of Vietnam 1962-1973; secondly, to recognise the 58 South Australians who paid the supreme sacrifice in Vietnam; and, thirdly, 38 years since the fall of Saigon in 1975.

It was a marvellous ceremony. It was led by Bill Denny AM, Co-chair of the Vietnam War Memorial Committee. We had a welcome address by Dr Anh Tuan Ngo, President of the Vietnamese Veterans Association, and a truly inspiring address by Lieutenant-Governor Hieu Van Le, who brought everyone to tears with his recollections of what happened. It is the second time that Hieu Van Le has brought me to tears at a function, and I only ever remember crying twice in my public life. There was also a marvellous address by Brigadier Laurie Lewis AM (Retd). He is, of course, very well known throughout South Australia and the veteran community.

It was a first, too, because the families of all the 58 soldiers were acknowledged. While not all families were represented, about half were, and they were called up and presented with a shield and a medallion. Of course South Australia has a very proud history of paying tribute in very special ways, and it was the first state to organise the recognition of Turkish soldiers (some years ago now) under a committee organised by Warren Featherby.

Later on that Sunday, I attended the Workers' Memorial Day Service at the Pilgrim Church in Flinders Street, along with the Deputy Premier, the member for Davenport, the Hon. Nick Xenophon and the Hon. Tammy Franks. This service commemorates the workers who have died on the job. It is a sad but very uplifting service, where families gather to remember their loved ones who paid such a terrible price at the workplace. Workplace accidents really have to be limited; and to lose someone's life on the job on the worksite is just a very sad and terrible experience for any family.

VOID (Voices of Industrial Death) is led by Andrea Madeley, and she has made the ceremony a very special and important day, where everyone tries to remember how important it is to keep workplace safety in their mind. The ceremony is supported by the Government of South Australia through SafeWork SA and SA Unions, and the Asbestos Victims Association and the Asbestos Diseases Society of South Australia were also heavily involved. It is these workers, the workers who have been exposed to asbestos, who are now paying the price, and not only the workers themselves but their families who are secondary recipients of the terrible diseases that asbestos has caused.

At the end of the service they always release some doves and we always release balloons with the names of our friends tied to the bottom of the balloon. Unfortunately, the number of balloons is growing. It is not only the deaths that we think about but the industrial accidents that cause injuries to workers, very much like the road safety toll, which we should keep in our mind at all times.

## STATE ECONOMY

**Mr VENNING (Schubert) (15:18):** For years and years we have sat in this house listening to the government talk up the economic benefits of the big mining boom and the huge number of infrastructure projects in South Australia, and in recent days they have even admitted to spruiking it up. Reality has it that this talk is nothing but spin, a result of years and years of the government leading the South Australian public into a false sense of security.

Under Labor, South Australia has the fastest growing debt and the second lowest economic performance in the nation. The government is guilty of misleading the public, talking up the massive dollars they are spending on infrastructure in the state, when reality has it that projects here in South Australia account for only 3 per cent of the national total. So, the spruiking is well and truly happening.

A new report released by Engineers Australia has revealed that, although investment in infrastructure across Australia may be at a record level, spending is not necessarily being spent evenly across public assets like water and transport. The growth rates for economic infrastructure

show that activity in South Australia has in fact contracted since the last infrastructure report card was released in 2010. Once again, South Australia has been left to dither while other states are moving ahead in leaps and bounds.

To add to these dismal figures, the decision to shelve the Olympic Dam expansion has had dire consequences for the state's economy, with recent data revealing a 37 per cent decline in the state's projected activity as compared with the same time last year. South Australia's share of our national economic output has declined from 7.4 per cent in 1987-88 to a projected 5.8 per cent in 2014-15.

These figures are in direct conflict with what we continually hear from this government, a government that has based its success on the polls and spruiking and, as they admit, on talking up the state's fantastic infrastructure. For a state that has a so-called abundance of natural resources, it really is concerning that there is a lack of construction in terms of new mines.

This state government has put all of its eggs in the one basket with the Olympic Dam expansion and, now that has fallen through, we are left with a state that is struggling economically and the outlook for the future is grim if you take into consideration this newest infrastructure statistic. South Australia is being out-performed by other states on a number of fronts. We are falling behind and this government continues to dig an even deeper hole in our state's economy. Taxes are high, the cost of living is high, our economic growth has been stunted, and infrastructure is failing.

South Australia is 'Heaps Good'. I think the release of the new logo for our state is timely because, at so many levels in terms of management by this government, there is no way our state is heaps good. Yes, we have plenty to offer in terms of tourism attractions and beauty, but this government is really tarnishing this Heaps Good image with high taxes and an economy that it is failing to stimulate.

Earlier this year, the Premier said, 'The way you grow is you invest in productive infrastructure which grows the jobs of the future.' Clearly, this government is not investing enough in productive infrastructure projects for the state. Clearly, the state's debt levels are rising and here we have a Premier who is not even willing to rule out a further increase in the state's debt level. We can blame the rampaging of the Australian dollar and the slowdown in the home construction building industry, but this government has failed with its lack of forward thinking and planning. Under this Labor government, South Australia continues to take a back seat to the other Australian states.

We are still 10 months from the election and I hate to think how bad it will be by then. That makes us question these fixed term elections—it cannot be all that good. I hate to be negative and I try to be a positive person, but we in opposition have a role to perform and we have to tell the people how bad it is. I was in this house listening to the then deputy leader of the opposition (Mr Foley) criticising our government with very negative strong rhetoric. It was nothing compared to this. So, for us to be criticised as being carping and negative, we are nowhere near as bad as them when they had nothing to complain about.

State debt is increasing to \$14.6 billion and the budget deficit for 2012-13 is forecast to reach \$1.2 billion. This is worse than the State Bank, because how do we turn it around when the government changes? We do not have the levers that we had in 1993 to turn it around. You are going to leave the state in a very bad condition. You should not have won the last election and you should not be there.

### **CAMBODIAN AND LAOTIAN NEW YEAR**

**Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:23):** I would like to speak today on the New Year's celebrations held recently in my electorate by the Cambodian and Laotian temples in and around my area. For many South Asian and South-East Asian cultures, 13 and 14 April this year marked the start of a New Year.

The electorate of Taylor is served by three Cambodian temples and a Laotian temple in Kudla. Many Laotians in the North went to the Wat Lao of Adelaide New Year's celebrations on 14 May. Mr Likhit Nikhomvan, who is a great friend of mine and a long-time constituent of Taylor, helped in the organisation of the event. Unfortunately, this year I was unable to get along to the Laotian event, but I believe it was a colourful and fun-filled event with much laughter.

I was honoured to visit two other temples during the weekend, and these events were steeped in age-old cultural traditions. It was a pleasure to see families eating, praying and

celebrating together as a community. Strong family values were displayed throughout the weekend. The Cambodian New Year, or Chaul Chnam Thmey in Khmer, places a strong emphasis on family and serving those who are in need. Celebrants come to temples throughout the area to give donations of food, money and other household staples to the monks who live in the temples.

The Venerable Bac Horng Ly is a well respected Buddhist monk, and he led the prayer service at the Watt Preah Puth Mean Chey, which is in the MacDonald Park area of my electorate. I admire the Venerable Ly's passion for learning and understanding. He is an erudite and entertaining preacher. His style of multiculturalism and mutual respect resonates with many in the local community. The Venerable Ly is a student of all religions and cultures and is adept at putting all of these commonalities into good speeches on the day.

The Wat Khemarab Dhammikaram is situated off the Salisbury Highway at Parafield Gardens, and this community was kind enough to invite me yet again to another Saturday evening celebration. Every time I visit this temple, I am continually impressed by the staggering amount of development they do in such a short period of time. The grounds include a traditional pagoda temple and the building serves as a lodging for the monks. Thanks to Mr Anh Oan for greeting me and showing me their amazing plans to upgrade the site over the forthcoming years.

I would also like to acknowledge the hard work of Mr Savonn Ly, the president of the Wat Khmer Santipheap Temple at Paralowie in my electorate, who was very busy coordinating events at the temple, considering that his son was getting married the following week to the Hon. Carmel Zollo's daughter. He was affected by the very sad and tragic decision by GMH to cut its workforce, but this did not faze his sense of duty to his community. With the assistance of Sambuth and Neang Yun, as well as the rest of the temple committee, they led a successful celebration full of traditional games, music and food. Indeed, I have been there many times and they always make me truly welcome; I feel part of a family there.

My electorate is a rich tapestry of cultures. The New Year celebrations earlier in April were just a small window into some of the traditions practised by many of the families in the north of my area. I congratulate all those who helped to organise the celebrations on a truly spectacular job and wish all a very happy and prosperous Year of the Snake.

#### COMMUNITY ALLIANCE MEETING

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:27):** I rise to advise the house of a public meeting that was held on Monday night this week at the Norwood Town Hall, convened by a group called Community Alliance under the stewardship of Rob Crocker. A number of members who attended would be familiar to the house, including Mayor Kirsten Alexander and other leaders in the community. Why did these people meet?

They met to hear from members of the parliament, including the Minister for Planning, myself, Senator Xenophon, the Hon. Mark Parnell in another place, followed by a panel of experts in the urban development field. It was an impressive meeting. Why did they meet specifically? Because they wanted to be able to find some answers as to how we can have better development and planning laws in South Australia, where the general community can effectively be consulted and able to participate in the development of plans for their community.

It was overwhelmingly impressive to see a representation of almost every suburb or district within metropolitan Adelaide. The government has issued a 30-year plan—we are familiar with that—for the development of metropolitan Adelaide, and there are very good aspects of that plan. We on this side of the house think that it is necessary to have a plan, but with a review of population data from the ABS. Obviously that needs to be reviewed. However, under the act, the government has determined that it will have structure plans to again provide detail to the planning authorities, which is essentially for local councils to be able to administer the planning processes in the state.

What has been very concerning is that under the current Minister for Planning's regime, particularly in the last 18 months, there has been a reigning of ministerial DPAs, some with interim control development impositions superseding or in fact wiping aside local government's autonomy in relation to their normal process. Having set up a structure, some of which is very good, to ensure that we have a proper process, the government has then bypassed some councils. It is concerning, for example, that in what is now called the Inner Metropolitan Growth Development Plan Amendment, which is to cover the border around the Adelaide City area, only three councils have been left with any say themselves in the administration of the development of a plan—that is Norwood Payneham and St Peters, Unley and West Torrens.

I have spoken to a number of the councillors and representative personnel in the planning divisions of those councils and each have indicated to me that, within the current legal obligations of accommodation of growth, diversity and density within their districts, each of them are able to accommodate that within the rules set under the 30-year plan. To have imposed upon them an obligation to have high-density dwellings, for example, up to 10 storeys high and higher in some regions, is of concern to the local community who say to the government, 'You have set the rules. You have identified the people who are supposed to implement them and now you have this idea where you want to dictate how this is going to occur.' So, the public are outraged.

I think the government actually understand how serious this situation is, that the public do not want to be ignored. They do want to participate right from the start of the development that is going to happen in their area. Overwhelmingly, I report to the house, certainly in my own district, there has been an embracing of higher density and urban infill as we know, and of the redevelopment and reinvigoration of their districts.

They are looking for good design and a way of best utilising their infrastructure, but they just want a commitment from the government that they are able to participate in how that is developed and that they have commitments of support from levels of government as to parking, transport, public transport, power, water, schools, clinics—all of the services that are necessary to go with an area.

Again using my own district, just on the weekend many members would have seen the sewage that exploded into a street—raw sewage into an inner metropolitan suburb in a high residential area. This is the sort of thing that needs to be done to ensure that infrastructure goes into planning.

Time expired.

#### CLARE TRADE SHED

**Mr BROCK (Frome) (15:32):** Today I will talk about the Trade Shed at Clare. I recently had the great privilege of opening the Trade Shed, which is an independent learning and training space at Clare. This facility, which is in partnership with the Clare Valley New Life Church, the Barossa Lower North Futures and the Clare council, aims to provide individual case management for young people to have opportunities to participate in project-based learning and to re-engage them in training, with the potential to further undertake accredited training to enhance their chances of employment within the regions.

Both accredited and non-accredited training includes: welding and fabrication, servicing of small engines, construction, wet trades, bricklaying, panel beating, spray painting, landscaping and automotive. Through project-based learning opportunities, this project links young people with local business and industry to enable them to participate in hands-on learning in a real-life work environment whilst at the same time developing independent living skills.

It is important to ensure that young people in the more remote parts of our region, and in many cases the most disadvantaged, have access to this training opportunity. Young people are transported from the town where they live in a people mover that was specifically purchased for this project. All young people are case managed and barriers are identified and addressed to successfully engage them in this community project-based learning opportunity supported by their local community.

Working alongside industry specialists, these young people are involved in project-based learning through this community project, which in addition will provide a focus on engagement and wellbeing, with the aim to ultimately enrol these young people into accredited training delivered by TAFE SA Regional and other RTOs. This is a whole-of-community response to support from an early age young people who are disengaged from education or are highly likely to disengage, to develop skills, including life skills, and to engage in a project-based learning opportunity and ultimately return to school, further training and employment.

Through this holistic approach to engaging this at-risk cohort of young people in training through case management and individualised flexible learning transition plans, they will: increase their self-esteem; become work ready with key employability skills; develop a pride in and sense of belonging to their community; acquire independent living skills; and become contributing members of the community.

Through the Office for Youth this organisation was successful in receiving funding for this project through the Youth Connect Grants, which have funded training and project materials to

deliver this hands-on learning. Through the Community Benefit SA grant they have also been able to purchase a vehicle hoist, screens to screen off a classroom in this training shed, flooring to create a classroom, and some form of heating to make this learning space a more friendly environment that will be conducive to learning.

Some of the equipment has been donated by local business and farmers, which allows the students to learn on the appropriate equipment. Too often we endeavour to teach our youth with theories only, and I am pleased that this organisation teaches both the theory and the practice. The whole Clare community is behind this project and it was very evident at the opening that this facility will certainly give the youth of Clare and surrounding locations every opportunity to be able to achieve employment, which is the reason that we are all involved in our communities. I congratulate the Clare Valley New Life Church, Lower North Futures, the Clare & Gilbert Valleys Council and the whole community for this great initiative.

### SUPPLY BILL 2013

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Goyder has six minutes remaining.

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:36):** Precisely done, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am pleased that you did not rip me off that last minute; I was worried about that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We would not dare do it; would not do it to you.

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** What a conjecture coming from across the court! I was going to talk about the state debt now.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** You had better make it quick then.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** I will; I will try to talk about that. Anybody who actually pays bills at home will appreciate the effort that goes into paying off debt. All of us who have purchased homes or purchased businesses or helped support that understand the implications of it. That is why, when you look at the future figures, and even with the SXLs that occurred, it is distressing; it truly is. From a very low debt position that existed only about five years ago to a substantial debt position of a fraction over \$14 billion projected in the 2015-16 financial year, you become worried.

It impacts upon the ability to manage the taxation policies and the infrastructure and service investment policies that are going to assist in government. That is an area for concern, that it is going to come back and haunt both sides, no matter who is in government from next year. I truly do hope it is this side, because it is the ability to service that debt that will become very substantial. I will talk briefly about unfunded liabilities such as superannuation too. It is not real sexy to a lot of people, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr Treloar:** It is to us, though.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** It is. To any person who is actually focusing on what their future retirement opportunities are, or someone who has a responsibility to help pay that unfunded liability, recognising that it is 2034, I think, when the full liability is funded, it is frightening, especially when it is not actually post-1993 employees. As I understand it, for everybody employed before 1993, there was an accumulation scheme and therefore the funds were there and earning a certain amount.

The benefit that is paid above what that fund earns, that is what a liability comes into also, but for those pre-1993 people, they are the ones who benefit from it. For everyone after 1993 the accumulation comes in—defined benefit before that, accumulation after that, and it is going to be very challenging indeed for us. With a \$13 billion debt going forward to 2034, it just goes to demonstrate some of the costs that this society is going to have to cover for. At \$13½ billion, that is very frightening.

I want to talk briefly on a couple of things that are occurring locally too, that impact upon budget decisions. One is the patient assistance transfer scheme. I appreciate the fact that the Minister for Health has flagged the fact that a review is to be undertaken and I recognise the effort by the member for Frome on this one too. It has been called for for some time. As a person who lives in a regional area, who is contacted regularly by people who have to travel to ensure they get the medical services and treatment they need because they are not available locally (and I understand some will always be based in metropolitan areas), I say this money needs to be there

and it needs to be in a system where it gives an opportunity for these people to at least cover a little more of their costs.

The first 100 kilometres is a self-absorbed cost of that, but, for example, for accommodation costs there is only \$30 per night. Try to find something that will give you a roof over your head and a bed to sleep on for \$30 a night—it just will not happen. The member for Frome has done the right thing. The Liberal members, I know, have written to the minister on this in previous years too and it is appropriate that it happens.

I have also been very concerned to see some significant withdrawals in funding, again through Health, for non-government organisations that are associated with mental health activities, particularly in the regional areas. I know of two in my own electorate, where one lost its funding a year ago and one has been flagged to lose its funding as of 30 June this year.

I met with this group last year. They are not going to make a political argument. They are prepared to try to work on as a volunteer-based group post 1 July, but how, I do not know. They have existed for nearly 15 years—for the first three years, purely as a volunteer group to prove their worth; for the last 12 years, through a funded arrangement—and they have demonstrated to hundreds of people who live on the Copper Coast the quality of services they provide to those who need some help.

No matter where you come from, there are people around all of us who are suffering and need some assistance. I really think that the fact that this NGO help that has been provided by Health in previous years to help mental health in regional areas and metropolitan areas has been withdrawn now is extremely sad.

I have also been very concerned about an instruction that has previously existed about Health on bequests that were given to hospitals. I can certainly quote one in a regional area which is about \$0.5 million, which this person had very generously decided to give to a hospital and an aged care health service that existed there. They were unable to approve any expenditure above \$2,000, even though \$0.5 million was put there.

**Mr Venning:** Ridiculous.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Absolute madness. The health advisory council members who are there have expressed their great frustration quite well. I am very pleased that Mrs Helen Colliver, from Arthurton, who is a member of the Yorke Peninsula HAC, has taken this to a wider voice. We have had some level of response from minister Snelling on it. Some changes have occurred which have improved it a little bit, but it still talks about evolving into a future management of a benevolent group that will allocate the funds.

I am thinking that health boards existed for decades and decades in regional areas. They made great decisions that allowed hospitals to be what they are now. They continued to raise money for decades, even after the state government took primary control of them, and they made good decisions that allowed hospitals to move forward. They got local support financially and now an opportunity to use some level of local financial support has been taken away.

It goes into a central pool of funds where it just does not come out too easily, unless you can manage to convince somebody that you have responsibility to spend above \$2,000. That is a decision about this that has continually frustrated people and it needs to improve. I look forward to future contributions made by other members in this chamber. I am sure they will be quite eloquent and interesting.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:42):** It is with pleasure that I get up to speak to the Supply Bill 2013. I indicate that I am not the lead speaker. The Leader of the Opposition will ultimately be lead speaker in due course. As we all know, the Supply Bill 2013 is simply a procedural mechanism to give the government enough money to continue to run its programs until the budget proper is passed, so it receives opposition support but it does provide for the opposition to make some comment in regards to the state of the budget and the state of the government's performance on economic management.

It is interesting to see how the government here has got itself into a very similar position to the federal government. Both have massively increased debt, both are running budget deficits and both are running relatively high-spending regimes. It is interesting that both governments have got themselves in trouble in their budget management and their economic management because of that philosophy of high debt, high tax and high spend budget management.

Just as the federal government has tried to resurrect its budget through things like the carbon tax and the mining tax and, if the rumours are right, now another levy on Medicare, the state government itself has also tried to resurrect its revenue by introducing a tax—the car park tax—and, of course, the leader has outlined the position on that.

It is interesting to note that if you look at the government's revenue position over the term of this government, it has received significantly more revenue than it ever budgeted for—around \$500 million dollars a year extra in revenue over the term of this particular government. What is frightening, is that if you look at the 2010 election year, when the government received over \$1 billion extra in revenue that particular year above budget, it is staggering that they managed to return a surplus that year of only \$187 million.

So the government, over the term of the government, has had plenty of revenue. Its real problem, of course, is that it has gone out and spent it straightaway and, over that period, it has spent about \$3.2 billion extra in greater expenditure than it originally budgeted, so it has over-expended by about \$3.2 billion in that particular period. As the then treasurer, Kevin Foley, said in Estimates, the government really has an expenditure problem.

The budget position really is a concern for South Australia. This is a government that ran six net operating balance deficits in seven years. The only year that they managed to secure a surplus was the 2010 election year when, through the courtesy of the federal government, we received massively increased grants, and we managed to return a surplus of just \$170 million. So, take out that electoral gift from the federal government and what we really have is a state government that has essentially run seven deficits in a row (if you ignore the windfall gift from the federal Labor government to try and bail out the government during the 2010 campaign).

If you go to the net lending deficit, which includes all the capital works then, in actual fact, the state has run eight deficits in eight years. So, there is clearly an issue with the management of the budget and we look forward to how the Premier, now Treasurer, is going to respond differently to what has happened under previous treasurers and previous premiers to the budget challenge that is now facing South Australia.

The interesting thing is that this year's deficit in round numbers is about \$1,200 million; the deficit next year is around \$870 million in round numbers; and then, by 2015-16, there is miraculously this surplus in the forward estimates of \$470 million in round numbers; and in 2016-17, \$765 million.

If you just take that five-year period, from this year where we have a \$1,200 million deficit, to the 2016-17 year where we have a \$763 million surplus, the government is suggesting in the Mid-Year Budget Review papers that the state's budget is going to go from the largest deficit in history—which is the \$1,169 million deficit this year, it may even be worse than that, but that's the budgeted deficit—and within a four year period, that is, the 2016-17 period, they are going to have a \$763 million surplus, which is, again, the largest surplus going back over 20 or 30 years. So, we are going from the biggest deficit to the biggest surplus all within four years.

**Dr McFetridge:** Incredible.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** One of my colleagues interjects and says 'Incredible.' I agree. I ask the house to contemplate, given all the media reports about the performance of the retail industry, the housing industry, the real estate industry, the unemployment rate slowly climbing, all of the governments reporting federally the fall of, what, \$12 billion revenue, and Queensland reporting a revenue drop—in that context—how has the government managed to budget for a turnaround in its net operating balance from \$1,169 million deficit to \$763 million surplus all within a four to five year period?

The surplus, of course—\$763 million dollars—is one year before the NDIS (which the government has just signed up to) kicks into its full expense. The ministerial statement by the Premier earlier this week suggests that expense is \$380 million extra. So, on the basis that is the net cost to the state, then that means that \$763 million surplus, if that was the ongoing surplus, would essentially be cut in half just on that one program, the NDIS. So, it will be interesting to see the final costings as the Mid-Year Budget Review comes out to find out exactly how the government plans on managing that particular expense.

The other expense, of course, that kicks in over that four to five-year period is the \$397 million a year for the new hospital. So, there are two expense lines coming on-stream, \$397 million for the hospital and \$380 million a year for the NDIS, so about \$750 million in round

numbers on two expense lines coming into the budget. We are already at a \$1,200 million deficit this year. So, the opposition will be watching with interest how the government goes about managing and setting out that expense and indeed whether the budget deficit will get worse and whether our debt position will get worse. Will we be borrowing to provide for those particular programs?

The reason we have interest in this is because this year's budget, which is a \$1,200 million operating balance deficit, when it was first predicted four years ago was a \$304 million surplus. Since that time, every time it has been reported, there has been a trend line down over that reporting period, and it has gone from a \$304 million surplus first prediction to a \$1,169 million deficit as the most recent prediction. That is a \$1,500 million error. That is a \$1,500 million miscalculation by Treasury and the government on what they thought the surplus would be today, or 30 June this year coming, as distinct from the \$1,200 million that it is budgeted to be.

We asked questions today through the leader about what is the likely impact, whether the deficit is likely to deteriorate further, and of course, what we have got essentially is a response to say, 'You'll just have to wait until the budget.' I suspect, given what other governments are reporting, you would have to question whether the deficit would not blow out even further.

The other issues I want to raise in relation to the budget, of course, is our budget position compared to other states. This, I think, is a telling statistic, because it really does show comparatively where South Australia sits in its budget management. The budget deficit in South Australia is \$1,169 million, then next year \$868 million, and the year after that an \$11 million deficit. The South Australian deficit is bigger than New South Wales, Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia combined—collectively. So, if you add up the New South Wales, Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia budget positions and compare that to South Australia, our deficit is worse. It is a bigger number.

Those four states have 17 million people to deal with that combined deficit. South Australia has 1.7 million people to deal with a bigger deficit. So, the budget ask by the government on South Australians in deficit terms is 10 times per capita what it is in those other states collectively. That is a staggering figure. The reality is that those states get back to surplus well before South Australia does, as well. So, in other words, South Australia is running bigger deficits and we are running deficits for longer periods of time than those other four states combined. That is just a staggering piece of information that I think illustrates just how bad this government's budget management has been.

Should this be a surprise to the government? The answer is no. The Auditor-General consistently warned this government right through from 2005-06. There has been a series of warnings over three or four years saying that this government's expenditure is unsustainable, that you are building in expenditure that was built on revenues that may not last and if your revenues drop you would be in trouble. That is essentially the message. The wording was: 'Given the forecast expectation that such revenue growth may not be sustained, control of expenses will be important.'

A couple of years later, the Auditor-General said, 'The state may have developed a culture of expecting growing revenues to continue to support increasing expenses.' Then again, the next year, he said, 'The state has received large amounts of unbudgeted revenues that enabled net operating surpluses.' In other words, the cabinet has nowhere to hide on this; the Premier and Treasurer has nowhere to hide.

The Auditor-General was putting it up in lights. He was saying that the government was running a high expenditure model based on revenues that were essentially a bonus. They were above the norm. As I said, there was \$5 billion of extra revenue over the term of this government and the government ignored the warnings and kept on spending, except they signed up even more contracts in expenditure after the warnings and now, of course, what we find is that the budget is in more trouble than Ned Kelly.

As a result of that, the government has lost its AAA credit rating and it has lost it deliberately. The Premier went out and said that they made deliberate choices that would put the AAA credit rating at risk. What we find is that Moody's are saying that the pace of debt accumulation is among the fastest growing of all the states. We have amongst the fastest growing debt of all states at around \$4 million per day every day for eight years.

The interest payment is about \$800 million a year, which we end up paying on the \$14 billion worth of debt when the hospital comes on stream. The interest payment is a staggering



figure. At that point we will be paying \$91,000 of interest every hour. We will be paying \$91,000 in interest every hour when we get to the \$800 million interest payment when the hospital comes on stream. Not only do we have some of the fastest accumulating debt, but according to the Queensland audit commission, we are paying the highest interest of all states. We are paying the highest interest of all states on our interest according to the Queensland audit commission.

That all adds up to us losing our AAA credit rating which, of course, ends up being an extra cost to the state. The reason we lost our AAA credit rating was simply put by the agency. It says, '...budget performance will be weaker than forecast...anticipated operating deficits will lead to a sharper rise in gross debt levels,' which has happened. Then in September, Standard & Poor's said, 'We are just not seeing evidence of cost constraints from the state government. The recent public sector wage increase was an example of that.' In other words there was no political will at the cabinet table to deal with the issues.

The then treasurer Snelling said that he was not going to let the state run up a credit card debt. We all know of course that, after selling the forests and after selling the lotteries commission, our debt goes north of \$14 billion. It is a figure that is well north of the \$11 billion when the State Bank collapse happened under the Bannon government.

This government's financial management has been a sad story for South Australia and they really have got the budget into an absolute mess. The reality is that South Australians are paying the highest taxes in Australia. It impacts on their cost of living, and if you want to know why people's cost of living is so high out there, it is due in large part to the economic mismanagement and budget mismanagement of this particular government.

There was the desal debacle, where the government went from saying, 'We don't need a desal plant at all,' and that the opposition's call for small desal plant was 'lunacy', to then coming out and saying, 'Well, you know what? We actually do need a desal plant and we don't need a little one like the opposition said, we actually need a really big one, so we'll double the size.' They then suddenly found out that to double the size to cater for the capacity you needed to actually join up the north to south interconnector, so it was another \$400 million, to a \$2.2 billion cost.

That is why water prices have gone up around 249 per cent under this government, because of their total, absolute mismanagement. Having charged everyone the increased water price of the desal plant, they are now going to turn it off. Is there a better example of the total incompetence in management of this government than that issue? It is not just the high taxes that drive the increased cost of living; it is the incompetent decisions such as those.

You also have to look at the infrastructure management of this government. This government has nearly cancelled as much infrastructure as it has built. This Sturt Road and South Road intersection has been front pages of the last two elections in my electorate. The present PPP was front-page in 2006; the Mount Bold reservoir expansion was front-page; the O-Bahn expansion was going to happen, and that got cancelled; the electrification of the line to Gawler has essentially been cancelled; and the Darlington interchange project essentially got cancelled. They have announced and announced and cancelled almost as much infrastructure as they have built.

The government is asking us to believe that their budget model is sustainable, but if we think about it in these terms: South Australians are paying the highest taxes in Australia, but even though we are paying the highest taxes in Australia the budget is \$1,200 million overspent—\$1,200 million overspent—and \$860 million overspent the next year. And the government say that their budget model is sustainable. Well, how is it sustainable? It is only sustainable if they continue to charge the highest taxes in Australia, because if they do not charge the highest taxes in Australia the deficit would obviously be worse.

This is a government whose budget strategy is in absolute tatters, and the Premier and Treasurer cannot escape it. He is the one constant in cabinet for the last 11 years. When they go to the election the one person who has been in the cabinet for all of the 12 years at that point is the current Premier. He has had oversight through cabinet of every decision, every backflip, every tax increase and every incompetent decision of this government.

The concept that the Premier is somehow going to try to duckshove the bad decisions to Mr Rann and Mr Foley and the good decisions to his administration is simply not going to work. We look forward to receiving the budget. It needs to redress South Australia's budget management problems, our debt and deficit problems. With those few comments, I support the Supply Bill.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:03):** The Supply Bill is a piece of legislation we get through this house on a regular basis, and we all get a chance to speak about the state of the state. In this particular case, the Supply Bill is for the sum of \$3,205 million—nearly \$3¼ billion—and that is to supply the public service of the state to the end of the financial year, 30 June 2014; so \$3,205 million. Yet, what do we see when we look at the state of the state? You would think that that would be a significant amount of money to make sure we can balance the books and do all the good things that South Australians expect this parliament and this government to do; but when we look at the state of the state and the Mid-Year Budget Review we see a picture that is not the brightest, and it is certainly a very sad state of the state.

We lost our AAA credit rating. First of all, it was put on negative outlook and then downgraded to AA+ with a negative outlook, and then downgraded to AA, the worst credit rating in Australia. The whole psyche of the state was built up around the last budget, with the Olympic Dam being once again over-spruiked by this government. We saw it go from a 'mirage in the desert', when former premier Mike Rann was the leader of the opposition, right through to being the world's largest event that was ever going to happen.

To try to blame events outside of South Australia is like when the former minister for tourism tried to blame the downturn in tourism in South Australia on SARS, yet we were the only state that had a downturn in tourism: all the other states were going well. We see the other states going well and we see the Australian economy is not doing as well as it possibly could but, certainly, the state of South Australia has a very sad outlook.

Let us look at the budget on any three of the measures that are used—and I am no economist but I do know that if you do not balance your budget and have enough cash flow to manage your expenditure, build your business and pay your current expenditure, you are going backwards. In the 2012-13 Mid-Year Budget Review the budget deficits on all three measures are: the net lending deficit of \$939 million, the cash deficit of \$1.4 billion and the net operating deficit of \$1.2 billion in 2012-13.

We have seen, year after year, the Auditor-General warn the Labor government it could not rely on revenues increasing to cover its expenditure. This government has ignored that and ended up imposing taxes on South Australia so that we are the highest taxed state in the nation, yet we see that by all three measures (the net lending deficit, the cash deficit and the net operating deficit) we are in serious debt.

The opportunity of making sure that this state is able to benefit from the opportunities we have here is one that I look forward to come March next year when we have the state election. I hope, beyond hope, that South Australians realise that the time is up for this government. They have demonstrated beyond any doubt that they cannot manage the state and the economy and should not be given another chance. It would be an absolute disaster for this state to have another four years of hard Labor.

The portfolio areas I currently hold are a range of portfolios that are vital to the future of this state and they include communities and social inclusion, disabilities, mental health and substance abuse, social housing, youth and volunteers. I also have the area of suicide prevention under my care, and I am being helped by the Hon. John Dawkins, who has a particular passion for suicide prevention. If we do not look at the areas covered by the other portfolios I have, this state will be far worse off.

The communities and social inclusion portfolio is one in which I am particularly interested in expanding the range of areas it is involved in—not just as a separate portfolio. It is a bit like having Health in all areas of government. We should be doing this in the area of communities and social inclusion so that we have a transport policy, a health policy, education policy—all sorts of policies that are socially inclusive and involving all areas of the community—and I certainly will be working with my colleagues to make sure that happens.

I note that the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion has overspent, according to the last Budget and Finance Committee's transcript, by the sum of about \$10 million, and that is, according to the evidence that was given, mainly in the disability area. According to the evidence, all governments around the country are under constant pressure in meeting demands around disability support, and I will have a bit more to say about disability support later in my contribution. Communities and social inclusion is a vital area—an area that we need to make sure we expand into all areas of government.

The other portfolio I have had previously, and have now again, is mental health and substance abuse. What do we see there? Every day, you go onto the government's own website, onto their own dashboards, and we are seeing an acute shortage in mental health acute beds. The whole problem in mental health is not just the acute beds: it is the whole way the system is being managed. Sure, the demand is increasing, but we all need to face up to the fact that mental health in South Australia is becoming a more and more widespread problem. It is reaching into more and more families and communities, and we need to make sure it is not just the sharp end—the acute mental health beds—that are being provided for.

According to the AMA, we are 43 acute mental health beds short in South Australia. We need to make sure that mental health is being treated as it was initially proposed to be in the Cappo report, the Stepping Up report, at a number of levels. In talking to a number of NGOs, the community providers of mental health support, as I have been doing over the last few months, there are so many examples of the good work that is being done with vital care to keep consumers of mental health assistance out of the acute part of the mental health system, our EDs and the Glenside campus.

Having visited the Glenside campus last week I was impressed with the way the campus has been organised. It goes against what the Cappo report said, which was about retaining the whole of the campus for mental health. However, in talking to the staff about what is being built, they are certainly enthusiastic about what they are getting. There is a bit more open space than I thought there would be, but I still have some concerns about the way the whole system is being run. We need to make sure that we have acute hospitals like that and that people out in the communities are being given support by not only the NGOs but the various mental health workers we have in the government departments.

The area of substance abuse is one that is changing all over the world. I was reading an article in *The New York Times* yesterday about the number of people now in their 60s and 70s who are abusing alcohol and prescription drugs. They are becoming serious substance abusers. We should make sure that that does not happen in South Australia. We need to make sure that people who are inclined to abuse alcohol and substances such as prescription drugs get the assistance they need.

We need to make sure that the potential damage that is caused by substance abuse, whether it is alcohol, illicit drugs or prescription drugs, or in some cases other addictions, is minimised and that the damage to people's lives, to their families and their communities is mitigated as best as possible.

The other area is the youth portfolio. It is interesting that South Australia is the only place that has a Minister for Youth other than Victoria. Whether it is mental health, social inclusion, social housing or volunteering, we really need to make sure that we are connecting with the young people of South Australia, and I think one way to do that is by having younger members of parliament in this place.

My kids are now in their 30s and perhaps seem old to some young people, however, they are able to put me in touch with some of the issues. I watch what is going on and I talk to people out there. I certainly sympathise with the 40 per cent of young unemployed people who are in the Playford area. I grew up in Elizabeth South and then in Salisbury. Those areas out there have challenges but they are certainly terrific areas. Glenn Docherty, the Mayor of Playford, should be proud of what he has out at Elizabeth. There are the challenges with Holden's rearranging its practices and we heard today about Saab reducing its workforce. There are some significant issues in that area.

The 40 per cent youth unemployment rate is certainly something that I will make sure that we on this side will keep the government up to speed on; what the government should and could be doing to make sure that our young people in not only the north (at Elizabeth) but also all through the regions and the metropolitan area of the state get what they deserve and what they want.

The area of social housing is another area. A lot of young people are looking for the security of some place to live. Social housing is one of those areas where we need to make sure that we provide as many opportunities as possible. I saw a press article yesterday about moving 5,000 Housing SA houses out to the NGOs. As I said, I grew up on Hogarth Road, Elizabeth South, in a Housing Trust house. Back then it was mainly public housing. It was not so much social housing: it was a start towards buying or building your own home. My parents built a house at Salisbury Downs and we moved there in the early sixties.

The unmet need with social housing now is huge. There would not be a member in this place who does not have somebody come in to ask them about getting some assistance in getting on or up the waiting list with Housing SA. It is important that we in this place make sure that those that are in dire straits are able to access social housing. To me, it does not matter who owns it or who runs it; it is about the outcomes. I have been speaking to a number of organisations out there which are managing a lot of Housing Trust stock or which have their own homes, the Adelaide Benevolent Society, for example. They are looking forward to being able to build more social housing so that the people in South Australia who need access to this sort of housing can actually do that.

It will be interesting to watch the changes that are going on with the management of it. There are changes going on interstate and I am watching that carefully to see how they improve the situation for people who want to access social housing, but in South Australia the days of moving to a Housing Trust house at Elizabeth are not anything like they were when I was a young lad. I want to make sure that people who do not have the advantages I have now are able to still access that sort of housing if they need to.

One of my other portfolios is volunteers. In South Australia we have about half a million volunteers contributing about \$5 billion in in-kind effort. I look forward in a couple of weeks' time to joining with the government in a completely bipartisan way in celebrating the input of volunteers in South Australia. It is not just the CFS and the SES.

There are so many volunteers right across the whole of South Australia and without them we could not—we know that as members of this parliament—do the job that is expected of us in delivering resources and services in South Australia, and keeping the high level of social interaction in the community. I put on the record my heartfelt thanks to those half a million or so volunteers, who do it without any want of payment or any need for recognition. They volunteer because they want to get out there and help their fellow South Australians.

The other portfolio that I will talk about in the six minutes or so that are left to me is the disabilities portfolio. We are seeing a lot of media at the moment about DisabilityCare Australia and the NDIS that is going to come in. There should be no doubt whatsoever that the opposition supports the NDIS, both federally and in the state. We do need to know what we are getting though. There are a lot more questions than answers around the NDIS, and not just the funding. There is also the eligibility of the people who will want to access the system, the way it will be managed and the bureaucracies that are set up, and the services that are actually going to be delivered.

I had a lady in to see me the other day whose daughter was expected to die when she was about six or seven with profound mental and physical disabilities. That daughter is now 48, and the saddest part is that the mum has malignant melanoma and she was tearing her hair out as to what she could do. I just hope that the NDIS is going to provide for people in her circumstances, to at least give her some comfort that her daughter will be looked after in the way she hopes that she should be looked after in the future. That is the big thing: we have raised a lot of expectations with the NDIS but we now have to deliver it. We cannot do it half baked or half funded. We have to make sure that it does the job.

In the Premier's press release yesterday I think he said there were 33,000 people in South Australia who would be eligible for the NDIS. I understood that it was about 10 times that number. I understood that there were 300,000 people in South Australia—about that number anyway—who have some form of disability. How many of those will be eligible to access the NDIS is a question I cannot answer at the moment. I have been to a number of briefings on the NDIS and I have come away with more questions than answers. I have asked some of my federal colleagues about the NDIS and they have said to me that I am no orphan in not having a full grasp of what is going on with the NDIS, because we do not actually know.

We know that the Premier signed a heads of agreement with the Prime Minister. The minister was not aware of that, according to press reports. I hope he is now. I hope he has read the heads of agreement, because we do need to know exactly what we are signing up for. What will the financial implications be for South Australia? We do know that the NDIS is starting here in South Australia with children under five, and that is starting on 1 July.

By 2018 the cost for South Australia will be about \$1.4 billion a year. Half of that is coming from the state and half of that is coming from the federal government—about that anyway. The

figures I have seen here are \$723 million from the Australian government by 2018-19 and \$760 million from the South Australian government.

The Premier has said that there is room in the budget for this to be fully funded. He said on 18 April on ABC that there is room in the state budget to fully fund South Australia's participation in the National Disability Insurance Scheme for the 33,000 South Australians. South Australia will commit to \$723 million by the year 2018, with the federal government contributing \$760 million.

The numbers there are, at best, rubbery, because we do not know exactly how many members of the South Australian disability sector are going to be able to apply. We do not know exactly what the figures will be in 2018. We do not know what the inflation figures are going to be or what the CPI is going to be. I understand that the funding will be held in a central pool by the National Disability Authority.

We need to make sure that we understand exactly what we are getting ourselves into, so that when the Productivity Commission does review the whole scheme in 2017 it is not going to be a case of, 'Well, where do we go from now, now that we can't fund this? After having raised expectations, we are not going to be able to deliver.'

It would be a tragedy for all those people with disabilities, all their families, all their relatives, to have proposed this scheme. We all support it, we all want it, we all know that there is going to be some extra funding required for it, and we know that there has been a 0.5 per cent proposed on the Medicare levy today which, according to the figures I have read, will be far from sufficient to fully fund the NDIS. We do know we want this; we want to know how it is going to be funded. We want to know how it is going to be organised and administered so that everybody in South Australia, and throughout the nation, who has disabilities can do what they want to do and that is to live their life to the best.

We all know that there are many people out there with profound disabilities and some with lesser disabilities whose lives could be so much different with a bit of extra help. We should be doing that for all South Australians of all sectors, being completely socially inclusive and making sure that we are doing our jobs as members of parliament, making sure that the legislation, the propositions we put in this place, are going to be sound, practical and deliverable.

The state of the state, the fact that the budget is in deficit, worries me, because if I am the minister this time next year, where that money is coming from is going to be a real concern. I will be doing my very best to make sure that we actually deliver on promises that this government is making now.

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (16:23):** It is my pleasure to rise to make a contribution in relation to the Supply Bill. It has already been mentioned, of course, that the Supply Bill is a peculiar creature simply to allow the government to continue paying the Public Service while we get through the budget. It strikes me every year as a little odd that many companies around the world which are much larger than this state government do manage to do their budget in sufficient time that they do not need to do anything like this. They simply get their budget ready and begin operating from 1 July with their new financial year.

It bewilders me that the government is so inept, and has been every year that I have been here, that every year we have a Supply Bill because the budget is not ready, and therefore we are going to go beyond 30 June, and therefore we need \$3.205 billion to continue to pay the Public Service until we actually catch up to where we are meant to be. So that strikes me as odd, because it gives us every year the opportunity to get up and put on the record of this place just how appalling this government's financial management of the state has been over the whole time that it has been in office.

The shadow treasurer has already pointed out, of course, that this government in its current budget has delivered the biggest debt and the biggest deficit that this state has ever seen. It makes the State Bank crisis pale into insignificance and it is frightening, not only because of its size but because it is so unnecessary.

When this government came into office in 2002, we were indeed in boom times. The consequence of that was that, for the first seven years in office or thereabouts at least, until the global financial crisis, this government received over and above what it budgeted to spend, on average, \$500 million—that is, \$0.5 billion—every year for the first seven years, over and above its budget.

Yet, still, not only could this government not manage to balance its budget, it has led us to a point where we are now expecting a debt of at least \$14 billion for this state. Our debt is growing at a rate of \$4 million every single day for eight years. There will be an increase in our debt of \$4 million a day, every single day, for eight years. It is incomprehensible that a government, with all the money that it had coming into this state, could possibly have got us to a situation where our debt is growing at that rate.

What is more, that even includes the sale of the forests and the sale of the Lotteries Commission. I have said many times in this place that the sale of those assets is selling the goose that laid the golden egg. We had a forestry situation where our forests were an asset producing in excess of \$40 million a year income. Our Lotteries Commission, in the last year I think had an income for us of over \$100 million.

Even when you take into account the bits that have been salvaged from that, we are still worse off for the sale, and that is the ridiculous thing. They are selling the goose that lays the golden egg and the only reason to sell the goose that lays the golden egg, with both the forests and the Lotteries Commission, is that we have a government that is so cash-strapped that it has no alternative.

The debt of this state is so big that it will cost us, the people of this state, \$2.2 million every single day just to pay the interest, and that is if things do not get worse and I have every expectation that they will indeed get worse before this time next year. Every single day, the people of this state will be liable for \$2.2 million in payments just on the interest, without reducing that debt at all.

I invite people to think about how good this state would look if, instead of paying interest on a debt that we should not have in the first place, instead of having to pay that \$2.2 million every single day, we could instead give to every community around the state, choose 365 of them just for this year and say, 'Here is \$2.2 million. You do what would improve your community and we will see what the state looks like after just one year.'

Imagine 365 communities around our suburbs and our regions with \$2.2 million to improve their facilities and to improve all of the outcomes for people who need help and assistance in our community. That is the sad thing about the situation in which we now find ourselves because, instead of that happening, we have to pay an interest bill of \$2.2 million a day.

That is the overall debt, of course, but our deficit, as I said, which is the biggest the state has ever seen, is due to be \$1.2 billion just for this year. The member for Morphett went through the process of explaining the net deficit, cash deficit and so on. I will just use the net operating deficit of \$1.2 billion.

So, there is \$1,200 million of deficit just for this year. The surprising thing is that, when you go back into the budget books of this state, back in 2009-10, which is not very long ago, when the government delivered its budget then they promised us that, this year, we would have a surplus of \$304 million. Indeed, by the Mid-Year Budget Review, partway through that year at around about Christmas, they said, 'It is actually going to be better than that.'

By the time we get to 2012-13, we are going to have a \$316 million surplus.' But then, when they got to the next budget, they said, 'Oh, no; \$216 million surplus.' Then we got to the next budget review and they halved that and made it \$127 million surplus. Then, at the 2011-12 budget it went down to \$114 million before they started to come clean at the 2011-12 Mid-Year Budget Review, and it was a deficit instead of a surplus.

So, in a matter of six months, we went from a prediction that this year we would have a \$114 million surplus to a prediction that we would instead have a \$453 million deficit, which was then, at the budget brought down in the middle of last year, reduced to an \$867 million deficit; and then, at the Mid-Year Budget Review, a \$1,169 million deficit, which is near enough to \$1.2 billion, and that is if they stay on track. I have every expectation, given that trend line, that, indeed, it will get worse, especially given that when the Mid-Year Budget Review was brought down we had not lost all the jobs and so on that we have lost so recently.

One of the other things that annoy me about all of this is that the government was not without advice that this could have been avoided. Every year the Auditor-General puts in a report to this parliament, and every year from at least 2005-06, the Auditor-General kept warning, and saying to the government things like 'You're relying on income you can't be relying on. You're

spending money you shouldn't be spending. You need to control your expenses.' Indeed, the most recent one was when the Auditor-General warned in the 2011-12 report, at page 54 of Part C:

A major risk to the Budget...is the outcomes from enterprise agreement and control of FTE numbers.

They kept telling them there were all sorts of problems but the government kept refusing to listen, and therein lies the heart of the problem. So, it is not that we have not had the money coming in and, indeed, the government said, 'We've got a AAA credit rating and it's terribly important to us to keep it.' Jack Snelling, in fact, as the treasurer—and, of course, we all know that the Premier, who has now become the Treasurer, decided that Jack Snelling was not quite up to the job of being treasurer—said as recently as 28 September 2011, 'We are committed to making sure we retain the AAA credit rating.'

Why did he say that? Because a few days earlier on 23 September, Standard and Poor's had put the state of South Australia's AAA rating on a negative outlook. Then, by May last year, they downgraded it from AAA to AA+ with a negative outlook. Moody's, of course, acted in the meantime to also downgrade, and then Standard and Poor's again in September last year took us further down again from AA+, and we were downgraded yet again to simply AA.

So, we are in a bad way. As I say, there is no reason for us to be in this situation. Not only did this government have the riches of the first seven years; indeed, they have had quite a lot of money throughout their time in office. In fact, I think overall, there is something like \$5.8 billion extra over and above budget that has come into the coffers of this government and, yet, in spite of that, they still have not had enough money.

Of course, one of the reasons that they have all this money is that there have been massive increases in the commonwealth grants that we have received in South Australia, but also they have had massive amounts of GST coming in—one of the things the Auditor-General said they could not rely on continuing—and then they were surprised when they heard that that might not be continuing.

The other thing is that we have the highest taxes in the nation. They do not seem to understand that businesses need to thrive in order to grow and to pay more taxes. It is a pretty basic concept: if businesses are thriving, if people are being employed, if people feel confident about the future, they grow their business, and that means that naturally more taxes will come in. Instead of that, this government has taken the opposite approach and said, 'Well, let's just keep applying higher and heavier and harder taxes', with the result that on many measures we have the highest taxes in the nation.

It is not just the Liberal Party that is asserting that this is the case. The Commonwealth Grants Commission says we have the highest taxes in the nation; the Institute of Public Affairs says that we have the highest taxes in the nation; and Pitcher Partners says that we have the highest taxes in the nation. So, here we are in a situation where there is, in fact, plenty of revenue coming in, and yet we have the highest taxes and we do not have a sound economic outlook. We do not have that—it is not lack of revenue that is the problem. It is a lack of capacity to control expenses and an appalling record on waste.

I just want to go through some of the examples about what waste we have seen by this government. They do things like, for example, the Adelaide Oval. The member for Adelaide sitting beside me here—I know it is one of her favourite projects. Remember back at the election when they said, 'It's going to cost us \$450 million and not a penny more'? Not a penny more—and what's more, that \$450 million they guaranteed us was going to include the car park and footbridge.

Then, after the election—surprise, surprise—well, it was true, it was not a penny more. It was \$85 million more, for a start. So, it was \$535 million, not \$450 million, and, by the way, it was no longer going to include the car park or the footbridge. Indeed, I notice the member for Bragg as the shadow minister for transport has today put out a media release about the blowout in the costs in the footbridge and the fact that it is not going to do what they said it would do, which was deliver people to the entry to the Adelaide Oval. There are massive amounts of money that is simply wasted.

The advertising budget of this government beggars belief. I do not understand, for the most part, why governments need to advertise. I understand some advertising is necessary if you have got to let people know about fire restrictions or water restrictions or whatever it might be—absolutely you need to have some advertising. But, this government spends money on, for instance, publishing in *The Advertiser* this campaign called 'I Love Murray', as if people in South

Australia needed to be persuaded that that was something that they cared about. Anyone who has done any polling would know that it was already the most important issue way back going into the last election. We all care about the Murray. We do not need to be told by *The Advertiser* that we care about the Murray, but this government spent \$2 million on that.

Perhaps one of the most startling spends was that of the desalination plant. It was Liberal Party policy from way back to have a 50 gigalitre desalination plant to protect this state against the possibility of running out of water because we were in the midst of a drought. A number of us went over to Perth, we looked at the desalination plant there and I was in the room when we specifically asked the gentleman who was building it and said, 'If we signed a contract today, how much would it cost us to build and have an operational desalination plant like this one in South Australia?' The answer was \$450 million.

We came home, we developed a policy, we announced the policy and the government said, 'No, no, no, we don't need a desalination plant.' They continued to say that for two years, and then suddenly, after two years, they did a complete double backflip, pike and somersault and said, 'Not only are we going to have a desalination plant, but it's going to be double the size of what the Liberals propose.' It is going to be 50 gigalitres, in spite of the fact that the Productivity Commission had said, and continues to say, there is no way that this state could ever need a desalination plant bigger than 50 gigalitres. But, no, this government has to spend the extra money, so we are going to have a 100 gigalitre desalination plant.

Of course, the price has gone up by now, so it ends up costing us, by the time we have the connection put in and all of the disruption that that involved, \$2.2 billion. We could have done it for \$450 million back when we had the policy, but no, they did not want it then. It ends up costing us \$2.2 billion. What's more, we are not going to use it. We are going to mothball it. Unless anyone thinks there is going to be a great saving there, in fact, the mothballing is going to cost us \$30 million just to keep it running. What's more, Treasury requires a 6 per cent return on the desalination plant asset, and that equates to another \$130 million a year.

An amount of \$130 million a year, plus the \$30 million to run it—that is \$160 million a year—for what? As I say, the waste of this government is just extraordinary and I am bewildered by the things that they do. We have a series of power poles up to the north of the city at the moment, put up there to electrify a line that is not going to be electrified in the foreseeable future. What they have created is a wonderful series of graffiti opportunities for those who get into that. But of course we all know that this government put all its eggs in the basket of the Olympic Dam expansion.

Remember in last year's budget, at the very beginning of the budget, the then treasurer Snelling said, 'South Australia will be a very different place in a few years. The expanded Olympic Dam mine—the largest open pit mine in the world—will be operating...' That is an extraordinary statement when you look back over those last few months and see just where this state has gone to, because they put all their eggs in that basket instead of recognising that they needed to be supporting a whole lot of other things.

Then very lately the government, when they prorogued and the new Premier had his opening speeches, suddenly decided agriculture was going to be something worth saving, after spending years closing things like agricultural research and taking money out of that sector and making our farmers do it as tough as could be. It is no wonder that on 27 September, Standard & Poor's told the media, 'We are just not seeing evidence of cost constraints from the state government...The recent public sector wage increase was an example of that.'

I only have a couple of minutes left and I do want to talk very briefly about one of my other pet hates with this government. There are a couple of them, but one of them is Shared Services. Shared Services was this insane idea that we were going to be able to centralise all the human resources and pay and so on—all those facets of the various government departments—into a central place. What the government promised when they announced this back in 2006 was that it was going to be completed by the year 2009-10 (and I note in passing that it is still not completed) and it was going to be done for an up-front cost of \$60 million to save \$60 million a year.

In spite of the fact that Western Australia had gone down this path, realised the error of its ways and retreated, this government insisted on still going ahead and so far the implementation has cost the state \$93 million and it is still continuing but what is more, they are so far \$83 million short of their promised savings. Meanwhile, as if that was not bad enough, the whole thrust of it was to actually improve the way services were provided. What we have now is a government



which, through the introduction of Shared Services, has failed to pay on time bills to the tune of \$1.5 billion.

Not only that but we pulled jobs out of our regional communities which were the payroll clerk in government departments and so on. What is more, if you were the payroll clerk, say, at Flinders Medical Centre and suddenly you have to come into Shared Services in the city, you—the individual payroll clerk—have lost time out of your day because you have to travel further, and what is more, it is costing you more money and is a lot less convenient if you lived in the southern suburbs or around Blackwood or somewhere like that.

The whole thrust of the Shared Services debacle is just an insurmountable problem and yet, instead of recognising that it could have been corrected, this government has persisted in going down the path of having Shared Services continue to be an affront to the people of this state.

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (16:43):** I indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition today. It is my great pleasure to speak on the Supply Bill proposed by the government. This bill of course guarantees the money supply from 1 July to the time when the Appropriation Bill comes down later down the track, and I have commented on this in the past because this seems such a crazy situation to me coming from the commercial sector. The government is essentially asking us today, with this debate on the bill, to authorise their expenditure of \$3.2 billion without telling us what they are going to spend the money on.

Of course, I think we can be cut some slack by people who say, 'That's a pretty cynical exercise. Of course you should trust the government.' Really, should we? Over an extended period of time, the forecast budgets that the government has projected have been loose to say the least and today we have to, as an act of faith, support the government in spending \$3.2 billion without seeing any sort of indication of what they are going to spend that money on. It would not happen in the private sector, but it happens here on an annual basis. Nevertheless, I will indicate that we will be supporting the Supply Bill, having made those comments.

There have been many comments in the media lately about the government's over-spruiking, and in particular there have been discussions in the media about over-spruiking jobs, with regards to Holden, with regards to the Arafura Resources project, with regards to the big daddy of them all, Olympic Dam. In fact, the Premier himself came out and said last week in the media that he thinks that the government has in the past been over-spruiking some of these projects.

Well, surely the most obvious evidence that anybody would ever need to be presented to them to demonstrate that the government has been over-spruiking is just a cursory glance at our economic performance in recent years. I think that provides the perfect evidence that anybody would need to see. Each year we are presented with pretty much the same picture: it is going to be tough in the next couple of years but thereafter it is going to be the land of milk and honey. Let's take the current year that we are sitting in, the 2012-13 financial year.

When the government originally forecast this year, they said that we were heading for a \$304 million surplus—do not forget that this is in the outer years of the forward estimates. They said \$304 million surplus this year that we are currently sitting in. Then, over the times of update to the house the position continually deteriorates. It went from \$304 million in the original 2009-10 budget, and in the Mid-Year Budget Review that year it actually went up. The government was more optimistic about this current financial year. They said it was going to be a surplus of \$316 million.

In the 2010-11 budget it dropped out to \$216 million. In the Mid-Year Budget Review they again confirmed that this would be a surplus year. In the 2011-12 budget, again, this year was forecast to be a surplus year. It was not until the 2011-12 budget that we were going to post a 'small deficit' in this financial year. Well, let me tell you: by the time the budget was finally brought down for this financial year the government said that we were heading for an \$867 million deficit in this year.

As if that was not bad enough, by the time we got around to December last year, in the dying days of 2012—when everybody was out wrapping their presents, getting their house ready to receive interstate or overseas guests, getting ready for Christmas, getting that turkey organised—the government snuck out its Mid-Year Budget Review. And let me tell you what it showed the people of South Australia: it said that we were heading towards the single largest deficit in the state's proud history—a \$1.2 billion deficit. So, it was originally forecast at a \$304 million surplus, and then we end up with a \$1.2 billion deficit, a forecasting error of just a lazy \$1.5 billion.

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**Mr MARSHALL:** And, as the member for Heysen points out, that was just the most recent update. Let me tell you that the government is so hopeless with their forecast that when we get to hear the actual performance this year it could be substantially worse. This government has no economic credibility whatsoever. They have been over-spruiking the finances for an extended period of time.

There are two explanations on the part of the government for this nearsighted, harsh reality and this longsighted delusion. It is either a deliberate strategy by the government to deceive the people of South Australia, or misrepresent the state's finances, or it is gross incompetence. You take your choice. I do not think either of them are particularly good opportunities or good options for the people of South Australia.

Of course, the Premier was not happy with the previous treasurer's performance, and he sacked him. He said that he was not doing a particularly good job and that the best person in this parliament to look after the finances of this state was indeed the Premier himself. So, of course, we are really looking forward to what is going to be contained in this budget because he is promising to sort this out.

Let us take a look at the government's most recent published document which relates to the state's finances. I refer, of course, to the Mid-Year Budget Review, which was titled, curiously, 'Strong Foundations, Stronger Future'. I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that in reality this document identifies a deteriorating foundation and a debt ridden future for the people of South Australia.

Of course, the government has repeatedly stated that this deteriorating budget position has been caused by this once-in-a-lifetime write-down of future revenues derived in this state for the GST revenue from the commonwealth government. I took a close look at the Mid-Year Budget Review expecting that there was going to be a once-in-a-lifetime order of magnitude write-down in GST revenue into this state incorporated into the Mid-Year Budget Review. That is a logical thing to expect.

What did I find? I found that there was actually a projected increase—admittedly, only small, \$2 million—in GST revenue from the commonwealth government contained in the Mid-Year Budget Review. This was extraordinary, as far as I was concerned, because I had been led to believe by the government that the reason for this massive blowout in the forecast deficit of this state was due to the write-down in revenue of GST into this state when, actually, it was quite the reverse.

The simple fact of the matter is that the government's spending is completely and utterly out of control. Again, if you need any proof of this, you just need to look at page 15 of the Mid-Year Budget Review which clearly shows there has been an increase of over \$888 million included in the remaining 3½ years of the forward estimates. That is the problem with our finances in this state. It is not a revenue problem: it is a spending problem. This is a government which is addicted to spending. I do not think they have ever seen a spending idea that they do not like, and they take action immediately.

I thought it was also interesting when we were looking at the Mid-Year Budget Review that there was some new terminology that the government has introduced. With the Premier taking over the role of Treasurer and being an avowed person against over-spruiking and 'bull dust', as he pointed out in the media in the last 24 hours, it will be interesting to see what he will do with some of this new terminology. I come from the business sector and, historically, we have called a blowout a blowout. In fact, we have called it many things but, generally speaking, we have called it a blowout.

Let me tell you what the government now calls these blowouts. They call them—are you ready for this—operating initiatives. I would just like to quote from page 14 of the Mid-Year Budget Review and it says:

The largest new operating initiative is an adjustment to the Department for Health and Ageing's budget following an assessment of its capacity to deliver savings.

When I think of operating initiatives I think there must be a new service which is actually being provided to the people of South Australia. I think that there must be some incremental improvement to the quality of service or products that are provided to the hardworking people of South Australia. Well, no: the single largest operating initiative of the government in the Mid-Year Budget Review is

essentially a blowout in expenditure, or a failure to achieve the budgeted savings, in the Department for Health and Ageing—and what a massive blowout that was.

In fact, this year, the new operating initiative in the Department for Health and Ageing cost us \$123 million and, in fact, if you look at the total cuts that are now required (they are much smaller than they previously were) by the Department for Health and Ageing to bring this budget in on track, they are \$949 million worth of cuts over the remaining 3½ half years. It is an incredibly hard situation for the government but it is a situation that, of course, they have got themselves into.

I also want to hark back to something that, of course, minister O'Brien introduced the people of South Australia to some years ago. He is not one for over-spruiking: he is one for telling us the plain, simple truth. Recently, he said to the people of South Australia, 'Of course we are in a dire situation. We are actually borrowing money to pay wages.' The government got into a flap and came up with a technical explanation—'Actually, we are not borrowing money to pay wages because there is a non-cash item in the Income and Expenditure Statement: it is called depreciation.' We accept that: that is a non-cash item. So, technically they got away with it for that period of time.

Of course, I looked up in the Mid-Year Budget Review what that principal non-cash item value of depreciation was for this current financial year and I am happy to inform the parliament it is \$832 million. Again, getting back to my schoolboy maths, I know that \$832 million is less than \$1.2 billion, so I can state for a fact on the record that minister O'Brien was right: we are, as a state, borrowing money each and every day to pay the wages here in South Australia. This has got nothing to do with the capital account: this is just the departmental income and expenditure statement. We are \$1.2 billion in deficit. Take off, if you like, the \$832 million of non-cash items (the depreciation, principally), and we are still borrowing money each and every day. That is the problem we have here in South Australia.

Of course, the other thing that the Mid-Year Budget Review made very clear to the people of South Australia is the deteriorating position with regards to state debt. You simply cannot continue to run deficit after deficit after deficit without it massively impacting upon the debt of the state. We had a situation again in December of last year where we had a further \$1 billion deterioration in the debt forecast for this state. In a six-month period they got it wrong by \$1 billion. This is an incredible situation. As Moody's (that independent group) has pointed out, we will be paying \$800 million—in fact, in excess of \$800 million—each and every year to service the debt that this government has mismanaged over its time in office.

We have to spend \$800 million a year before we can look at any programs to ease cost of living pressures here in South Australia, \$800 million before we can look at any form of tax reform in our budget, \$800 million before we can spend a cent in providing government services to the people of South Australia—\$800 million per year is a massive amount of money. Quite frankly, it is immoral, because what it basically demonstrates is that the next generation has to pay for our excesses of today. We have overspent our money and the next generation will be paying; that is, my kids, your kids, our grandkids and the next generation. Quite frankly, it is completely and utterly immoral.

I would like to also raise another issue, and I do not think it has been an issue that the parliament has really looked at in much detail. When I look at the government's financial statements and the cost of that debt and in particular the interest rate that is payable on that debt, I see that it currently sits at 4.9 per cent. So, the average interest rate we are paying on the \$14 billion worth of debt is 4.9 per cent. For those of us who have been in business and for those of us who have had a mortgage on our house, we accept that 4.9 per cent is an historically very low interest rate. What would be the case in South Australia if that interest rate increased? Of course, there is no reason to believe that it will not increase.

I do not think that anybody as optimistic or as overspruiking as they could be would think that we are going to remain at this historically low level indefinitely going forward, so I have made some calculations. Let me tell you: if it went from 4.9 per cent to 5.9 per cent then, guess what? We would be paying in excess of another \$150 million per year on that interest rate. Imagine if we were back to where we were a couple of decades ago: over 10 per cent, over 12 per cent. Imagine this debt and how much it would encumber the next generation of South Australians. They would never, ever get over it.

I would now like to make one other observation with regards to this unprecedented level of debt that is now forecast for South Australia, and that is the noises made last year by the former

treasurer, treasurer Snelling. He was actually quite concerned about the increased level of debt. He was so concerned that he said, 'I'm going to bring in a new debt ceiling that we are not going to breach.' There had been quite a lot of discussion about this increasing level of debt. He said, 'We are going to set this debt ceiling at 50 per cent.' He did that in May last year. Less than a year ago he said, 'We will set that at 50 per cent.' Now six months later he is forecasting that they have already breached it. Our debt to revenue ratio has already blown out in the forward estimates to 55 per cent.

If you look at the total government financial liabilities compared to our revenue, guess what that moves to? It moves to nearly 200 per cent. Quite frankly, the previous treasurer knew this was a problem. He put a program in place. Alright, he breached it and he got sacked for it. Obviously the Premier did not like what he heard about this new level of responsibility imposed by the treasurer, so the Premier sacked him. He thought he could do a much better job. I will put this statistic to the house: when this government came to power the debt to revenue ratio was 7 per cent and 11 years later it is now forecast to hit 55 per cent. This is gross economic mismanagement of the highest order. What is the government's response to this continually deteriorating financial situation? This makes for really interesting reading in the Mid-Year Budget Review.

First of all, as everybody is more than aware, we are going to sell the forward sale of the forestry rotations and also the licence for SA Lotteries. They are two transactions that occurred of course within public non-financial corporations, so you would think that the sale proceeds of that transaction would stay within those public non-financial corporations. That is pretty orthodox. Well, guess what? No way! It is not staying there. It is being transferred over to the income and expenditure statement in the departmental summary. This is unorthodox and is actually being presented as a note in the Mid-Year Budget Review. It is very unorthodox, but of course this cash-strapped government would have posted a significantly larger deficit this year if it was not for bringing that money into the departmental budgets.

South Australia is of course widely acknowledged now, for four years in a row, as having the highest business taxes in the nation. I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that this creates a handbrake on the South Australian economy, and that is why in South Australia we have slowed and indeed stopped. It does not matter whether we look at last week's CommSec report, the Deloitte Access Economics report or the previous month's ABS statistics, they are all saying the same thing: South Australia has stopped treading water and we are now going backwards. I put it to you that that is because we are the highest business taxed state in Australia.

The government's response to this is to introduce a new tax. Admittedly they did originally call it a Transport Development Levy. That is how it was originally termed, although I think even the Premier now, in this new atmosphere of removal of bulldust, is referring to it as a tax in the parliament. It is nothing more than a tax. It is designed in the Mid-Year Budget Review to bring in additional revenue of \$25.7 million. The government will have you believe that this is actually to build park-and-ride facilities. Fair enough, if that is the government's position I thought a reasonable question to the Premier would be, 'Once those park-and-ride facilities have been built I presume you will be removing the tax and unencumbering the people of South Australia.' What was his answer? 'No way! No, we're going to keep that tax—I mean, that Transport Development Levy.'

Give me a break! We have a cash-strapped government and an economy that is stalled, and the government's only response is not to tighten their own belt or look at eliminating waste within their own budgets but to simply impose another tax on our businesses, our small businesses who are all doing it tough, and on people who come in to shop and work in our CBD. Of course, we ask a range of questions. We know that the government is predicting \$25.7 million in terms of revenue, but we always say 'What is the net effect on the budget?' The state government has car parks. They are going to have to pay that car park tax themselves. 'What is the net effect?' 'We haven't done that modelling.' 'You've had six months; but okay.' We asked questions about what are going to be the impacts on businesses in our state. 'Well, we haven't decided on the final form.'

We cannot believe on this side of the house that the government would essentially go out to the people of South Australia, send letters out from Revenue SA to all car park owners in South Australia and tell them that there is going to be an increase in tax before they have even done the modelling. We asked the Premier repeatedly in the house, 'Has a cost benefit analysis been done?' 'Not at this point. We are still working through the details of the model.' We find it absolutely extraordinary.

Of course, the centrepiece of the Mid-Year Budget Review's tightening of the belt methodology comes with the addition of what they are referring to as an 'efficiency dividend'. It comes at 1 per cent in this current financial year, 2 per cent next financial year, and 3 per cent in the following financial year; so it is a 1, 2, 3. Of course, it is written up as 1 per cent, then 1 per cent, then 1 per cent; people think it is only 1 per cent, but is cumulative and so it adds up and of course it is a major efficiency dividend that the government is seeking.

Of course, we would welcome some cost savings, but when have they ever achieved these budget savings that they have set for them? You only need to look at the Department for Health. I am sorry that the former minister has had to leave the chamber at the moment, because he seemed quite interested in what I had to say. Can I just say, every single year we seem to have this heroic assumption in terms of how we are going to achieve these budget savings, only for a complete disappointment to the people of South Australia, and of course to this parliament, to follow when those heroic assumptions are not achieved.

Of course, also contained within the Mid-Year Budget Review is an announcement by the government that it will be ceasing the operation of Zero Waste SA. This comes under the heading 'Waste policy reform'. I cannot see how getting rid of an agency which, quite frankly, has served the people of South Australia well is a reform. The government has seen fit to impose a solid waste levy on the people of South Australia. We have seen a massive increase in the dimension of all these levies, fees, fines, charges and cost recovery methodologies over the last 11 years. This is one of the greatest ones.

They have put out this levy, they are collecting \$42 per tonne in metropolitan Adelaide, \$21 per tonne in country SA, predicted to go up to \$50 per tonne in a few weeks' time. They have massive rivers of money flowing into the EPA. The EPA now makes a profit each year—can you believe it? Our major environmental regulator is now a profit centre for this cash-strapped government. The other half of the money, approximately \$17 million in this year's budget, goes to Zero Waste SA and this is to fund all the objects, all the policy objectives contained within the act—except that the government only allowed Zero Waste to spend \$8.5 million last year, going down to \$8.2 million this year.

There is this ongoing massive accumulation in the government coffers of the solid waste levy, which is now called the waste to resources fund. When they have that waste to resources fund brimming with money, what do they do? They decide to actually scrap Zero Waste SA. This is an extraordinary situation and it really highlights to people that the solid waste levy to be hypothecated against the objectives of the act was nothing more than a tax to accumulate money for the government.

The Mid-Year Budget Review also takes a swipe at the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources. They are predicting a cut of \$10 million in the 2013-14 year, then rising steeply to \$40 million a year by 2014-15. It seems to me that we are going to lose an entire component of that department. The problem is, of course, that we have not been told by the government at this stage precisely what we are going to be losing.

Another issue that I would like to raise from the Mid-Year Budget Review, and something that really worries me, is a massive provision for 'operation slippage'. I come from the business community; I am not sure what 'operation slippage' is. I do not know whether it is something you go out and exercise on or something like, 'Operation slippage—all aboard.'

Anyway, it is a provision which is contained within the Mid-Year Budget Review. The Mid-Year Budget Review came down and all the departmental budgets were put in place. As I said, there were some efficiency dividends put in place but, by and large, those budgets were not massively changed. So, the casual observer could look at their area of responsibility and say, 'Do you know what? There is not a big change to my budget. There is this 1 per cent efficiency dividend in the coming financial year.'

But, down the bottom of the Mid-Year Budget Review was this new idea, which is a massive increase in what was called 'operation slippage'. This provision actually amounted to \$287 million. There has been \$287 million worth of 'operation slippage' built into the budget. So, this is now the government saying, 'We know we have got these budgets by department, but we are not actually going to really spend that money.' In fact, \$287 million is not going to be spent.

So, you sort of say to yourself, 'How is this going to be made up? Which department is not going to be spending this money?' If you just add up all of the departmental budgets themselves, we are heading for a budget deficit of \$1.5 billion this year. I put it to you, because we have never

had this item in anywhere near this order of magnitude—\$287 million—that I find it very difficult to believe that, firstly, we are going to achieve that slippage or, secondly, if we are and the government is forecasting it, why don't they tell us where it is actually going to be? Why don't they tell us what this \$287 million provision is, or did they just not like the headline figure of a \$1.5 billion deficit in this financial year?

As I have stated, the Liberal opposition, despite all of my protestations this afternoon, will be supporting this bill. We are going to agree with the government that we should allow supply of \$3.2 billion to the government, prior to them giving us the budget.

Let me tell you that I am really looking forward to this Premier's, this new Treasurer's, first budget in this house. I have got no idea how he is going to provide for achieving the forecasts that he has updated to us only a few months ago and still incorporate the increasing costs of delivering on the NDIS, of delivering on Gonski and of delivering on the massive health expenditure cuts that we have now got built into the budget.

I asked the Premier, today in this house, if he could rule out any further increase to the projected deficit—the largest deficit in the 176 years of this state. He said, 'You will have to wait.' I said, 'Have you actually sought any advice from the Prime Minister, from the federal government, to update this state on what the likely revenue decrease is going to be, given that the Prime Minister herself went out to the people of Australia and said that there is going to be a \$12 billion budget deficit in the commonwealth this year?'

We asked the Premier what would be the flow-on effects. He said he had no update. On a \$12 billion sum, he had no update for the people of South Australia. We have to wait. He said, 'Be patient. We have to wait. We have not got long to wait. On 6 June, all will be revealed.'

I implore this new Treasurer, this part-time Treasurer of our state, to give us a decent, honest set of accounts going forward. We do not want any more over-spruiking. He has admitted that the government which he has led has been over-spruiking for an extended period of time. He wanted us to believe that that was the previous premier, the previous treasurer, and that things were going to be different under his watch.

I hope they are. I hope that we get a decent, honest, forthright set of accounts. The people of South Australia deserve that. We have not had good forecast accuracy in the past, and I look forward to a solid set of numbers—ones that we can rely on. I hope that he can resist the temptation, as his last budget before the next election, to over-promise in the next financial year, over-promise in the year after, over-promise in the forward estimates, and tell us that we are going to get back to surplus, only to be disappointed. I leave you with this thought: this government in the last eight years, in the outer year of the forward estimates, has promised eight surpluses—only one has been delivered.

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (17:15):** I rise to support the Supply Bill. This is a very important debate each year because the debate on the Supply Bill allows the government and the opposition to speak on a range of issues beyond that of just one bill. Sometimes, though, the debate degenerates into an opposition exercise in denigrating the state as those on the other side (as we have just heard) fling angry criticism at the government. It is important, therefore, to remind the house that South Australia is a great place in which to live. Many young South Australians have proudly sported the oddly worded 'Heaps Good' T-shirt. The slogan 'Heaps Good' usually refers to places, events and products—

**Mr Marshall:** Heaps broke.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** May I say I did not interject—which is unlike me—but I did not interject on the leader's speech. So, I would ask you to show me some courtesy.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The leader was heard in silence. I am sure he will wish to pay it back.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Don't point at me either; it's very rude. I am sure your mum told you that.

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**Mr GARDNER:** The member is clearly straying from the substance of the debate at hand.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no point of order; the member can continue.

**An honourable member:** Heaps rude.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Yes, 'Heaps Rude' might be a good T-shirt for them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** This slogan often refers to events and products which are the signatures of South Australia such as our world-class wines, Lucia's in the market and bung fritz, which is the favourite of every South Australian of a certain age (including my dogs), but it can also describe other aspects of life in South Australia such as education, health care, social services, and living in safe and spacious communities. Last year's budget was delivered still within the shadow of the global economic crisis. As a result of global forces, the state has endured economic write-downs of over \$3 billion since the 2011-12 budget. This government has, therefore, introduced savings measures that will reduce the debt level by \$6 billion by 2015-16.

Nevertheless, the government is still meeting its obligations to South Australians in need. In last year's budget, \$210.2 million over four years was earmarked to assist people who need some assistance to prosper in our society. For example, in the area of disability services: \$101.6 million over four years for accommodation and community support as well as very important respite services for carers; \$61.5 million over four years to the South Australian Housing Trust to construct new community-based disability housing; and \$21.6 million over four years to move residents of the Strathmont Centre into community living.

The Strathmont Centre is in my electorate and I observed closely the transition of residents into community-based housing. I have been extremely pleased to see the changes that such a move brings to the residents. Their lives are substantially enriched; they are considerably happier in their new environment; they have pleasant courtyards in which to spend time; their inside environment is pleasantly decorated; and they can see their food being prepared for the first time for many of these residents, which is a much more pleasant experience than receiving meals that are delivered from the central kitchen.

Unsurprisingly, these changes benefit not only the residents, but also their families whose lives are made less stressful by the knowledge that their loved ones are being cared for in a happier environment. We cannot, I think, underestimate the level of social capital that is generated by investment in this sector. I would say to people, if they ever have the opportunity, perhaps, to have a look at some of the community housing, because it is a really homely environment and a pleasant place to visit.

Another area of investment in good social policy enacted by the government that is popular among a lot of constituents in Torrens is the regime of concessions available to low income earners and people on fixed incomes. These include the medical heating and cooling concession for people whose medical conditions require a temperature-controlled environment, water bill concessions for up to 25 per cent of a water bill, sewerage rate concession and energy concessions. Recognising the impact of these imposts, the government increased these concession payments at the beginning of the current financial year.

Maintaining a high quality health service is always a challenge, but the government continues to pursue its agenda of making high quality health care available to all South Australians. One way this is being done is by creating facilities that offer a range of services in one place, which not only minimises costs, but also makes it easier and less time-consuming for patients, carers and parents when they need a health care professional.

Many such projects are the result of joint commonwealth-state funding arrangements. One recent example of this is the laying of the foundation for the new \$46 million teaching and research facility at the Repatriation General Hospital in a partnership with Flinders University and the ACH Group. Linking health, aged care and education, the facility will allow older Australians to receive rehabilitation and other support services in a specialised facility in one place.

A further example is the recent opening of a \$12 million older persons' mental health unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Establishing facilities like these is forward-looking as we face the challenge of future health care for the ageing boomer population, which I think might include me. This is a slightly—

**Mr Venning:** No, you're only a youngster.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I thank the member for Schubert for saying it does not, but he might be wearing some rose-coloured glasses today. This is a slightly unpalatable turn of phrase, I have to say, for those of us who fall into that category, but government policy must always have an eye to the future, as well as meeting contemporary demands.

In modern western societies, as we all know, treatment of cancer looms large, and the difficulty and prolonged nature of the treatment means that it is expensive and highly disruptive to patients and their families. That is why the government is investing in regional chemotherapy units, and I have to say, having had personal experience in dealing with that issue, I think that is a great credit to the government. It is so essential—

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** Hear, hear.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** —to have them in regional areas, yes, as the member for Ashford says. In February, a new \$442,000 chemotherapy unit opened at the Clare Hospital, which will give relief from travelling for treatment to people who live in Clare and those surrounding towns. This unit is the first of 10 units to be opened in the regions. Establishing new health facilities like the chemotherapy units, the facility at the Repat and of course the new Royal Adelaide Hospital means South Australians are gaining state of the art, world-class health services.

In closing, I cannot fail to mention the government's investment in our great future for South Australia that contributes to all areas of government priorities. Our amazing infrastructure projects provide jobs, better health facilities, improved public transport, water security—

**Ms Chapman:** You should have scrubbed that one out.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Well, the member for Bragg talks about transport services, but I can recall when I first moved into my home there was no bus service on a Sunday. We had bus services every hour, if we were lucky, and you would have to get exceptionally early, in my case with young children, to be able to get into town or to work for appointments. So, in the comparison between what it was like and what it is like now, we have a far better, more efficient service available to people. Nothing is ever perfect, but the service is good and if you look at the O-Bahn, for example, it is an amazing service and—

**Ms Chapman:** You should be thanking Dean Brown. He built it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** —extremely well patronised and the changes that we have made to that have enhanced it tenfold.

**Mr Gardner:** What happened to the extension? Weren't you guys going to extend it into town?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** It is really interesting just to listen to negativity from the other side.

**Mr Gardner:** We're proud of it.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** You're proud of it?

**Mr Gardner:** We're proud of the O-Bahn.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** You're proud of the negativity that you continue to share with the chamber.

**Mr GARDNER:** Sir, I must take objection. The member is imputing improper motives yet again.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Are you taking a point of order?

**Mr GARDNER:** I am, sir. I think if you look at 127, if a member is imputing improper motives, then the other standing order says it has to be objected to at the time, and I do object to the member imputing improper motives on me.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I don't think there is a point of order.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** In my defence, sir, if I may—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I haven't agreed to the point of order.



**Mrs GERAGHTY:** No, and you are quite right in not agreeing with him. Had the member not been interjecting, I would not have had this discussion across the chamber with him. Sometimes, it does not pay to interject. Anyway, as I was saying, we have better health facilities, improved public transport, a vibrant city and good education facilities. I might just say about education, in all my years as the member for Torrens, I have seen some of the most remarkable changes in my schools—new facilities.

Buildings that were run down and were appalling were just left: we have improved those facilities. The children now go into classrooms that are fresh, where they do not sit on a chair and it rolls down to a wall or they are sitting there and windows pop out. I know that the educators in my schools are exceptionally happy with the changes that are occurring not just around the buildings but also around the opportunities that are provided for them to educate our young children well.

We also have our transport corridors for the future and this is going to improve immensely both private and commercial transport. Some \$680 million in infrastructure investments were budgeted for in 2012-13, and I think that is something to be exceptionally proud of. As a member who will not be here in the next term—

**Mr Gardner:** For shame!

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I am sad about it, but—

**Mr Venning:** Is this your last one, Robyn?

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Yes, this is my last term. But I am exceptionally proud to support this bill as part of this government.

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (17:27):** I also rise to speak in support of the Supply Bill. The Mid-Year Budget Review delivers the highest debt in the state's history and the highest budget deficits in the state's history. The state debt is increasing to \$14 billion while the budget deficit for 2012-13 is budgeted to reach \$1.2 billion. This deficit is followed by an \$868 million deficit in the 2013-14 year. The government is also expecting zero job growth for this year. In just over one year of a Weatherill Labor government, South Australia's AAA credit rating was put on negative outlook, then downgraded to AA+ with a negative outlook, then downgraded to AA—the worst credit rating in Australia.

The much anticipated Olympic Dam expansion has been cancelled. There are 4,100 fewer jobs. Labor has budgeted for the largest deficit in the state's history and the largest debt in the state's history. Labor has mothballed the desalination plant that they doubled in size. For the second year running, South Australia failed to meet the national average NAPLAN scores in all 20 categories. South Australia has the worst property sales figures in 27 years.

The government budgeted for and then spent the proceeds of the Olympic Dam expansion before it was approved. Now, the \$30 billion 25,000-job project has been cancelled. The cost of living is skyrocketing in South Australia with the world's highest electricity prices, the highest water prices of all Australian capitals and the highest taxes in the nation. Labor will collect over \$17.7 billion in taxes over the next four years.

It is no secret that the reason I stood for parliament and joined the Liberal Party, campaigned and then won my seat, was because of the wasteful Labor government, the wrong priorities and general frustration at seeing my state being ruined by the incompetence of this Labor government. There are many things that are affecting the state as a whole and there are many that are also specifically in my electorate that do also affect the entire state.

In a desperate need for money the Labor government has decided to bring in a car parking tax of \$750 per car park for both on-street and off-street car parking in the city. This is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard of to create vibrancy in the city. On the one hand, the Labor government has allowed shop trading on public holidays in the city in order to improve the vibrancy of the city, and then on the other hand they are going to hit people with a tax to do so. Why would people come in to the city when it is just so expensive, when they could just go shopping at Westfield or somewhere else and not pay at all?

I have had many, many calls to my office regarding the car parking tax. If the intent of the car parking tax is to reduce congestion in the city and also to improve public transport, these are good initiatives, certainly, but this is not the way to go about it. There have been 2.2 million fewer trips on public transport over the last year. Had the Labor government, in a cost saving attempt, not changed suppliers of their transport facilities they perhaps would not have such a congestion issue,

and people would still have faith in the bus system if it was running on time, if drivers knew where they were going and the buses were not full before they get to all the inner city suburbs.

It has been an absolute debacle. They have had to reprint the bus timetables and they have had to add bus lanes through the city, which is frustrating the traffic even more, and it was all due to a cost saving measure which has gone terribly wrong. In order to compensate for that they are trying to now get cars out of the city by putting in this car parking tax. If this was aimed correctly at, perhaps, people who work full-time in the city from 9 to 5, when there is adequate public transport available, maybe there could be some merit; however, it is not—this is a blanket \$750 tax on every car park in the city. So, it is actually hitting shoppers, it is hitting residents. With all the DPAs for the city there is no longer a requirement to have the exact number of car parks per resident.

For example, at the UNO apartments, that I was recently at the opening for, I believe there are something like 36 car parks for 131 apartments. I have been contacted by people who live there. Whilst it is an amazing building, and it is terrific, and I certainly agree with the principle of encouraging fewer people to have cars, it is not in our near future. One of the residents of the building is on a disability pension and has to have a car in order to get to her different appointments.

Because there is no bus that runs directly in front of the building, she does need a car, so that means she has to pay for commercial car parking. She has contacted my office deeply concerned that the extra \$750 a year is just absolutely unaffordable and will mean that she will be more isolated in her own home and not able to leave at all, and she will not be able to afford to have a car and the mobility and the freedom that that gives her.

I have had other calls from residents who have also bought cheaper units in the city to save money. They are young, they have been encouraged into the city by this Labor government by different initiatives, which is a great thing; however, there is no car parking available with the units that they own. Therefore, they lease commercial car parks and now they are going to be hit by the \$750. So they are saying to me, 'Why did the government encourage us to move into the city to save money? It'd be cheaper for me to have just had a house in the suburbs and have my car parked in my driveway at no cost.'

Either the government wants a vibrant city or it does not want a vibrant city, and this car parking tax certainly will be to the detriment of the vibrancy of the city. I have also had calls from churches and community groups that earn money from leasing out their car parking on their property in order to maintain their buildings and run their properties. They will also be hit by this \$750 tax which makes it not affordable for them to do that and, in some cases, they will not be able to provide any of the services that they have been providing for the community.

If you also look at this from a business point of view, the value of an asset is determined by the revenue that you can raise or the profit that is available. If you take someone's, say, million-dollar car park in the city, if they had 1,000 car parks and you have just added a \$750 fee to each of those, that is, I imagine, \$750,000 that you have just taken off their revenue base, which means you have just devalued their property. If they have that property mortgaged and then have other investments, you have affected all of their other investments and their ability to create more jobs or assets and purchase more assets throughout our city. So this is really not a well thought out proposal.

The Premier has referred to this working in Melbourne. However, in Melbourne, instead of it being evenly spread between all of the long-term and short-term car parks, in order to keep their clientele, the long-term parkers (who are the ones the government seeks to keep out of the city and on public transport) have had their amount protected and it has been put onto the short-term parkers—the shoppers, the mums and dads, and the people going to the dentist in the city or to specialist visits.

They are the ones getting hit for double the amount, so you are actually reducing the vibrancy of the city and not hitting the people who you want to have catch public transport and that is the long-term parkers. Whilst perhaps reducing congestion in the city and getting more people on buses is a great idea, I do not think this tax will do it at all. It has not been well thought out and there are perhaps a lot of unintended consequences or plain stupidity.

The topic of Adelaide Oval was brought up by other members today and, certainly, it has been one of my bugbears. Prior to the election, we were told that the Adelaide Oval would cost \$450 million and not a penny more, and that was to include car parking and a footbridge. Of

course, not long after the election, we ended up paying the \$85 million SACA debt, which they assured people they could have afforded to pay off themselves. I do not know why the taxpayers of South Australia were lumped with this debt when SACA was perfectly capable of paying off its own debt.

However, it also then failed to include the footbridge, which became \$40 million, and then I believe there was also about \$30 million from the federal government in order to help as well, and a couple of million from the AFL, which we have not heard much about lately. This has ended up being an incredibly higher cost than the \$450 million that we were told about, and we are getting a footbridge that does not cross over War Memorial Drive, is far smaller than anticipated and now includes upgrades to a bistro and some office area; and, again, I am unsure why it is appropriate to include that in the budget for the Adelaide Oval.

I would also like to mention Adelaide High School. In a last-minute desperate attempt to save the seat of Adelaide, only days before the last election the government announced a \$60 million expansion of four high schools. It promised to add 250 places to Adelaide High School and expand the zone to include Prospect and Walkerville. This was to be done without encroaching on the Parklands and would be ready for the 2013 school year. Well, it is 2013 and work has only just begun. The expansion is largely on the Parklands and no expansion of the zone to include Prospect or Walkerville has been announced. Now we hear that the government is actually reviewing the whole thing.

From FOI documents I have received, the member for Croydon is also now encouraging the government to abandon its promise to expand the zone to include Prospect and Walkerville and is instead requesting that it is expanded westward. This government ignores the fact that we actually need a second campus of Adelaide High School to accommodate the demand for an inner-city high school, not to mention the government's own 30-year plan, which anticipates a huge growth in the number of people living in the city.

People will only move to the city if there is adequate schooling for their children. If we want families to move to the city, we need to realise that there is a lack of schooling available both at the primary school level and the high school level. These 250 extra places are for a school that is already 200 places over capacity and already does not accept people within its own zone unless they were there in grade 7 in term 3 of the year before they needed to go to the school. If you move into Adelaide High's existing zone anytime after year 7, you cannot be guaranteed a place and it is highly unlikely that you will be accepted.

Adelaide High School does not even accept siblings. There are no sibling rights at Adelaide High School. My view is that the 250 places could be filled immediately just by people already in the current zone, let alone after expanding the zone.

It is also on record—and being on the governing council I am certainly aware—that the 250 places will only be divvied up at 50 per year. If we put 50 extra students in year 8 as soon as the school opens, we will need to accommodate those 50 all through the school. So that means that in 2016 or 2017, or whenever it gets finished, there will only be 50 places in that school for all that money. So the government really does not realise that it is totally inadequate and that there has to be another city school.

The Women's and Children's Hospital car park is another big issue in my electorate. I have had many calls and I have been working on this issue for a couple of years. There are issues with staff not having adequate access to parking. They are sometimes lining up in the current car park for up to 45 minutes and their pays are being docked. It also interferes with scheduled surgeries because adequate staff is not on board; so they are delaying things. We have also had safety issues, with nurses parking as far away as Barton Terrace West. We know that there have been several rapes throughout North Adelaide and in the Parklands. The last thing we want is nursing staff and hospital staff walking all the way through the dark streets of North Adelaide because there is not adequate parking.

We have also had stories in the paper about sick children carrying their oxygen bottles all the way from the Lion on Melbourne Street because they cannot get a park anywhere. I have had constituents contact my office about being booked. Because of all the streets being full, the City Council has now zoned the area for two-hour parking so that residents have some hope of having visitors to their home. That means that we now have people with sick children getting booked when they take their children to the hospital.

I believe this car park needs to be expanded. I believe that car parking is part of providing adequate health care and I believe that it is the government's role to provide that. This car park brings in about \$1.2 million in revenue to the government every year, so I find it astounding that it would want to sell off yet another asset that actually brings in money.

The health minister has said that he is not in the business of providing car parking and that it is not part of the health service, yet the government will invent a whole car parking tax to pay for park-and-ride, which is car parking. Perhaps it is only in the business of providing car parking at a loss and not at a profit.

It is astounding that the government would keep selling anything that makes money—the lotteries, the forests—and leave us in massive debt with no hope of paying it off. At least if we had a surplus we could be getting our debt down. We not only have massive debt, we have a deficit, so we are going backwards. If we sell every asset that makes money, we have no hope of ever recovering this economy in the future.

The desalination plant has been mentioned by a few people. Again, the desalination plant was the Liberals' idea. Labor thought it was ridiculous at the time and did not go ahead with it. The Liberals proposed a 50 gigalitre desalination plant at a cost of \$450 million. Due to the Labor government's need to upstage and make something even more grand, we have ended up with a 100 gigalitre desalination plant at a cost of \$2.2 billion which has now been mothballed. These are examples of why I could not sit at home and watch this Labor government destroy my state any longer. It is just disappointing that it is continuing. I am extremely concerned about the state that this government will leave our state in.

Irresponsible spending and wrong priorities are further demonstrated by the Mid-Year Budget Review's \$3.5 million cut from grassroots community sports and recreation clubs, the \$40 million funding cut to preventative health programs, the scaling back of the much-needed upgrade of the Lyell McEwin Hospital to save \$24 million, and the \$150 million slashed from the SA Police budget, threatening the number of officers on patrol.

There are all of these cuts, yet for some reason the government could still find the \$40 million needed for the footbridge, so this was a priority over health, policing and community sports. I find it absolutely astounding that we needed to spend \$40 million on a footbridge when there are five bridges within one kilometre of that area. We have had a bridge since I think the 1930s that was specifically built to cope with crowds of up to 60,000 people, which it has managed in the past when there were not so many seats and there were more standing areas, and there were crowds of up to 60,000.

The priorities of this government continue to be wrong. They continue to sell anything that produces money and only build things that can possibly lose money. It is just astounding; however, for the function of government, I will be accepting the Supply Bill.

### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (17:45):** I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to allow the house to continue to sit beyond 7pm.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

*An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:*

Motion carried.

### SUPPLY BILL 2013

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (17:47):** Today I have the pleasure of addressing the Supply Bill and some of the achievements of my part of the state and the role that the government has played in this. First of all, can I say to my colleagues opposite: emigrate, just emigrate. If it is that bad in this state, just go. I am sick of the whingeing, the whining, the putting down, and the attitude of the opposition about this state. This is a great place to live: it is clean, it is green, it is beautiful; we have a good quality of life; our kids have a future and jobs if we want them, so get

over it! Try living in Greece or Turkey at present, or go to Kenya or the Solomon Islands. Go and get sick in America and see how you go.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. L.R. BREUER:** Yes, we have some problems. The cost of living is going up and people on low incomes are finding it tough now, but on a world scale they are not starving, their kids go to school and they have a great health system. We are much the envy of the world, so get over it! You are some of the luckiest people in the world in one of the luckiest countries in the world and you are a bunch of whingey, whiney, wimpy, grumpy old farts! And now to my electorate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order.

**Mr GARDNER:** Sir, I object to at least four of the words there.

**An honourable member:** And 'old' as well!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member may continue.

**The Hon. L.R. BREUER:** Thank you. Some people are very sensitive about being called old. I want to talk about the \$69 million Whyalla Hospital redevelopment, which is going ahead and is looking absolutely wonderful. Certainly, people in Whyalla are very excited about the prospect of what appears to be a whole rebuild of our hospital. Whyalla was one of the four regional hospitals that received upgrades as part of the South Australian health reform. Our hospital is apparently on budget and on schedule, and the project has been progressing very well. It has been interesting to watch it go up. I think most of us thought we were going to get a little building that was to house our cancer centre, but it has turned out to be something monumental and we are very excited about it.

Earlier this year, nine patient accommodation units were opened for use and also the new accident and emergency unit is operating from the western side of the hospital. Our new cancer centre will include six chemotherapy chairs, outpatient care, counselling, and space for research and training activities, along with an extra 34 medical, surgical and palliative care beds, three new operating theatres and a new day procedure unit.

Patients who come to our hospital, which will include a lot from the Eyre Peninsula and the north of the state—so it is good to see the member from Flinders over there—will be able to stay closer to the hospital. They will have nine new self-contained one-bedroom accommodation units on the site, which will also be available to patients' carers. That is an issue for us from the country. If you go to Adelaide or to another centre, you often do not have family there. Patients' carers will be able to stay there with them if the patients need to be admitted.

People who travel to Adelaide for treatment may also be able to return to our region earlier for their rehab and other outpatient services, and carers, as I said, who are there will be able to book into the units. It will make accommodation and travel costs much more affordable for our patients and their carers. I have had a look at the area; it looks nice. There are some lovely little outdoor landscape areas there. We also have two two-bedroom units for visiting medical specialists and their families, which will be opened as part of the redevelopment. We are very happy with this. It is a wonderful asset for our city and it is a great example of this government caring for our region.

Giles, of course, is not just Whyalla, even though the majority of the population lives there. I was very pleased today to see that the town of Hawker is going to get its desalination plant to improve its water quality. That is very exciting news because we have been trying for this for some time. Today I understand that the water minister, Ian Hunter, said that they have been able to identify an appropriate desalination solution that is suitable for that remote location, and it can be delivered efficiently. I know SA Water has had extensive discussions with The Flinders Ranges Council about improving the water quality to the town, and after significant research SA Water has determined the most appropriate solution is a reverse osmosis desalination plant.

The local community, the council and SA Water have arrived at a solution which applies the available funding in the most efficient way and gets the outcome that the community wanted. It will desalinate the existing groundwater supplies. Tenders are now being called for the construction of the project. It is due to commence later this year and it is hoped that it will be operational in the latter half of 2014.

Hawker is only a small community, but they needed that water supply. Water, of course, is very scarce in my electorate, being in the desert. It is certainly becoming a very big issue with the mining developments that have been happening, so I am pleased that this government has been able to find a solution for Hawker which I think will transpose to other areas of the state also in my part of the state. I am pleased also that they have been looking so carefully at the issue.

Recently I was very sad to say farewell to Scott Denny, who has been our Whyalla police operations inspector for over three years. He was recently promoted to the superintendent officer in charge of the Yorke and Mid North local service area, and he has relocated to Port Pirie. I was sad to see him go because I am very proud of our police force in Whyalla and I know Scott was a very popular inspector there, who certainly had the respect of the local community.

As operations inspector he worked across the Eyre and Western local service area in Whyalla, Port Lincoln and Ceduna. Over the three years he was there, he certainly took part in many operations which were aimed to make our communities across the area safer. His staff and their hard work were able to improve road safety in our region. The statistics now show that we have actually had a significant reduction in fatal crashes across the area, as well as a steady decline in victim reported crime.

I know Superintendent Denny spent a great deal of time and effort in taking drugs off our streets. With a crackdown on drugs, they were able to shut down a number of clandestine drug laboratories, particularly those associated with the production of methamphetamines. There were also a significant amount of cannabis hauls made across the local service area. By taking the drugs off the street, of course, it makes our community a much safer place.

I say good luck to Scott and thanks for your hard work, but also thanks to all of our other wonderful police force who are operating in Whyalla. I know they have some difficulties in attracting people there but, once they get there, they love the area. We can be very proud of our police force.

I am also very proud of the schools in my electorate and the work that the state government is doing in there. I am particularly happy with the way that the Coober Pedy Area School has moved ahead after its difficulties of the last few years. I am hearing good reports from there all the time and from the community about how pleased they are now that the Coober Pedy school has gone ahead.

I know that there is a motion on the books about these schools in country areas and the importance of them. I can only emphasise that, in small communities, the schools are very often the heart of that community, so it is good to see what is happening with the Coober Pedy school.

Stuart High School in Whyalla is an amazing school. They have a very high percentage of Aboriginal students there. It is probably in one of the lowest socioeconomic areas of the city and they have all sorts of difficulties, but they forge ahead and they do an incredible job thanks to their staff, including Veronica Conley, who is the principal there, and the local deputy principal, Steve Walker.

One thing that they do at Stuart High School—and even though we live by the sea, we live in the desert—is have an aquaculture program operating, which started off with just some simple yabby farming that they got their students to do in a couple of tanks in a classroom. As the years went on, they put a lot of hard slog into it. They raised funds and they expanded the project and now they have got a purpose-built shed, which is able to sustain an industrial smoker. They have several freshwater tanks to farm kingfish and salmon and self-contained water irrigation, where they irrigate a small horticulture area they have got.

This whole exercise has been great for students, who have learnt a very real and practical work situation of cultivating and producing food products, and many have gone on and developed an interest in pursuing a career in the aquaculture industry, which is, of course, so important on Eyre Peninsula. There are other areas of aquaculture that the Stuart High School is looking at—for example, things like marine radio courses, boat licensing and underwater welding—which will certainly expand the students' aquaculture skills and make them very competitive for work in the aquaculture industry.

So, my congratulations to Stuart High School, and particularly to Steve Walker for the hard work he has put in, but to Veronica and all the rest of her staff because they have got many other amazing programs going on—Aboriginal programs and all sorts. They are a typical country school who get on with it and get things done and are a real success story. Incidentally, recently, Stuart High School sold over 120 kilograms of smoked fish at the Whyalla Snapper Competition.

**Mr Pengilly:** How much did you get?

**The Hon. L.R. BREUER:** I didn't get any. I wasn't there on the day and I missed out, but I have had their product before and it is wonderful. They incorporate all the processes from the raw product right through to the sales and marketing and the preparation of the fish, etc. They are able to cover all of the small business principles.

I was also very pleased to hear recently that South Australia has agreed to implement DisabilityCare Australia. We have supported this and this will give 33,000 South Australians with a disability the support they need for a lifetime. We have a number of people with disabilities in Whyalla, of course, as does any community.

People with disabilities, along with their families and carers, will be able to make decisions now about the support that they need to live dignified and fulfilling lives. It is a fundamental shift in the way that we will support people with disabilities and, certainly, there has been a substantial increase in funding.

The South Australian Labor government has already almost trebled funding for disability services from \$123 million in 2002 to \$345 million in 2012-13. Upon full implementation in 2018, South Australia's contribution will have risen to \$723 million, so it is an amazing investment and certainly very caring for people with disabilities in our state.

For families in Whyalla, this has been a long-awaited need. We certainly have our share of people with disabilities, and we also have a wonderful organisation there called the Phoenix Society Incorporated, which I am sure you have all heard of, and which has been a very important part of our city for a long time. I do have to declare a conflict of interest in this before I go on because I am a board member of the Phoenix Society in South Australia, and have been for a number of years, and I also have a very close family member working there. I became a member of the Phoenix board because I have had this close association with the organisation in Whyalla for many years, going back to the days when it was the Whyalla sheltered workshop.

Over the years I have regularly visited there, and in recent years I have had regular pizza lunchtimes with the workers. I also try to take any visiting politicians there when they are in town—and I love to see their reaction—and they make them very welcome. I do this because I am always impressed with the work done there by our local people, some of whom who have worked there for years, and I know one person who has been there for over 30 years. It is a great asset to our city, and a wonderful work environment for people with disabilities, the majority of whom have intellectual disabilities.

I know in Whyalla that we are one of the best performing branches in South Australia and we employ over 50 people. In Whyalla, the work includes outside maintenance on various businesses and properties; car detailing; and various projects on the floor including cleaning headphones for Qantas. Any headphones that come in on flights into Adelaide are taken to Whyalla and cleaned and prepared and put in sealed packages and sent away again. We have an amazing embroidery service which supplies many local and state businesses, clubs and organisations. In fact, Phoenix will look at any sort of work that is proposed and are always on the lookout for new contracts.

I am not normally in the practice of promoting companies but, in this instance, I am very passionate about Phoenix. I believe that the role they play in the lives of people with disabilities is essential in giving them employment opportunities, self-esteem and a social environment in which they can be comfortable and make friends, and of course any money that is made goes back into the business supporting this wonderful organisation. What Phoenix cannot do locally, their branches in Adelaide may be able to do: in Adelaide they do all sorts of things like making furniture, they have a call centre, they label wine bottles and process food—amongst their many other jobs—and their prices are very competitive.

There are many other state government organisations and departments in Whyalla and I will not have time to go into all of them today but the Public Service in regional South Australia is very important and they provide a presence there. Generally, local people are employed, so they are a big employer in our country regions and very important to us. I have to compliment Housing SA in Whyalla which does an amazing job. Prior to this, the Minister for Housing was sitting here, and I was hoping he would still be here. Irene Adair is the manager there, she is a local person, and she has been there for many years. She is caring, very empathic and very fair, and this is reflected in her staff who similarly do a very good job.

We used to have many houses which were vacant but now, like every area, we have a shortage of housing, and so there are all sorts of difficulties that have evolved from that, but they manage very well there, and we do not get too many complaints about Housing SA in Whyalla because we know that they are doing a good job and a very fair job. We have a TAFE campus and a university campus in Whyalla. There are so many other government departments that are based there and I appreciate the work that they do.

So, the sky is not falling in. We are doing okay in South Australia and regional South Australia. I am very proud to support this bill. The cancellation of the Olympic Dam project and the Arafura project—both vital to my communities and to my electorate—have nothing to do with this government's policy and I have to emphasise that. This government has gone out of its way to support these industries. They have done everything possible to keep them here, to keep them in South Australia and, certainly, I know in Whyalla and Roxby, etc., while people are hurting, it has not been the government's fault.

I do not know if the opposition has ever heard of the GFC. I do not know whether they realise that there are lowered oil prices all over the world. I do not know if they realise that there is a lack of finance coming in from overseas. That is why these projects were cancelled, not because of this state government. We will continue as a state government to encourage companies to come to South Australia, to encourage companies to come to my part of the state, and to keep those businesses out there that are reliant on the mining industry going.

It was a blow to lose the Olympic Dam project. It was certainly a big blow to lose the Arafura project. They were very good corporate citizens in the time they were in Whyalla, and they were there for about three years. They worked very well with our community and we really thought that one was going to happen, so it is a shame, it is a blow, but it is not the end of the world. We will get on, we will survive, we will manage and something else will happen. So I say to the opposition, be thankful that we live in this state, enjoy our assets that we have in this state, enjoy our lifestyle and stop your whingeing.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (18:05):** I am pleased to take my place here in the house to speak to the Supply Bill. I always think it is important that when members do speak to legislation they actually provide some facts. I want to provide some facts in relation to the state's finances and the current situation that we find ourselves in here in South Australia. Let us have a look at some facts in terms of what has taken place in the one year since the Hon. Jay Weatherill has become Premier of this state, in the one year that the current Premier has been in the role.

South Australia's AAA credit rating was put on a negative outlook, then downgraded to AA+, again with a negative outlook, and then downgraded again to AA, which is currently the worst credit rating in Australia. That is my number one point. The second point—and the member for Giles spoke about this—is that the much anticipated Olympic Dam expansion has been cancelled, not put on hold, but cancelled.

The government themselves, over the course of the last week or so, have admitted that they over-spruik and oversell these projects. There are 4,100 fewer jobs in South Australia. This Labor government has budgeted for the largest deficit in the state's history totalling \$1.2 billion. Labor budgeted for the largest debt in the state's history, peaking at \$14 billion. They have mothballed the desalination plant that they doubled in size. It is important to remind the house that it was the Liberal Party's policy to construct a desalination plant here in this state.

We strongly supported and campaigned for a 50 gegalitre plant, but what did we see? We saw the then prime minister Kevin Rudd fly in and say, 'Let's make good fellows of ourselves and double the desalination plant to 100 gegalitres.' That is twice the amount of capacity that we ever needed, and now what do we see? We see it mothballed. What an absolute waste of money, time and effort. It went from 50 gegalitres, which was the Liberal Party's proposal, to 100 gegalitres and now it has been mothballed.

For the second year running, the state failed to meet the national average within the NAPLAN scores in all 20 categories and South Australia has the worst property sales figures in 27 years. That paints a pretty gloomy picture of the state of South Australia's finances and situation and that is just in one year of this current Premier holding that role.

Let us have a look at some other facts and figures in relation to the fiscal position and the outlook here in South Australia. Let us have a look at the deficit situation. In the 2012-13 Mid-Year Budget Review, there are budget deficits on all three measures, the first being the net lending



deficit of \$939 million, the second being the cash deficit of \$1.4 billion and the third being the net operating deficit of \$1.2 billion for the 2012-13 year.

I have been in this place for nearly 12 years, and year after year we have been saying this, trying to tell the government that they are on the wrong track. The Auditor-General has warned the government repeatedly that it cannot rely on revenues to continue coming in over-budget to rescue its high spending habits. As I have said before in this place when I get the opportunity to speak to legislation such as this, when the budget is brought down and we get the opportunity to speak to the budget bill, this government and Labor governments ever since I can remember, since the 1970s when Gough Whitlam was the prime minister, Labor governments federally and at the state level are high taxing, high spending governments. I will broaden my comments in relation to those matters in a few moments.

Let us also have a look at the fiscal position and outlook and the historic deficit situation. We have had six deficits in seven years. In 2008-09 we had a deficit of \$233 million, and in one of those seven years a surplus was forecast. That was in 2009-10 and, guess what, Mr Acting Speaker? What year was the 2009-10 year? That was an election year. We had a forecast in that year of a surplus of \$187 million, but immediately following the 2010-11 year it plunged back into a deficit of \$53 million and then in 2011-12 to \$258 million. Then we hit the big time in 2012-13 with \$1.169 billion (rounded up it is \$1.2 billion), and in 2012-14 it is \$868 million.

Again, that paints a pretty gloomy picture of how things have travelled over the past seven years. As I said, the only year that a surplus was predicted was in the election year. Call me a cynic, but that is the reality of the situation; they are the facts of the matter. Let us also have a look at the demise of our credit rating. The AAA credit rating has gone to AA+ and then AA. The then treasurer Snelling made the following commitment, and I quote from *Hansard* dated 28 September 2011: 'We are committed to making sure we retain the AAA credit rating.'

However, despite repeated warnings from rating agencies about unsustainable spending and high debt levels, we have seen the state lose its AAA credit rating and it downgraded it to AA. The loss of the credit rating in Queensland cost it an extra \$200 million; that is a significant amount of money. The loss of the Queensland AAA rating cost it \$200 million a year, and some financial commentators estimated that our downgraded AAA credit rating to AA+ could cost South Australia over \$20 million a year. As I have stated, we have seen the credit rating downgraded even further to a AA position since then.

The former treasurer, the Hon. Kevin Foley, who has departed the parliament, said in 2010 that the loss of the AAA rating would 'send our state spiralling down into an abyss of debt'. And what have we seen? Those words have come true. We have spiralled into an abyss of debt, where we have plunged to a forecast debt position of \$14 billion, and that equates to the state paying the equivalent of \$2.2 million a day in interest payments on that debt. This afternoon, we heard the shadow treasurer (the member for Davenport) equate that to how much interest we are paying per hour every day, each and every day, for the ensuing period of time.

We have talked about deficits and we have talked about debt. Let's have a look at the other side of the ledger in terms of revenue. In the period this government has been in power, from 2002 to 2012 (a 10-year period), we have seen a massive \$5.2 billion in excess of what the government has budgeted for. What we on this side of the house have said continuously is that this government has not had a revenue problem; what it has had is a problem with managing its costs. It has had a real issue in managing its expenditure.

Over the forward estimates, in relation to taxation, in the Mid-Year Budget Review, the government will collect over \$17.7 billion in taxes. Under Labor, this state has the unworthy reputation of being the highest taxed state in the nation. That is a shameful legacy of this Labor government. I see the minister across the way pulling faces and so on. He can do what he likes, but the fact of the matter is that this is the highest taxed state in the nation, and that is a disgrace, given the revenue streams we have and shows the lack of will this government has shown in terms of managing its expenditure.

We can list the taxes—payroll tax, conveyancing duty, land tax, other property taxes, taxes on gambling, taxes on insurance, motor vehicle taxes and other miscellaneous taxes—that have all increased significantly. There has been a percentage change in general government taxation of 85 per cent and a percentage change against CPI of 36 per cent. So, the government has not had a problem with revenue: it has had a problem with its expenses. As I have stated before, the Auditor-General has warned the government over the years about controlling expenses.

Standard & Poors told the media on 27 September, 'We are just not seeing evidence of cost constraints from the state government.'

As I have said, there has been a pattern of high taxing and high spending with Labor governments right around the state. There is a pattern of tax, borrow; tax, borrow; and tax some more. The most recent example of that is we saw the Prime Minister come out today and announce that a 0.5 per cent levy will be imposed to partly fund the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS). So, we have seen that most recent example at the federal level.

The most recent example in the state has been the announcement of the toxic car park tax—\$750 per car park per year in the CBD. If that is not a brake on the economy, particularly when we are trying to revitalise the city, I do not know what it is. We have seen the Liberal Party respond by stating that that tax will be abolished under a Steven Marshall-led Liberal government, and with strong support from the business community here in the city and from a whole lot of—

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Kavel, would you please not refer to members by their Christian name or their surname as it tends to make feelings rise and cause disorder. It is against the standing orders of the house and its long usage. The person to whom you refer is the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** Thank you for that direction, Mr Speaker. We have seen that the Liberal Opposition has come out with a policy initiative stating that that toxic car park tax will be abolished when the Liberal Party forms government. As I said, the state has not had an income problem: it has had a cost control problem. Really, state Labor has certainly not controlled its expenditures and not had the will to manage its costs properly. I think I have spoken enough on that matter.

In the last few minutes (and I want to continue this in the opportunity I get after this particular debate) I want to turn my focus and remarks to the issues as a consequence of the government being re-elected in March 2010—supported by Greens preferences, I might add. It is another indisputable fact that this Labor government was re-elected in March 2010 supported by Greens preferences. I know they do not like hearing that, but it is the fact of the matter, and I will continue to keep stating that. In every key marginal seat, the Greens supported the ALP before they supported the Liberal Party, and that is a fact.

I want to make some comments in relation to the consequences of the government's being re-elected and the decision it made a number of months after that, in December 2010, to rezone that vast tract of land in Mount Barker—1,310 hectares—for residential development. I have been in this place continually calling on the government to provide infrastructure and services up to and since that decision, particularly since that decision because we know that that land has all been rezoned and that there is real demand for infrastructure and services.

The government has announced a second park-and-ride facility to be constructed in Mount Barker. The first the community knew about this proposal was when it hit the front page of the local newspaper a fortnight ago. The first the local community knew about this project was when it hit the front page of the local Mount Barker *Courier*. While I have been calling for improvement in infrastructure and services, what about the community consultation process? To me, this shows that the government has learnt nothing from previous mistakes in terms of consulting with the local community, particularly in relation to the proposed site of this park-and-ride facility.

I am also aware that a DPTI officer met with some local residents to hear their concerns and I am certainly aware of the issues that were raised at that meeting and I, as the local member, will be taking up those issues with the government and the council. I know the council does not necessarily have a lot of influence in these matters because it is a DPTI project on state government land. However, I am going to take up and discuss the issues with the council. So, really, you could call it another announce-and-defend proposition.

Has the government really learnt anything from its past mistakes? It did not listen to the community concerns when it pushed ahead and ignored any and every community concern in relation to rezoning the land, and, in relation to the first decent piece of infrastructure we have had proposed since that decision, the community has not been brought with it and has not been taken along the process. So, it is pretty clear that the government has not learnt anything.

We also have the issue with a private company looking to build a wastewater treatment plant, 20 kilometres east of the Hills, only a couple of kilometres away from the township of Callington to treat wastewater coming from this newly rezoned area in Mount Barker. Personally I

think that is a ludicrous proposal and, to its credit, the Mount Barker council has come up with an alternative scheme. All in all, I know what the member for Giles has said that we have a lot to be thankful for, but we have a lot of areas to improve on as well.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (18:25):** I rise to speak in support of the Supply Bill in a somewhat quirky necessity of this parliament to make sure that the machinery of government continues to operate. In my contribution I intend to cover a few areas. I have read and listened to the contributions to date of the opposition, and really it seems to me to be the same old, same old. They talk down our state. They are very negative. They cannot see a future for our state and not only can they not see a future but they refuse to articulate what it might be if they were in government and how they would contribute to that future.

The member for Giles made a very good contribution and I endorse her comments that we are lucky enough to live in the best state in the best country in the world. What differentiates this government from the opposition is that we do have a vision and strategies, and we are working through those strategies to ensure that that vision is fulfilled, not simply where we need to be in the next year or so but a vision that takes us 10, 20, 50 years into our future.

Of course, sir, you are aware as is this house of the seven priorities. I will not go through each and every one of those state priorities but it will be these pillars that will hold up our social, economic wellbeing and the wellbeing of all South Australians. They will form the foundation on which we will build this state's positive and productive future.

Let me now focus for a few minutes on a couple of those priorities. Advanced manufacturing is one, as well as premium food and wine from our clean green environment and sharing the benefits of the mining boom. Of course, there is a direct link between the food and wine initiative, advanced manufacturing and the benefits of the mining boom. That link is the establishment of creative industries, the diversification of our economy, the establishment of smart businesses that are to underpin this state and our advanced manufacturing sector.

We have already seen evidence of this occurring through those outstanding companies like SAGE Automation, Redarc and Osmoflo to name a few, and many others that exist in the wine and food sector and the water industry. Contrary to the views expressed opposite, South Australia has a positive, productive and inclusive future—a future that this government believes in and that we are committed to working towards with the South Australian community.

I want to turn now to some of the critical infrastructure projects that underpin this future that we believe in and that South Australians believe in. We see just down the road the construction of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and alongside it the research centre. We are continuing to see in this state the work being undertaken at the Lyell McEwin, the QEH, the Repatriation Hospital, at Flinders and, as was mentioned by the member for Giles, our four regional hospitals. We have seen the ongoing electrification of our railways, including the Seaford rail extension and light rail, which will continue to grow. You need to take that first step forward and that started with the extension to our trams.

You can see the work being undertaken to rectify the former Liberal government's one-way Southern Expressway by turning it into a two-way expressway. We have seen the advantages that have arisen from the construction of the Port Adelaide Expressway, the Northern Expressway. In fact, you could leave here in peak hour traffic and get to Truro in an hour, the gateway to the Riverland. These are outstanding projects. We are seeing the work being undertaken on South Road. We are seeing the work that is being undertaken on the Riverbank project. That will indeed be part of the mechanism that will be the transformation of the city with respect to the vibrant city priority.

We have seen the construction of the desalination plant and the north-south interconnector that guarantees not just our future water security but also the security of our future economic well being. We have heard a lot from the opposition about their initiative of the desalination plant and, of course, how they would have built a 50 gegalitre plant, just as they would have built—and did build—a one-way southern expressway. However, I recall the comments of my friend the member for Schubert who at the time advocated for a massive desalination plant to be built. In fact, the bigger the better I think were his words.

When asked, 'How will you then transfer the water throughout the system and what if it is not big enough?', I think one of the former leaders of the opposition (the now member for Heysen) said, 'We'll just build another one up north.' These throwaway lines show that whilst it might have in their view been their initiative they really had not, like on many things, thought the process or the

project through. There are many other projects that I could mention, but those I have mentioned will be transformational to this state.

We have also seen during the last few years significant social welfare programs, with additional funding injected into disability services, accommodation support and resources for our most vulnerable within our society and, of course, our younger children. We have seen additional funding to our emergency services and to our police and the significant growth in those particular sectors. That link to our healthy and safe environments is again one of our priorities.

In the area of higher and further education—and I acknowledge the presence of the minister for further and higher education—we have seen the number of international students advance over the last decade from 11,000 in 2002 to 28,000 in 2012. Whilst that figure has stabilised, as you would expect in the context of a more fragile global economy than we have had for some time, it is still a significant contributor to this state, contributing in excess of \$850 million in export earnings on an annual basis.

It is an area that will continue to grow; I have no doubt about that. Why? Because of the fantastic learning institutions that we have in this state: our three outstanding universities and our very significant and vibrant VET sector, and the fact that this state and this city is a safe, friendly and welcoming place for international students to study. When they return home, or indeed if they choose to stay, they become great ambassadors for the state of South Australia.

I briefly want to turn to the environment. This is another area that distinguishes us from the opposition. We care for our environment. I do not believe that they do. Their record when in government shows exactly that. During their term—

**Mr Gardner:** What did you do for the purple spotted gudgeon?

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** We saved it. During their term not one extra square metre was added to the wilderness protection areas, the highest level of protection with which you would be very familiar, sir. I forget the figures and I do not want to come in and have to correct them, but it is like this. When Labor lost government in 1993, I think 70,000 hectares had been classified under wilderness protection. It was still 70,000 hectares when we returned to government in 2002 and it now stands—or will soon—at close to 2 million hectares.

There have been additions to national parks. We have seen the preservation and protection of Arkaroola. We have seen the establishment of marine parks despite the doom and gloom and the hysteria and the scaremongering of the opposition: that we would see the world as we know it collapse. It has not. The marine parks are a fitting legacy for our state's future.

We have also seen the Murray-Darling Basin plan, again, that very important plan that was based on both environmental and economic initiatives. Again, the attitude of the opposition when contrasted to what this government has achieved with respect to the Murray-Darling Basin plan is quite stark. What did they do and what did they want to do? They wanted to settle for a Mazda. They wanted to cave in at 2,750 gigalitres even though they knew it was not enough water to return the system to sustainable health.

They were willing, ready but thankfully not able to haul up the white flag that they surely would have done. South Australia, as a state, has been instrumental in delivering one of this nation's most significant and important reforms—the Murray Darling Basin Plan. It was never about the environment versus irrigation because those two matters and the health of the environment and irrigation are inextricably linked.

Another area demonised by the opposition is the natural resource management reforms that are critically linked to the premium wine and food priority. The success of this priority will only be as good as the health of the environment in which this primary production takes place. It is reform about whole of landscape management, realising that the landscape is linked and any consumptive use, as I mentioned, is dependent on the health of the environment in which this activity occurs.

This leads me to my next point, which is the vital importance of primary production to this state's economy. Not just our regional economy, but our state economy. Speaker after speaker has advanced that this government is city-centric and this is an absolute nonsense. If any government has neglected our regional and country area it has been, and was, the opposition when in government between 1993 and 2002. Why did it neglect its core constituency? Because it takes its regional and rural constituency for granted, and that is why we saw Independents in the Riverland, in the South-East and in the Mallee.

I loved my job as agriculture minister. It was a terrific job, but those people who I spoke to in the regions knew and understood the commitment of this government to regional and rural South Australia. During my travels throughout regional South Australia they spoke of the two greatest agriculture ministers that they believe have existed—John Kerin as the federal minister and Frank Blevins as the state agriculture minister, and that was mentioned ad nauseam whilst I was out in regional South Australia.

Alas, they never said that about me, but I am happy to have followed in the footsteps of those two great agriculture ministers. Why is it that they believe a Labor agriculture minister is far in advance of that that was ever proffered up or thrown up by the opposition when it was in government? Because Labor agriculture ministers can be relied upon to do the right thing and not pander to the louder political voices to which a Liberal government would, of course, succumb. So, we, as Labor agriculture ministers, can do the right thing, not the political thing that often Liberal agriculture ministers have no choice but to succumb to.

A lot of the opposition have spoken about the debt and the revenue, and I want to conclude on just these few points. All that I have spoken about has been undertaken at a time of global economic fragility, at a time of reduced revenue. All that I have spoken about—the infrastructure build, economic, social and environmental reforms—has put this state in a very good position. Our outlook is positive. Our debt levels are manageable. Revenues, whilst I have not got a crystal ball, are sure to rebound.

We have a plan for this state. We have strategies to deliver this plan. We live in the best state, in the best country, in the world. We will prosper as a state. Our community will grow in strength. Compare this, if you like, to the negativity that has been expressed by every opposition speaker. They have no plan. They have no strategies. They are bereft of ideas and policies. They do not believe in South Australia and its people. They do not believe in themselves.

I have listened to the three former leaders of the opposition speak almost in succession—the member for Davenport, the member for Heysen and the member for Norwood. It is a pity that the member for Waite is overseas because we would have had the quadrella of former leaders. Not one has been positive in their message for or about this state. At best it is sad and at worst it is pathetic.

We have our challenges and I do not deny that, but in no way are they insurmountable. If we compare Australia and South Australia to the rest of the world, we are in a pretty good state. Again, what would the opposition have us do? If we have a look at the skyline around here, admittedly a lot of the projects that are being undertaken are government projects. In fact, this town has been called by some people a company town at this point in time, and I am glad that it is. Not only are these projects able to stimulate the economy but they are transformational in their very nature.

What would the opposition have us do? Put money away for a rainy day when it is pouring. This is the exact right time to undertake this build. What would the opposition want us to do? Again, put that money away for a rainy day when it is pouring so that we would in turn have many thousands of people unemployed. We would be in a similar situation to Europe where some of these countries are sitting at 19 or 20 per cent unemployment levels. I understand today it was announced that there is a 12.5 per cent unemployment level across the European zone. Is that what the Liberal Party would want us to do and the position it would like us to be in? What do we get from the opposition? We get absolutely nothing. I listened to the member for Kavel and he talked about—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** There was your mistake.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I often think, 'How can we win the next election when the member for Kavel is so ruthless in the way he manages his approach to this parliament?' The member for Kavel stated that they have come up with a policy, and that policy is to oppose the car park tax. It is a position that I actually support. I think the car park tax is a good policy, but that is the only policy that it appears the Liberal opposition has: to oppose things.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** Don't worry, the Property Council might think of another one.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** They can think of other things themselves to oppose, I am sure, but the point is that the policy is to oppose things. I did not necessarily want to speak today but I was certainly compelled to, given the level of negativity that has been expressed by the opposition and the level of nonsense that was spoken. I and this side of the house believe that we have a positive

future—well, we know that we have a positive future and we know that, working with the South Australian people, we will achieve this positive future.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (18:42):** I am delighted that I am following the member for Colton, because there are a few matters that he has put on the record that I will be able to straighten up. It fascinates me that members of the government are using as an excuse for this government's incompetence the fact that we enjoy better circumstances in this country than people do in other countries. They are saying that, because other people are worse off, we should be thankful for their incompetence. It does not make sense to me.

What I think the opposition is saying is, 'Just imagine how much better we could be if we got even a handful of things right,' because this government has not got many things right. The member for Colton mentioned a number of things that this government has done, and I will go through some of them and put the record straight, because a heck of a lot of them they have not got right; they have made an absolute stuff-up of them.

The member for Giles had a similar theme: why are we complaining when we are so well off? We are so well off, but again I make the point that we should be a lot better off. What the government ignores is that the reason that places like Greece, Spain and a number of other European countries currently have problems with unemployment and have all sorts of financial problems and thus, flowing from that, social problems, is that they have been at it a bit longer than we have been here. They have gone further down the road that this government is travelling; that is the road of deficit on top of deficit on top of deficit, creating unmanageable debt. I remember treasurers of this government saying there was no way they would allow our debt to get over 50 per cent of the revenue.

**Mr Gardner:** It was not that long ago.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** It was not that long ago; it was probably only 18 months ago. But today, we have forgotten about that; the government has forgotten about that.

**The SPEAKER:** Would the member for MacKillop be seated. The member for Elder.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Can I ask the member for Morialta to stop interjecting so I can listen to the speaker?

**Mr Gardner:** I think that is frivolous and obstructing the house, sir.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Are you ruling?

**The SPEAKER:** I am about to rule when the member for Morialta is paying attention. The member for Morialta was called to order earlier today and he was warned a first time. If I hear him interjecting again, I shall warn him a second time. The member for MacKillop.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The member for Morialta certainly was not putting me off and I seem to think that the—

**The SPEAKER:** That is not the principal consideration.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** That may not be, sir, but the member for Elder's point of order just cost me a minute or a minute and a half of my allotted time and I think his point of order was frivolous and vexatious and deliberate, notwithstanding.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for MacKillop, would you be seated. That is a matter I will adjudicate. Member for MacKillop.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I thought you were going to adjudicate on the matter, sir. I will continue. I was saying that the Labor Party fails to understand that those countries they are saying are so much worse off or are in such a bad state that we should be thankful, got to that state because they have been doing for a little longer what Labor governments in this nation are doing today—building deficit on deficit and creating unmanageable debt. That is the problem.

We have a government which does not understand the difference between inputs and outputs. Every time there is a debate about some public policy, we have ministers of this government stand up and say, 'We are spending record amounts on this particular problem or issue.' They never acknowledge that they are wasting money, because that is what they are doing. If they were spending record amounts, one would expect that they might resolve the problem, but they have not.

Because I was put off by the member for Elder, I did lose track of what I wanted to say about the member for Colton's comments regarding agricultural ministers. Can I put the record straight with regard to federal minister for agriculture, John Kerin. It is a piece of Australian historical fact that he actually presided over the demise of the greatest industry that this nation has ever had—the wool industry. He was the minister who presided over the destruction of the Australian wool industry, the greatest industry—the industry that built this nation.

I think if any farmer in this nation said that he was the best agriculture minister at the federal level this country has had, that farmer is either very young or has failed to read anything about agricultural history in this nation. He single-handedly brought the wool industry to its knees. Not only did he bring the wool industry to its knees, he destroyed it. Twenty-odd years later—almost 25 years later—the wool industry is still struggling and it will never recover from the things that he did to it. So, I am pleased that I am following the member for Colton and I am able to make that comment, so that it is now on the public record.

With regard to the member for Colton, I am sure some of his colleagues talked about infrastructure build, etc., the money that they are spending and the cranes on the skyline. He did acknowledge that most of the cranes on the skyline—I would suggest all of the cranes on the skyline in Adelaide—are as a result of public infrastructure. There is very little private construction happening out there. It is public infrastructure. But he didn't acknowledge two important facts. One is that a fair bit of that is being funded by the commonwealth government.

He talked about travelling out to Truro in an hour. Most of that work was funded by the commonwealth government: the Northern Expressway and even all the Port River Expressway and the bridges, etc. Most of that was funded by the commonwealth government. He talked about the electrification of the railway lines and the Seaford extension; there is fair swag of commonwealth money in there. He talked about the medical research building down here on the Torrens—more commonwealth money.

If you look at the numbers, the amount of money that is being spent on infrastructure in South Australia today by taxpayers, particularly that spent by South Australian taxpayers by the South Australian government, you will find that it is much less than the total amount of indebtedness that has been racked up by this government.

This government, as minister O'Brien famously said in Mount Gambier some years ago, is borrowing to pay its day-to-day running costs. This government has been borrowing to pay its day-to-day running costs. It is an absolute myth that the indebtedness that has been racked up in the last few years by this government is all about infrastructure. That is an absolute myth. The numbers just do not add up.

The member for Colton also talked about the desal plant and he seemed to be quite proud of that. He was the minister responsible for part of that project. That is one of those absolute messes that this government has made—a stupid, dumb decision to spend another lazy billion dollars to create something which I doubt whether we will ever use. He said that the opposition did not have a plan; it did not have a strategy.

I will tell you what we did have. We did decide a long time ago that a modest desal plant would give us a guarantee against actually running out of essential water supplies. It was not 50 gigs. The proposition put forward by the then leader, the member for Davenport, was 45 gigs, because it was based on the plant that we visited in Kwinana in Western Australia, which was a 45-gig plant.

**The Hon. P. Caica:** That was the logical way to do it, wasn't it?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Yes, it was. You do not have in opposition all the benefits of being in government. You do not have access to the Public Service, but we did have access to the people in Western Australia and we actually got some numbers. We knew what it would cost to build. We talked to the people who were building that desal plant over there and we said, 'If we built the same in South Australia, what would it cost?'

I can tell you, from the answers we got, it would have cost a hell of a lot less than what this government spent here in South Australia—a hell of a lot less than even if they had stuck to the original plan of building a 50-gig desal plant. That has been one of the biggest and most foolish mistakes that this government has made. I say one of them, because there are a number of them. That is one of the reasons why we have now this huge debt. It is one of the reasons why South Australians are paying huge prices for water.

It is a massively stupid mistake that the government made. It does not matter how much they try to spruik it up. Even though they are so good at over-spruiking things, they will never convince the people of South Australia that it was a good and clever decision, because it simply was not. Just to touch on some of the other problems: what a debacle the Royal Adelaide Hospital has been, and what a legacy it will leave to the people of South Australia. It has not even come onto the books yet and it is something which this state is going to struggle with for many years.

Of course, there is Adelaide Oval, another fantastic decision by this government. Remember, it was going to be not a penny more than \$450 million; then there was another lazy \$85 million, and that was going to include a footbridge. I think in those days the footbridge was going to be about \$20 million; now it is \$40 million—\$40 million to build a footbridge across this puddle out here! It is unbelievable. This government has no idea about how to manage the state's finances. What it fails to understand—

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for Elder to order. The member for MacKillop will be heard in silence—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Thank you, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** —unless the remark is genuinely funny.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The government also fails to understand the importance of small business. It talks about advanced manufacturing over and over and over, but to be quite frank I do not think it understands what advanced manufacturing is. I am absolutely certain that it does not understand what small business is, and I am absolutely certain it does not understand the importance of small business to this state. We cannot continue to spend money that we do not have and continue to increase taxes on the productive sector of the economy. That is what this government has been doing.

The case that has come up most recently is the car park tax. I know a lot of people have talked about the car park tax, but today the Premier went to where the Labor Party often goes, that is, to the class war. When he was being criticised and facing a bit of pressure over the car park tax, he went to the class war and said, 'Oh, the Liberal Party has sided and teamed up with the big end of town.' That was where he was going. Well, the Liberal Party actually agrees with some of the things the Premier has been saying about revitalising the city, rebuilding some vibrancy in the city, but you cannot do that by imposing another \$26 million a year tax on the very people who are going to come in and make it vibrant. What part of that does the government not get? How can it be so stupid?

In question time today the Premier also said that he suspected some of the instances of this tax are likely to fall on property owners. Well, how about that! They are property owners so we will bang them with another tax—the very people this government has already hit with ever-increasing land taxes. These are the same people. Land tax is up 311 per cent under this government—and that was at the time of the last budget—or 203 per cent after taking into account CPI, compared with the across the board tax increase of 85 per cent, which in itself is the reason that business in South Australia struggles.

The member for Colton also said that the opposition does not really care about South Australia and that we keep talking it down. One of the things that drives me is this. I have four children. One of the other members (I think it was the member for Giles) said, 'Well, if you don't like it, then get out, go somewhere else.' I have four children, and two of them are farmers. It is damned hard to get out if you are a farmer because you cannot pick up your farm and put in the trailer and take it with you. My two sons are both farmers and they are proud South Australians.

I also have two daughters, of whom I am extremely proud. They did their schooling here in South Australia and got their tertiary education here in South Australia. They are both very highly paid professional people today, but neither of them have worked one day in paid employment here in South Australia, not one day. A member of this government will say that I am not a proud South Australian, but it hurts me greatly that my children, whom I educated in this state that I love, cannot work here in this state because we have had too much of Labor governments that keep undermining the ability of business to prosper and employ people. That is the problem that we have here in South Australia. I am not talking down South Australia, the people of South Australia or the natural attributes of South Australia, but I will use every breath in my body to point out the failings of this incompetent government, and that is what it is.



As I am winding up, and I see the time is running away from me, let me just talk about something which has been dear to me for a long time; that is, the mining sector. Today I asked a supplementary question of the Premier, which the minister for mines got up to answer, about the Fraser Institute ranking of South Australia as a jurisdiction to attract mining investment.

The Fraser Institute is based in Canada. It surveys a little over 4,000 people in the mining industry with a range of questions to get their feedback and then they rank jurisdictions, under a number of headings, as to being a favourable place to invest. This government, many times when the ranking was high, was spruiking this and saying how wonderful it was. In the last couple of years, the ranking has nosedived somewhat.

There are 96 jurisdictions in the latest ranking. South Australia was about seven a few years ago and it now has dropped to around about 20, I think. When you look at the individual rankings, when we talk about environmental regulatory uncertainty, we come 30<sup>th</sup> out of 96. When you talk about uncertainty concerning disputed land claims, we come 43<sup>rd</sup> out of 96. When we left government, we had introduced the ILUA scheme, which was working very well. I suspect it has stalled somewhat.

For infrastructure to assist the sector, we rank 34 out of 96, and we had people here in the government saying what a wonderful place we are. These are rankings against countries in places like Africa, West Africa, Southern Africa, South America, and we rank 34 out of 96. For labour regulations and employment agreements, we rank 55 out of 96—that does not necessarily surprise.

The one that does not surprise me but shows where we are going as a state is tax regime. We rank 62 out of 96. We are the 62<sup>nd</sup> down the list where the tax regime is an impediment to investment in the mining sector in South Australia. This government for many years has been claiming that the mining sector will be the saviour. Our rankings, under the Fraser Institute system of ranking, have been going downhill.

I shuddered when the member for Colton said that agriculture is so important to South Australia and this government might try to do something to help it. If it has the same success as it has with manufacturing and mining in South Australia in recent years, I shudder to think of the outcome that we will have in agriculture because, when this government tries to help, it actually makes things worse.

**The SPEAKER:** Has the time on I have granted the member for MacKillop adequately compensated him for interjections?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** That was most generous of you, Mr Speaker. Although there are plenty more things that I would love to put on the record, I will conclude my remarks there, thank you.

**Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (19:03):** I am pleased to rise today to speak about the government's infrastructure program and the interactive public information campaign about it, called the Big Build. I am proud to be part of a government and a team which works to actually build infrastructure to equip our city and our state not just for today but also for the future.

Infrastructure is not a glamorous spend. New roads, bridges, rail infrastructure, crucial investment in health and medical research and investments in our city centres for sport and entertainment precincts are all major projects with long lead times. The proof, as they say, will be in the pudding. The long-term benefits will only be fully appreciated once those projects are completed and being utilised by all South Australians.

However, there are benefits in the short term for our state as these projects roll out as well. Building infrastructure drives economic activity, fosters private investment and, crucially, creates jobs. It is often said that the so-called 'crane index' is the best measure of the health of a local economy. It is pleasing to see so many cranes across our city skyline. I believe there are around 17 at the moment.

Our skies have been this way for some time, as we look forward to a brand new, state-of-the-art Royal Adelaide Hospital and a reimagined Adelaide Oval and river precinct, among other things. In fact, our state Labor government is delivering a historic level of infrastructure investment: a \$9.3 billion capital program which underpins an average of more than 7,500 jobs annually. The projects in which we are investing include:

- \$535 million Adelaide Oval redevelopment, which creates 1,200 jobs
- \$350 million Adelaide Convention Centre upgrade, creating 300 jobs

- \$200 million SA Health and Medical Research Centre, creating 320 jobs
- \$1.85 billion Royal Adelaide Hospital, creating 3,000 jobs
- \$40 million Adelaide Oval footbridge, creating 170 jobs
- \$50 million Adelaide Railway Station and yard, creating 170 jobs
- \$842 million South Road Superway, creating 2,100 jobs
- \$407.5 million Southern Expressway duplication, creating 1,040 jobs
- \$291.2 million Seaford Rail extension, creating 610 jobs
- \$110 million Goodwood junction, creating 250 jobs
- \$100 million Adelaide-to-Melbourne road corridor, creating 150 jobs

In total, this adds up to 9,310 direct jobs created as a result of this infrastructure. That is without taking into account the flow-on jobs created as a result of these projects. As I said earlier, this is investment which provides for an average of more than 7,500 jobs on an annual basis.

The message from these figures is obvious: this government is pro development and pro jobs. We believe in building up our economy, not tearing it down as those opposite are so sadly adept at trying to do. Many of the jobs created by the government's Big Build are highly-skilled engineering and construction roles. These will enable South Australians to gain experience and capacity to be able to bid for and deliver future major projects both here and interstate.

The Weatherill government's show of faith in our future through this massive investment in infrastructure will potentially bring billions of dollars of private investment into our CBD. The government's reform in planning law and its construction grants have also played their part in this.

Making it easier to develop a clear picture of this massive and vital injection of our life is the Big Build. The Big Build is an online campaign designed to provide a graphic representation of the major projects underway across the Adelaide metropolitan area. These projects traverse health, entertainment, transport and other sectors.

By visiting [www.thebigbuild.sa.gov.au](http://www.thebigbuild.sa.gov.au), we can see where and how money is being invested in our state's future. The Big Build's aim is to explain how each project is part of the broader goal to create a vibrant city boasting world-class facilities. It is a 21<sup>st</sup> century model by which website visitors can take an online tour of what is happening and what is planned. Links and videos further flesh out the story of our city coming of age with all the associated colour and vibrancy.

Adelaide may not be the biggest city in the world but it is certainly one of the most liveable. This government wants Adelaide to remain one of the great places in which to grow up and grow old, in which to learn, in which to earn, and in which to do business. But we also want it to improve, to grow, to be more in tune with the great cities of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and to continue to lead the world in the things we excel in.

Just sitting on our hands will not allow us to innovate or create. We need to continue to build on what we already love about Adelaide, as well as building on the new, fresh elements of its character. So, I ask a question that has been asked in this place before. Why do we invest in infrastructure, and why do we implement policy reforms to foster development? The answer is simple: because we want to see the state economy grow. To ensure that that happens, we need a government that will continue to invest in developing this state; and a government that believes in South Australia's potential and is prepared to lead the way in attracting private investment rather than relying on it just coming our way.

Unfortunately those opposite have, for many years it seems, been averse to investing in infrastructure. Instead they would let our assets age and deteriorate beyond their useful lives, with little thought to planning and building for the future. Of course, they did build a one-way freeway through my electorate and those of several other members here. That is the legacy of the Liberal government. The contrast could not be clearer.

The legacy of this government will be: 17 cranes on our skyline; a new hospital; a proper expressway to serve the southern suburbs in both directions, all day every day; an exciting new sporting and entertainment precinct in the heart of our beautiful, vibrant city; a modern and efficient rail network and, most importantly, South Australians in employment. The Weatherill government's Big Build is vital for our state's future economic growth. I am very proud to be part of a team that

will be remembered in history for delivering these massive projects for the benefit of all South Australians.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Schubert.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert) (19:13):** Thank you Mr Speaker. I am, indeed, honoured, that you are here tonight to hear me make my last, historic, speech to Supply, after 22 years. As we do every year around this time, we need to ensure finance of government operations until the budget is handed down, and it gives us a good opportunity to look at the state of South Australia's finances.

State debt is increasing to \$14 billion and the budget deficit for 2012-13 is budgeted to reach \$1.2 billion. Labor has now budgeted six deficits in seven years. Just hearing this previous speech, sir—some members of this house are living on a different planet to me. He listed off all these wonderful projects and I just could not believe it. This member has only been here a short time—well, I am sorry, but he will probably pay the price for his own government's inaction and lack of performance, which is a bit sad because I think the gentleman is quite a nice man. Honestly, I have been around the place for quite a while and I think we are deluding ourselves if we think that things are good.

In just one year under the leadership of Premier Weatherill we have lost our AAA credit rating—and the honourable member did not mention that—and have been downgraded to AA, the worst in Australia. The Olympic Dam expansion has been cancelled, there are more than 4,000 less jobs, and we hear of more and more staff being laid off every week. This does not bode well for confidence in our state.

Many of the decisions the government made have gone bad. We have a desalination plant that has been mothballed, a plant that this government would not support at all and then, of course, went the full turn and built one twice as big as was needed. Even keeping it on standby now, because it is such a large plant, is a very expensive operation.

I shudder to think what the state economy is going to look like once the Royal Adelaide Hospital is built on the rail yards. It will cost taxpayers \$1.1 million a day for 30 years, not including the cost of doctors and nurses, and will add \$2.8 billion to the state debt—\$2.8 billion with a 'b'.

Under Labor, South Australia has become the highest-taxing state in the nation which has impacted upon all South Australians—individuals and businesses—through increases in the cost of living. That affects all of us—even me. You make adjustments to your business arrangements just to try to avoid some of these huge imposts. Cost of living pressure is one of the biggest issues facing South Australians.

My office—and I am certain many other members' offices—receive calls every day from constituents who are struggling with increases in the cost of living: car registrations, licences, other government fees and utility charges which continue to increase, placing pressure on household budgets. Many South Australians have never felt financial strain before, and now they are.

Under this Labor government South Australia has the highest taxes in Australia. What sort of an accolade is that? I see the previous treasurer is here and I know that he made a comment that he did not want to leave a debt for his children. He has a lovely family—it might be the largest in this place—and I do not know what he thinks now about what he is going to leave for his children. It is the same for me, and the same for all of us.

I have been here for 22 years and it is a shame that I have to say when I leave that the economy is going to be much worse than when I came here. It is not a great accolade. I am afraid that I have a sense of failure about that because I think in the end we all have to take a bit of a rap for what we do and what happens in this state, as members of parliament, and controlling what we do in South Australia.

As I say to the then treasurer (and now Minister for Health and Ageing), who has five children, I do not know what sort of a state you are going to leave for those lovely young children. I remember reading a message I think your wife left about the buses, that your children could not catch the bus on time. We are all human, and we all have to make decisions that affect not just our children but everybody's children, the citizens of tomorrow.

As I said, this Labor government in South Australia has the highest taxes in Australia, the highest electricity prices in the world, the highest water prices of all capital cities, the highest ever state budget deficit and the highest ever state debt outlook. I do not know how you can make a

rosy picture out of that. I was accused earlier this afternoon of having rose-coloured glasses but I do not think anybody could make anything out of that.

Since Labor came to power in March 2002 to December 2012, water bills have increased by 249 per cent, electricity bills have increased by 144 per cent and gas bills have increased by 110 per cent, while inflation was only 36 per cent over the same period. You do not have to be an economic scientist to work out the impact of that.

Why has the government had to increase taxes and other charges? Because of their waste and economic mismanagement over the last 11 years, including over \$200 million spent on consultants and contractors, over \$75 million spent on advertising and approximately \$25 million spent on overseas travel every year. Even they were going to spend \$630,000 to paint a bridge; \$630,000 to paint a bridge in my electorate, which I painted for \$2,000. Even though it was a joke—call it what you like, a stunt, whatever you want to call it—it happened. That is what it is. Then they had the gall to turn around and put the EPA on to me, and I told them, 'Cut to the chase; put me in gaol. You are on a trip to nowhere.'

It is ridiculous. You must question the process: just because some government bureaucrat said that this bridge needs to be removed, taken to Port Adelaide, sandblasted, repainted and rebuilt. Really, somebody should have woken up to this. But, no, your processes do not allow that: \$630,000 against \$2,000! I did it for that principle alone. If you go and look at it, it looks very nice indeed. You have squandered our opportunities with deals like that. The saddest thing for me is that, of all the great things I have done in 22 years, the only thing you will remember is that bloody bridge. That upsets me a bit.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Oh, no; your legend will live on.

**Mr VENNING:** That is the reality of it all. It was not going to be a gimmick, but that is what happened. The opportunities that have been squandered are unbelievable. When massive resources were coming to South Australia, particularly in the early 2000s—2002 to 2005—when we were flushed with GST funds, they just threw it away, with huge increases to the Public Service and other non-tangible assets.

I was on the Public Works Committee at the time Labor came to office in 2002, and there were no major public infrastructure works until at least until 2008, when the crunch was about to happen. All they did when I got on the Public Works Committee was finish off the major works that the previous Liberal government had in train. There were three or four years of no major works; that is where the problem was.

This goes on with a bit of history and what the Dunstan government did with the old MATS plan. We are paying a big price for that now, because you are doing the MATS plan at 50 times the cost. What you are doing on South Road is the MATS plan. Dunstan stopped it and sold off the land. Labor has a history of this, not just for now but for generations. They ruin and spoil the future of our state.

South Australian businesses are also suffering under Labor government policy, and we hear of closures almost every day, of job losses. Today we heard about Saab, the RDNS and others, and that is sad. We are not here to score points, to laugh or to say, 'We told you'; we are here to say that we are supposed to be responsible citizens. Collectively we should say that we do not want to accept this, because every day it is more bad news.

You try to get back these jobs in this climate! It is quite serious: having the highest taxes in the country increases the cost of doing business interstate compared with others. We have the land tax, stamp duty and WorkCover premiums in Australia. I do not like to be negative, but I have to say it how it is.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** I am not a negative person—most people would say that I am not. I smile most of the time, but I have been here for a fair while. As a member of the opposition I have to join my colleagues and tell the people of South Australia how bad is this government's performance. I hear the criticism of negative comments: 'Why are you are putting down the state?' Mr Speaker, I was here in 1993, as were you, when we heard the greatest negative diatribes from the then opposition, particularly the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr Kevin Foley.

One can pick up *Hansard* and read what he used to say about us in government, yet we were achieving things, winning, creating jobs and paying debt, yet look at what he said about us,

the state and everything else, and now you are accusing us of being negative! We have every reason to be; we have to be. That is what people expect us to do, and with our shadow treasurer here I am very confident that when he becomes treasurer of South Australia he will be able to steer us back; it will be a very tough thing to do. He has the mettle and the wherewithal to do that.

I reflect back because I was here, sir. I was in this chamber, as were you, when the State Bank thing hit us. It hit us like a 10-tonne truck. I can remember very clearly when the Hon. Jenny Cashmore stormed out of that door and brought down the blind on the State Bank, and it was a pretty sad day.

**The SPEAKER:** Surely 'pulled up the blind'?

**Mr VENNING:** Well, all was revealed.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** Mr Speaker, stop interjecting.

**The SPEAKER:** I'm trying to help.

**Mr VENNING:** It is small wonder that now we have to highlight this parlous condition of our state. A recently released report from the Institute of Public Affairs shows that a medium-size sample business is paying more than \$300,000 in annual state taxes, an increase of \$9,000 on the previous year and \$22,000 above the national average. That is hard to believe, so I checked it. It is correct. Many businesses are struggling to remain sustainable in the face of continual increases in state taxes and levies, and many have been forced to lay off staff—we have heard that today—and downsize their operation to try to survive.

State taxes, levies and increased regulations coupled with other factors, such as the high Australian dollar, have caused some businesses to close. One of our most important industries is primary industries, and our farmers are under great financial stress. Rural debt is as high as it has ever been and we are urgently looking for rain across the state.

Late last year, the general manager of Tatiara Seeds (a South Australian country business since 1976) wrote to all members of parliament, and I would like to quote a few lines from that correspondence. You may have read them, but you have probably forgotten. I will remind you because I think the points show how much business in this state is struggling as a result of the Weatherill Labor government:

This is the first time that I have written to a Member of Parliament, but doing business in South Australia has now become nearly impossible.

Mr Ramsdale points to correspondence he received from SA Power Networks 'advising of a 20% increase in our electricity account'. The letter goes on:

Three years ago, the Environmental Protection Agency (with whom we need to be licensed) advised that our fees were to be increased by 100% over the next four years.

Our WorkCover levy is equal to three peoples' wages per year. Our 2011-2012 payroll tax would pay for three peoples' wages. We are being encouraged to keep employing or employ people until they reach 70 years of age or wish to retire. However, WorkCover will not pay their wages if they are injured.

How ridiculous is that? I have been hammering that one for many years since being here. If they are over 70, they will not pay, so why should they be paying the premium? What a nonsense! Is it any wonder that there are so many cases of businesses in trouble in South Australia? Look at Spring Gully—it is only the publicity they received that saved them. Mondello Farms, also affected, has been placed in receivership and is now facing a cut of 140 jobs. Accolade Wines last year saw large-scale job cuts of 175 jobs with more set to follow to cut costs.

Larger businesses, as we all know, are struggling. Holden has cut 20 per cent of jobs since late 2012. Broens cut 60 jobs after the federal Labor government gave a key defence contract to an overseas supplier. BAE Systems faced more than 450 lost jobs. Priority Engineering collapsed in March with a loss of 86 jobs, and the list goes on. It gives me no joy at all to recall all this, but it just goes on and on and we do not seem to want to do anything about it. We do not seem to be very concerned.

The government stationery contract is another example of the Labor government failing to support local business. At least 10 staff members of ANCOL (the Associated Newsagent Co-operative SA Ltd) and KW Wholesale Stationers have been lost recently due to the loss of a contract, with other staff losing hours of work.

Business is integral to the state economy, yet it continues to bear the brunt of overtaxing by the Labor government. Now we see the state Labor government wanting to introduce a CBD car parking tax. What message is this? What will this result in? It will add to the cost of shopping in the CBD. Do they want a vibrant city? It is exactly the wrong message, and every country person coming to the CBD usually parks their car in the city.

They will park their car in the suburbs and shop in the suburbs, and what is that going to do to the centre of your city, the part we are supposed to be so proud of? It is a ridiculous thing, the wrong message entirely. There is not only a lack of government support for business, but there is also a lack of support for primary producers, which is causing problems in the country, and unless they are resolved it will affect all South Australians.

The Governor said in his speech which opened this session of parliament that the government would give priority to clean, green food production, and later to cut red tape. Well, that was over three years ago, and what do we see? The situation for our farmers is worse—far worse—almost desperate. Our farmers are being harassed at every turn by several outside bodies. These include a largely unsympathetic and often hostile media, noisy and nosy groups of city-based activists who want to stop farmers progressing with modern techniques, bureaucrats, mining companies and, worst of all, out of touch politicians who are not across the issues and nor are they interested; they bleat but act the opposite.

Well, it is now biting hard, very hard, and not only is our vital food production being affected, so too will the economy of South Australia. When you look at the number of imports, particularly vegetables, coming into our country right now, it is a disgrace. I remind the house that year in and year out the dairy industry is a most important part of this state's economy and vital to our state's GDP, and they are in serious trouble. Most dairy producers are producing milk below the cost of production. They are buying hay, buying grain, knowing they will not recover the costs. How long do you think you can do that for? They are using up their family bank accounts.

Agriculture accounts for 65 per cent of our state's economic activity, yet we give it 15 per cent of the economic resources. This is a fact, and this government should be condemned for this deliberate oversight. Agriculture needs to build on last year's Australian Year of the Farmer celebrations, which highlighted the profile of farmers and the rural sections in the wider community.

The federal government has finally announced a policy directed at our agriculture sector, a package of measures aimed to assist farmers alleviate their debt, comprising of low interest loans, tax deductions, more rural finance counsellors to assist farmers, and government negotiations with banks. This is too little too late. For many this is definitely the case, but I am hopeful that some of our primary producers can get the assistance they need to continue producing our food through this package to restructure their farm debt, retool, and to encourage more young people to go into farming and farm consultancies.

What is the South Australian government doing for agriculture, given that premium food and wine from our clean environment is one of their strategic priorities? What are they doing for agriculture, which the then treasurer announced was going to be the saviour of our state following the cancellation of the Olympic Dam project? Absolutely nothing; in fact, every year for, I think, 13 years, they have stripped money out of the budget from agriculture—totally ridiculous. Agriculture's voice is not being heard. This government has never listened, and therefore so many farmers have given up. What is the government's response? They withdraw funding to the Advisory Board of Agriculture. What an insult.

They withdraw funding from the Advisory Board of Agriculture, which is basically a group of volunteers who give their time. All this money covered was expenses for when they were living in Adelaide—mainly accommodation. It is a paltry amount of money: approximately \$175,000. That is indescribable and absolutely ridiculous. What sort of message is that? The Advisory Board of Agriculture is also the head branch that controls our agricultural bureaus, the best practising farmer group in Australia. That sends a message.

I am quite disgusted. Everywhere you look there is very little to be positive about, particularly in developments. We know developments are happening in our rural areas. The planning situation is very bad at Port Wakefield. We have developments waiting to happen there. They always have a can't do attitude, and we need to change all that.

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (19:34):** I rise to speak on the Supply Bill 2013. It is a bill that the Liberal Party supports, to appropriate \$3.205 billion for the running of the state between the

hiatus at the end of the financial year until the budget is ready and the money is flowing from that. This will continue to pay for the running of the government until the state budget is ready.

As other speakers have noted, it is the sort of thing that strikes one as unusual if you have a background outside the South Australian government sector. However, there it is; the budget is happening on 6 June and, presumably, the government is concerned it will not pass the parliament and the money from that will not flow on 1 July; so we announce this \$3 billion so the government can continue to do the things that it does. Much of the money will go towards paying the salaries, teachers, nurses, doctors, police officers and things that we are very happy for it to do, and that is why it is important that it be passed.

Of course, much of it is also going to be spent in the other ways that this government spends money so recklessly, as they have done for over 11 years—more than \$200 million per year on consultants and contractors, more than \$75 million per year on advertising, and about \$25 million per year on overseas travel. But, there it is. We will support the bill because we must for the functioning of government. I think that in an ideal world we probably would not design it this way, but there it is.

I have listened to a great many contributions. It is a privilege being the Whip for the opposition and I get the opportunity to hear very many perspectives. I have enjoyed the perspectives of nearly all the members on this side of the house. I think they have outlined very well the situation in which South Australia finds itself, and they presented a compelling vision for the future of South Australia under a Liberal government.

I have also had the opportunity to listen to some of the contributions by members of the government. Some of them have chosen to defend the record, some obviously think everything is going terribly well and should continue to do so, and some have just decided to spend their entire time in an outrageous fashion attacking members of the opposition, which I think has been a waste of the house's time, frankly. I am particularly thinking of the member for Colton, who talked about vision. He said he had not actually heard enough vision from members of the opposition. I wrote it down. He said he would like to hear about vision 10, 20, 50 years ahead and then proceeded to offer exactly none. He spent his entire 17 minutes just bagging the opposition.

I want to think about vision for a moment, because the opposition does have a vision for the future of South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition has presented a vision for South Australia focused on South Australia's bicentenary, thinking about 2036 and how, after 200 years after white settlement in South Australia, South Australia will have an economy that has grown with small businesses and economic growth at the core of the government's focus, with infrastructure dealt with through long-term planning through a body called Infrastructure SA which would, in fact, scrutinise infrastructure projects, make sure that there was a rolling plan in place taking into consideration the economic times and the infrastructure needs of South Australia—importantly, productive infrastructure being at the core, not the sort of thing we saw with the government's new hospital, the sort of policy on the back of an envelope.

It would be a focus on productive infrastructure that is going to grow our economy, assist businesses and assist the South Australian people with things that we need so that the money that is spent on infrastructure is not wasted. Of course, to reach this sort of prosperity, a government needs to address the cost of living and the cost of doing business in South Australia.

Alternatively, as the member for Colton referred to, the government has, of sorts, presented a vision in a way of speaking. He mentioned the seven priorities that the Governor outlined in his speech last year and it is not a document that I have heard government members talking about a great deal lately. I was wondering why I have not heard about that. It was like the member for Colton's reference to it triggered it in my mind. I thought: what were those seven priorities and how is the government going at delivering them? This is the focus of the new Premier's government. The thing that was going to differentiate him from the previous 10 years of Labor government was these seven priorities. How are they going? Let us go through them.

The first one is creating a vibrant city. How do you do that? The government's answer is to put a car park tax on coming into the city, and I think the Rundle Mall Management Authority, the Property Council and the Adelaide City Council very clearly have articulated this week that the last thing you want to do if you want to create a vibrant city is put on a car park tax. But that is the government's plan, so, strike 1 on the first pillar of their plan.

They talk about safer communities and healthy neighbourhoods but, since that pillar was announced, we have had cuts to the police budget and, just this year alone, since New Year's Eve,

we have seen 23 shootings, hardly the sort of thing to build confidence in creating safer communities and healthy neighbourhoods.

The third pillar was an affordable place to live, and I am going to come back to that later. I think it is laughable to think that the Labor Party is serious about making South Australia an affordable place to live if their own budget priorities and policies are anything to go by. We will come back to that one.

The fourth pillar was Every Chance for Every Child, which is a worthy goal. Of course, the Labor government after 11 years has only failure to point to in this area. NAPLAN scores are below the national average in 20 out of 20 categories. We are at the bottom of the class, South Australia. We used to be at the top of the class. The member for Torrens in her articulate contribution earlier, and I commend her for her articulate contribution (not its content but certainly the delivery), talked about how happy she was with how the government had gone with schooling in the 20 years she has been in this place.

**Mrs Geraghty:** Nineteen.

**Mr GARDNER:** Nineteen, I apologise to the member for Torrens for my mistake. Nineteen years—a period in which time we have gone from being one of the highest achievers in school education to being bottom of the class, below the national average in 20 out of 20 categories. It is a great shame and I think that she should take a good hard look at herself and she would learn a great deal by having a look at the figures and the facts as they are.

Of course, Every Chance for Every Child also relates to the Families portfolio which has now been incorporated into education, and I would like to focus on an area that troubles me greatly. When I was the shadow minister I spoke on a number of occasions about it, and I am referring to the opportunities for children in care to have a natural, normal domestic-style environment in which to be looked after once the government has taken the challenging and difficult decision to remove a child from their own parents' care.

In 2001, South Australia led the nation. More than 99 per cent of children in care lived in domestic environments. I realise that there were fewer children in care then but that has been the case across Australia. According to the Report on Government Services (according to the last 11 reports) in which this is one of the key things that is tracked, it was 99.9 per cent—and I will correct the record if it was not the case. We were first in the nation. Domestic based environments: they could be foster care, a foster family, a natural home based environment.

We are now either fifth or sixth out of states in the nation. We are down to 90 per cent. Something like 10 per cent of South Australian children in care no longer live in that sort of environment. They are in pods, holiday homes and units, serviced apartments. We are coming at the bottom of the class in this area and it is a serious concern that the government needs to address. Every Chance for Every Child, yes, it is a worthy goal and it is something that must form part of every government's vision but after 11 years of Labor the government should take a long hard look at itself if it wishes to see why these are such important goals.

The government's fifth pillar of its seven was to grow advanced manufacturing. How has that gone? Saab, Holden, Broens, BAE, Accolade Wines, Priority Engineering—this is just in the last few weeks, by the way, let alone all of the times since the new premier has been in, let alone the 11 long years that Labor has been taking the state in the wrong direction. Growing advanced manufacturing, yes, we would love to but this is the government that has created the very business environment under which these businesses have had to shed staff and take decisions that are very difficult for the workers of South Australia and their families.

The sixth plan is realising the benefits of the mining boom. You have to laugh. You wonder whether there is or is not a mining boom because it seems on different days of different weeks with different ministers and the Premier, you have entirely different answers to whether or not there is a mining boom. We had the Premier in here a little while ago arguing that the reason South Australia's economy was struggling was because we were not a resource state, despite the fact that former premier Mike Rann spent 10 years telling us that we were on the cusp of the mining boom. Then last week we had the Minister for Finance admitting that the mining boom may have been going on elsewhere but it just passed South Australia by. It is a real shame.

This week with the mining conference in town, apparently the new Premier and the minister for mines have a different view again. You have to wonder when the Premier admits that his own government is over spruiking, does he actually have a good hard look at himself sometimes?



Olympic Dam, Arafura, all of these things—and Arafura is a case in point. The Premier says that that was an example of how, yes, he admits it is over spruiking, suggesting that it was the former premier Mike Rann or the former treasurer Kevin Foley who might have been doing the over spruiking.

I had a little look at the record and according to government press releases, yes, former minister Paul Holloway had a bit of a spruik on Arafura, but the other two ministers who were out and about, going hard on telling the South Australian public how many jobs would be created, how many billion dollars worth of investment this would create, were the deputy premier and the minister for mining in 2011, over-spruiking Arafura as they have over-spruiked Olympic Dam as they over-spruiked the salvation of Holden (all those jobs that they said they had saved except now we find that they did not), realising the benefits of the mining boom. Well, let's have a mining boom first and then we will realise its benefits.

The seventh grand plan of the government is premium food and wine from our clean environment. It was a revelation to this government that South Australia made money from agriculture after Olympic Dam shut down. We did not hear about it very much. All we used to hear about was how Olympic Dam was going to be this fantastic saviour for South Australia's economy: eleven years of over-spruiking. I can remember the former treasurer, the now Minister for Health, going on radio to talk about agriculture and how exciting it was that the agriculture industry was going so very well the morning after BHP Billiton made its decision on Olympic Dam last year.

It is very important that our premium food and wine goes well. A number of businesses are very close to my heart, as I know that they are to a number of people in the chamber and in the parliament. They are struggling. They are facing some very severe challenges. The government says that a pillar of its plan is to focus on premium food and wine and yet it seems like when there have been some challenges for a local food producer recently—and a number of them have grouped together to focus on a swap and shop platform and program—the best that the government can do is to re-tweet the work they are doing on social media.

There was a meeting of one business and the Minister for Manufacturing in which we were told that, 'not much was promised. Maybe if they get through their hard times there will be something more on the table'. It is difficult to have confidence in this government to deliver on these sorts of pillars when they have so little inspiration in what they can offer to the people of South Australia.

In March 2013, the Premier launched what was heralded as a significant economic statement for the future of South Australia. He said that there were going to be four areas in which the South Australian economy was going to be revitalised and everything was going to go terribly well. Of course, it had already been going terribly well according to Labor, but now everything was going to go even better.

With the four priorities, this grand economic plan, he took the four economically related pillars from the seven in the previous year and put them in a new document and said this was somehow a new economic statement. We have growing advanced manufacturing, creating a vibrant city, premium food and wine and realising the benefits of the mining boom—even with the same syntax and grammar. They are just the same four from the seven pillars.

It strikes me as an economic plan put out because the Premier decided that he needed to have something he could point to that was remotely able to be called an economic plan, but it is no such thing. The Premier and the government seek to look at the hard work and the endeavour of South Australian business and claim the credit for those which are doing well, but whenever one of them is struggling, it is never ever their fault and that is a real shame.

The fact of the matter is—and I will turn now to cost of living because that is one of the Premier's seven pillars and something on which the supply bill is very pertinent—the money that we spend on the Supply Bill is crucially focused on delivering outcomes for the people of South Australia. In my electorate office, as in many other electorate offices around the Liberal side, I know the key thing that we hear from our constituents is that they are struggling under the cost of living pressures. The key thing that we hear from our local businesses is that they are struggling under the pressures of the cost to do business in South Australia. Why could that possibly be?

Let us have a look at the costs that people are facing. State taxes have gone up twice the rate of CPI under this Premier, the member for Cheltenham. Water bills have nearly tripled since 2007 and 11 times the CPI under this Premier. Gas bills are seven times the CPI under this Premier. Electricity bills are five times the CPI under this Premier. State taxes or property charges

are twice the rate of CPI under this Premier. Public transport fees are up. Car registration and licences are up. Motor registration is up. Liquor licensing fees are up 36 per cent. The EPA and solid waste levies are up. The Environment Protection Authority seems to have gone from being a service delivery function of the government to being a revenue-raising function of the government under Labor's watch. Of course, there is the car park tax.

The fact of the matter is that if you want to live in South Australia and do business in South Australia this government will put your charges up. It is more expensive to live, to do business and to drink. Whether you want to drink beer or water, your prices have gone up. While we are on water, it is more expensive to wash by a significant amount as well, which explains a great deal.

If you want to go into town and go to work, it is more expensive to catch the bus, or in fact if you want to drive it is more expensive to do that too, and when you get there it is more expensive to park. It takes a special kind of arrogance to have as a central theory or a central pillar of your economic plan that you are going to reduce the cost of living when you and your government are in fact deeply responsible for the very reasons that so many of these things are an issue for so many people in South Australia in the first place.

The member for Mitchell just said that, 'We believe in building an economy, not tearing it down as those opposite are so adept at doing.' That was an extraordinary statement that this side of the parliament could possibly be accused of tearing an economy down when in 1993, when the Liberal Party came to power, with an economy that had been torn down already by those opposite—and over a very difficult period of time economically—we fixed the economy, paid down debt and got the State Bank debt paid off to the point where I think on the chart it was a minuscule amount compared to what we found in 1993.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** Three billion dollars.

**Mr GARDNER:** Three billion dollars from \$12 billion. This government came to power with that level of debt, had the rivers of gold from the GST revenues coming through throughout the entirety of the first six years of its government. Five billion dollars was spent in unbudgeted expenditure over that time under this government, and the current Premier was a member of the cabinet for every single day.

The fact of the matter is that it is this government, through its own choices, decisions and bad policies, that has increased the deficit to \$867 million as it was at last year's budget, \$1.2 billion as the Mid-Year Budget Review found, and God only knows what it is going to turn out to be come budget day. It is this government that has delivered a state debt that is going to reach \$14 billion, and what have they had? They have had rivers of gold—\$5 billion of unbudgeted expenditure that has led them there.

It did not need to happen. We are paying \$800 million a year in interest bills. It is those decisions that mean that it is more difficult and more challenging for the budget to deal with the cost of living pressures or indeed to address some of the other issues that the government has in its own seven pillars. If only, if only, if only it had not made those decisions and we did not have that \$800 million a year in interest or that \$1 million a day that we are going to be spending on Labor's new RAH—what was briefly going to be called the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson hospital.

If only the government had not made the decision to double the size of the desalination plant and lay those pipes, which cost hundreds of millions of dollars, then perhaps they might have had a better chance now of delivering on their promises. It is going to take a Liberal government, led by the member for Norwood, to fix this budget hole. We have to get the South Australian economy moving again. We have to grow the economy and focus on making sure we can cut waste, live within our means, pay down that debt, and we will be able to deliver on the sorts of things that are important: cost of living, improving the business environment, reducing the cost of doing business in South Australia and creating a better environment for businesses to invest in South Australia. That is the sort of vision that we need for South Australia and that is the sort of vision that the Liberal Party will deliver. I look forward very much to 16 March next year when we can start delivering on this vision.

**The SPEAKER:** Alack and alas, the member's time has expired. I take it his 'If only, if only, if only' was a reference to Noel Coward's famous song *Louisa*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. S.W. Key.

**CHILD PROTECTION**

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (19:55):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Today the member for Unley asked me when I was made aware of the new charges laid against an out-of-school-hours care worker who had previously been found guilty of offences against a child and is currently imprisoned for these offences. In my answer I said, as I understand it, these charges were laid in relation to his first victim.

The DPP tonight advised me that today's court proceedings involved new charges being laid that were not related to that first victim. The most important thing we must all remember in regard to this matter is that this person is behind bars and has no access to children in our community.

At 19:56 the house adjourned until Thursday 2 May 2013 at 10:30.