

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 17 October 2013

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:33 and read prayers.

GOVERNMENT ELECTION FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY BILL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:34): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to improve government pre-election financial responsibility and reporting; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:35): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In moving this bill, what the opposition is trying to do is improve the financial transparency that is available to all political parties and to the public when an election is called. Mr Speaker, you are aware that, in federal elections, through the changes made by treasurer Costello in his time, there was a charter of budget honesty brought in at the federal level. Part of that legislation requires a pre-election fiscal and economic outlook to be published 10 days after the issuing of the federal writs.

That particular statement (PEFO) is prepared by the federal Treasury secretary without interference from the political wing of government, and it gives an independent assessment of the budget and the state of the finances at the federal level at that time, so that the political parties going to the election have the most up-to-date and independent information available to them from the federal Treasury.

What this bill does is, essentially, copy that system and introduce that into the South Australian statute and, therefore, it will be part of the election framework. What this bill essentially does is set up a system that requires the state Under Treasurer, five days after the issuing of the writs, to provide publicly an assessment of the state's finances so that all politicians and the media are aware of the true state of the budget.

We know the government bring down a budget mid-year in May/June. We know they then bring down a thing called the Mid-Year Budget Review around Christmas time. If you look at the dates when the Mid-Year Budget Review has been released, it has traditionally been released days before Christmas in non-election years, and then, in election years, it has been released roughly around the Australia Day long weekend.

The timing of that release is subject to the Treasurer of the day's political whim. If the Treasurer of the day wanted to bring the Mid-Year Budget Review release forward to, say, November, the Treasurer of the day could do that; that would then, of course, deny the parliament, the public and the opposition the most up-to-date figures for a March 2014 election.

This piece of legislation requires, regardless of the budget introduced in May/June, regardless of the Mid-Year Budget Review—whenever it is released—the Under Treasurer, five days after the issuing of the writs, to produce a summary of the state finances. It also requires that, having released the Under Treasurer's financial outlook report at that time, if something occurs during the election period that the Under Treasurer thinks is of financial significance and has to brief the government on, he would also be required to brief the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the other parties. It puts that obligation on the Under Treasurer to provide advice to both parties.

Members of the house may scratch their head and ask, 'Why would you want this particular piece of legislation?' Let me give you a live example. In the 2010 election, about a week out from the election, we were advised that the federal government had advised the state government that there was another \$600 million of GST revenue available to the state. In an election context, that is a handy piece of information to have. What came out after the election, of course, was that the then treasurer Foley had had that information for a few days before passing it on to the opposition.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: They had to check it was right.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: They had to check it was right, yes. Under this system here through this bill, what would happen is, when the Under Treasurer received that information, given

it is of financial significance, he would immediately brief the government and opposition—basically, different briefings but on the same day.

So, what we are trying to do is introduce to South Australia a system of financial transparency that exists at the federal level. It was used in the last federal government by the federal Labor government and it has been used in previous federal elections by the federal Liberal government, so this is not a Liberal/Labor issue. This is an issue of financial transparency. It works federally; it puts in place a mechanism where the parties have independent information verified to them by the Under Treasurer of the day.

Obviously, the Under Treasurer would not need to notify the government or the opposition on every single little matter that changed within the budget. It is a matter of matters of significance and there is a \$1 million threshold in the bill in some clauses to clarify that, otherwise it would be totally unworkable. So, what we are looking for is to introduce a system that exists federally, works federally and offers transparency, and all we are requiring is that five days after the issuing of writs, the independent Under Treasurer produces a report on the financial status of the budget, even though the mid-year budget review might have been released some weeks earlier by the Treasurer.

Exactly the same principle is in place federally. In the federal system, in the budget there is a form of report that is used as the benchmark for the pre-election fiscal outlook report. We have adopted exactly the same system here. So, the intention of this bill and the instructions to parliamentary counsel were to copy the federal legislation in regards to this particular element of their Charter of Budget Honesty, and that is what this bill seeks to do.

Obviously, we have not had the chance to consult Treasury on this matter. This is not surprising, because obviously Treasury are beholden to the government, and we accept that is how the system works. We are not critical of that. We just make the point that if the government, having read this between now and when it is put to the vote, think there is a way of improving it through amendment following Treasury advice, we are open to that. If we form government at some point in the future, then obviously we would be seeking Treasury advice about whether there are ways to improve this particular measure.

There is time for this bill to go through the parliament between now and the next election. There are three weeks of sitting left; the government have plenty of time to consider this and put it through both houses. I hope the government can see their way clear to support what we think is a good measure and an improvement to financial transparency around the budget and financial matters of the state.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (NATURAL DISASTERS COMMITTEE) (NO. 3) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill comes from the other place, which supported the bill. This bill seeks to set up a parliamentary committee into natural disasters, and this bill has had a long gestation. This is the fifth attempt, I believe, to get the parliament to set up a standing committee in relation to natural disasters. A little bit of history: this originally was an idea to set up a parliamentary committee into bushfires. The government opposed that idea and sent a reference to the parliament's Natural Resources Committee, which did an inquiry under the now Deputy Premier's stewardship, which continued under the member for Ashford's stewardship as Chair.

That committee, made up of Labor, Liberal and minor party members, unanimously recommended to set up a parliamentary committee into natural disasters. So, it would not just deal with bushfire, flooding or earthquake but it would deal with natural disasters in the broad. The government has voted this down at least three times, if not four times, so the Hon. John Dawkins—I thank him for his effort and support—moved this bill in the other place, and the other place has supported it. That is why we are debating it here today.

The reality is that in my electorate and other electorates there are natural disaster issues that should be put front and centre of a parliamentary committee. If you want evidence of that, have a look at what is happening with the select committee into the Cherryville fire, where there are a

whole range of issues that have come out of that particular select committee that could easily have been dealt with by a standing committee of the parliament.

The government's argument has been that you do not want to put the bureaucracy under the extra burden of having to answer to the parliament on every issue in regard to their agency. The answer to that is: have a look at what happened with the Cherryville fire. Look at the parliament's response. The parliament's response was to set up a select committee just to look at that fire.

This becomes the problem: that select committee will look at the issues around one single fire but it will not look at system issues across the whole of the departments on a whole-of-government basis: the police's power to evacuate, SA Water's provision of appropriate standards and volumes of water, the planning system, building design, being able to evacuate and the road capacity. All those issues are whole-of-government, whole-of-system issues.

What we have had—and the parliament has done it consistently—is a fire in Port Lincoln, let's have an inquiry; a fire in the Adelaide Hills, let's have an inquiry; a fire at Cherryville, let's have an inquiry. It is a nonsense, in my view and, indeed, the opposition's view, that we continue to set up these individual inquiries on a one-off basis that look at just one incident when many of the issues are systematic.

If you have a look at every single report into bushfires the same issues will come up. It will talk about communications on the day, the capacity and training of the volunteer/professional staff, was the provision of equipment adequate, what is the media message, should they have been evacuated or should they not have been evacuated? All those questions come up in every single inquiry.

There is no doubt in my mind that by not having a standing committee into natural disasters the parliament is doing a disservice and ultimately putting lives at risks. I think anyone who lives in the Adelaide Hills would be concerned—having had a very wet winter and what is going to be a spring with lots of growth—about the level of bushfire risk this particular summer.

I will give you an example of the things this committee could deal with. It has taken me nearly 15 months to deal with one issue about a house fire in Penno Parade North, which is one street outside my electorate. When the CFS arrived, there was not enough water capacity to fight the house fire. There was not enough water capacity in the mains to fight a single house fire. Having dealt with that through the then minister for water, the member for Colton's office, and then ultimately the new Minister for Water having followed it up, it has taken something like 15 to 18 months to have that investigated and finally have the mains replaced in that street.

The pretty obvious question is: if there is not enough mains water in that street to fight a single house fire, is there enough mains pressure in the district to fight a bushfire of the Ash Wednesday-type capacity? It is those sorts of issues the committee could sit down and look at, but the government—I think through political belligerence—is deciding not to open up that avenue of questioning for local members in the form of a parliamentary committee. It should not take a member of parliament 15 months and six or seven letters to try to work out whether there is enough water capacity in one street when ultimately you could do it through a parliamentary committee.

As I say, this is our fifth attempt to try to get this piece of legislation up. I am hoping that the government might have seen the error of its ways, given the fire danger that is going to be upon us this summer, which I think will be one of our worst for a long time in terms of potential danger. I am hoping that the government can see the error of its ways. Whether you are talking about a bushfire, an earthquake or flooding—and I know the member for West Torrens has an issue in his electorate, as do a lot of the western suburbs—it is interesting that the government does not want the parliament to have a committee overseeing those sorts of issues, even concerning matters in their own electorates. I am not sure why you would not want parliamentary oversight of that.

The government says you do not want to tie the bureaucrats answering to a committee. What is the parliament for if not to ask the appropriate questions? A parliamentary committee provides a broader range of experience sitting around the table to ask the appropriate questions, and every member of parliament comes to the table representing a different electorate with a different set of experiences, and to have them quiz the bureaucrats I think puts pressure on the system to make sure that we are properly prepared.

I have given this example before, but again I raise this for the government's consideration. The evidence from the CFS given to the Natural Resources Committee, when they had the bushfire

reference, from the CFS in my electorate, was that my electorate does not have the capacity to evacuate at the time of a fire; the road capacity is not there. When talking to the CFS about who will give the instruction to evacuate, they said, 'Don't worry about it, that's the responsibility of the police.' I am intrigued because if the CFS professionals say that there is not the capacity to evacuate, what plan is in place to deal with 30,000 people in the Mitcham Hills (and a lot more in the Adelaide Hills) in regard to evacuations?

The government says that the policy is, 'Leave before the fire starts.' For 120,000 people, the policy is, 'Leave before the fire starts.' Even if that could occur, and even if they were prepared to do it, my view is they will do it when we have these long stretches of seven, eight, nine or 10 days of 40° heat—and we get those in Adelaide every now and again. I think six or seven years ago there was one run of 13 days straight.

I suspect that the diligent people, who are going to leave before the fire starts, will do it on day one and, when there is no fire, they will do it on day two, maybe, but by days three and four they will not evacuate before the fire starts. There is going to be a large pool of people, and the CFS policy is, 'Leave before it starts,' and at that point, if they have not left, what then?

What the government knows, because it is on the formal record of the evidence, is that the view of the CFS is that there will be something like 7,000 to 8,000 cars on the road, and the road does not have the capacity. I have tried to get the Old Belair Road upgraded many times; this government took funding away from the upgrade as one of its first actions under the Rann government.

I have put everything I can on the record about this issue in the best interest of my electorate and the government has point blankly stonewalled it. I can do no more than raise the issue and pray there is not a press conference at some point in the future saying, 'I told you so.'

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHELTENHAM PARK AND RELATED AMENDMENTS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 September 2013.)

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (10:57): The reason behind this matter is that we have a situation where a significant business in South Australia, that is, the racing industry, is being compromised by a number of actions, some of which I think to some extent are beyond its control and some of which I think fall firmly at the feet of this government and actions that this government have taken. They are, I believe, compromising the ability of the SAJC to continue to operate here efficiently and effectively in presenting a viable racing industry or racing program which underpins the whole industry.

What we find at Cheltenham Park is that when the SAJC ran races at the venue it had a significant club facility there. It is still there, and it operates a significant number of poker machines which provide a significant revenue stream to the SAJC and, obviously, to the industry.

With the cessation of racing on that venue, and the change of that land from what was traditionally a racecourse to now being developed, the SAJC find that their club is probably not situated in the most advantageous place, and that their business is suffering because of that. Also, it is arguable whether the licence under which the club operates its poker machines has not fallen outside of the licensing conditions, as it is a special licence because of the racing activities which were previously held there. So, it is a fairly complicated situation.

The SAJC want to move their operation to another site on land which is owned by them and is contiguous to the site of the current operation. What they want to do is move to this other location, re-establish there, and get on with business. To do that under the current law and regulations, they would have to go through a significant process. Part of that process is that they would have to relinquish their current gaming machine licences and then repurchase them; there is obviously a cost in doing that.

Also, under the regime which is currently operating in this state, they would lose a significant number of their machine licences, which would be relinquished and handed back to the government as part of the program to reduce the number of poker machines, and they would also wear the cost of doing that. They would also have to go through the full process which anybody would need to go through if they were establishing a new facility.

One of the significant issues is that, under the act and regulations, part of that process means that they would have to go through a social effects test. That opens up all sorts of rights of appeal, and I think I am right in saying that there has been no case in South Australia where somebody has applied and got through the social effects test and got a positive outcome from that process. Here we have the SAJC, which have been operating this facility there for a significant number of years; they want to move it, basically within their own land—it will obviously be on a different street front; I understand it will be moved around 200 metres, on land which they own. Notwithstanding that, they currently have to go through these processes because the address will be different.

What the member for Davenport is attempting to do with this matter before the house is to give the commissioner the discretion to waive some of those processes and to accept that this is indeed a minor matter, so that the SAJC will not have to go through the full process as if it was a brand new proposal, thereby protecting the business of the SAJC. The opposition believes that if this bill is not enacted and these processes are not made somewhat more favourable to allow the SAJC to move its premises, the cost to that organisation would be around \$1 million.

We know that there is already huge pressure on the racing industry in South Australia. We are in competition with other states in providing racing product; that competition is very strong, and I do not believe the SAJC is in a position to forgo \$1 million simply to move its poker machines 200 metres, so—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: If they are not successful in the process, they will lose \$900,000 a year.

Mr WILLIAMS: The member for Davenport points out that it is not just a \$1 million cost as a one-off. It is our understanding that the ongoing cost to the SAJC will be about \$900,000 per year if they cannot get the approvals. That money is what helps the SAJC to be competitive. I was just talking about the competitive nature of the racing industry and providing racing product in what is now a national betting system.

If you cannot provide a high quality product, you will not get people wagering on your product and, therefore, you will not get the return, and the wagering obviously provides a big part of the business of the racing industry. Also, the \$900,000 return from other aspects of their business underpins their product. It allows them to put that money into prize money for their races on a regular basis and, therefore, improve the quality of their product, and that is part of the business plan.

This is very important to what is a significant industry in South Australia, and I urge members to take this matter very seriously. I congratulate the member for Davenport for bringing this matter before the house. I remind members of a matter that went through this house a few years ago, sponsored by the Labor Party, to support a not dissimilar move by the North Adelaide Football Club, which sought to move its club operations and poker machines away from the oval at Prospect to a more advantageous site. I think it was across Main North Road at North Park, I think it is called.

I remember that particular move was the subject of considerable debate in this house. The Labor Party in that case strongly supported the North Adelaide Football Club and I think the North Adelaide Football Club has been very thankful and benefited greatly from that move. I would urge members of the government to consider this matter in the same light, because it is just as important to the SAJC and the racing industry in South Australia that we come to an equitable and sustainable solution for the SAJC to allow them to continue to participate and operate sustainably in South Australia. I commend the matter to the house.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:07): I rise also to support the member for Davenport in his very genuine, very serious and very carefully thought out support for the South Australian Jockey Club in this issue but, more importantly, it is support for the South Australian economy. Let me declare an interest. I am a member of the South Australian Jockey Club but that really has nothing to do with my support for this bill.

The issue here is that the SAJC has poker machines that they operate and they just want to shift them 200 or 300 metres down the road onto another block of land that they own. It will cost them about \$1 million to do that, currently. The real crux of the issue is that people are trying to force them, when they surrender the licence that they have to operate in one place and try to start it up again just down the road on land that they already own, to surrender one out of every four gaming machines that they want to close the licence on. They have 40 machines now, they would

have to give up 10 of them and they could apply to have another 30 licences just down the road. People might think that's a good way to get rid—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: They would apply for 40.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, they could keep 30 of the 40 that they currently have just down the road. People might think that is a good way to get rid of gaming machines, and let me say quite clearly that when it comes to the appeal of playing pokie machines, I just don't get it. I really don't get it. They have no appeal to me whatsoever. However, I do understand how important they are to the economy more broadly. For the SAJC to shift their 40 machines, they have to surrender 10 of them, shift 30, and then buy 10 back. So, essentially, they have to give away the value of 10 machines and then pay the value of 10 machines to, basically, keep their business as it currently is just down the road.

The reason this is so important to me is because of the value of the racing industry to our state. It is not about pokie machines, as far as I am concerned, it is about allowing the SAJC to continue to do what they do on behalf of the racing industry, but also on behalf of the South Australian economy. The SAJC, of course, is the pre-eminent racing club in Adelaide. There are other racing clubs sprinkled throughout regional South Australia. It is fair to say, and very important to point out actually, that all racing clubs throughout South Australia and in regional South Australia have benefitted significantly over the years from the South Australian Jockey Club.

Racing is—I am sorry, I forget—either the fourth or fifth largest employer in the nation. Compared to any other industry, the racing industry is the fourth or fifth largest employer in the nation by number of people employed. You think about the thousands and thousands of race meetings held all across the nation, you think about the very broad range of people who are able to gain employment in the racing industry, from farriers all the way through to the sort of things you normally think of in terms of trainers and jockeys, all the people associated with the hospitality industry and, very importantly, people who may not be able to pick up employment at other times: high school students, university students, middle aged and older people who, for whatever reason, their life requires that they get part-time work outside of normal business hours, they benefit enormously from the racing industry. It makes a staggering contribution to our state's economy.

If the SAJC suffers the racing industry suffers. If the racing industry suffers then our state's economy suffers. That is why, for me, this is a very important issue. I am not suggesting that the SAJC should get any significant advantage compared to any other business that just wanted to, basically, pick up what it currently does and move a couple hundred metres down the road. That is really what they are asking to do. As the members for Davenport and MacKillop have quite rightly pointed out, this is not new. The principle was established with regard to the North Adelaide Football Club, for very good reasons. I think that same principle should be continued here, as set out by the member for Davenport's bill, and I think it should be done because of the benefit it provides to the South Australian economy.

Racing is one of those industries that people can participate in however they choose, and people of all walks of life. You can be interested in horse racing really seriously or just a little bit and go to the races and have a great day. You can go to the races and drink or not drink. You can go to the races and gamble or not gamble. You can go to the races and get dressed up or not get dressed up. Anybody in South Australia: male, female, rich, poor, young, old, Aboriginal, non-Aboriginal, migrant, it does not matter, any single person is attracted to racing for all those sorts of reasons, because you can go and enjoy it at whatever level you choose to enjoy it. It is that attraction that makes it such an important—

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Florey to order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: It is that attraction to such a broad range of people that is the foundation of the employment that it creates, which is such an important contributor to our economy. I say again, if the SAJC is disadvantaged in this way the racing industry will be disadvantaged and our economy will be disadvantaged.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:14): I can put on the record that the only electorate in the metropolitan area that has an SAJC racing course now is my electorate of Morphett. It is a huge industry in South Australia and particularly down in my electorate. It is a big employer and a big contributor to the local economy. Just this week I received—and I assume other members did—a booklet from the SAJC outlining some of the benefits of racing in South Australia. Can I just put it

on the record that the South Australian racing industry—and that is not only the gallops, but it is the dogs and the trots as well—generates over \$401 million per annum in economic benefit for South Australia; sustains the employment of 3,628 South Australians—I will repeat that: 3,628 South Australians—that is a huge industry; provides \$224 million per annum in household income; provides \$19 million in GST; and generates \$303 million per annum in direct expenditure, with more than 40 per cent of this expenditure occurring in regional areas.

It is a huge industry, not just in the electorate of Morphett, but across the state. For the SAJC to be able to conduct their business, as they have been legally for many years now, down at Cheltenham, with the gaming area down there, is something that we should not be getting in the way of. This is not creating a new area. This is not going to change the whole social impact of that area; it has been there for a long time.

This is a sensible motion that has been put up by the member for Davenport, and I strongly support this motion. I urge everybody in this place to have a look at the racing industry in South Australia and have a look at the gaming industry generally in South Australia to see what we can do to make sure it is working for South Australians.

There are some issues with problem gamblers, I know that. I have had personal issues with family members who have had serious losses—and I mean hundreds of thousands of dollars worth—through problem gambling, but that is not to say we throw the baby out with the bathwater. We invoke the precautionary principle again to social legislation, we make sure we use a sensible approach, and this is a sensible approach not only for the SAJC but for the people of South Australia. It is fair and sensible.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:17): I also wish to speak in regard to this bill, and there are probably a few people who have unexpectedly risen to speak. I must admit that I put a lot of thought into this one, personally, having in a previous life held the shadow portfolio for gambling. I have been exposed to the activities of the industry and the concerns of many people in the community who have problems with it. I will admit that I am a member of the Balaklava Racing Club, so as much as I am associated with horseracing, it is in that area. I also wish to recognise that earlier this week the City of Charles Sturt forwarded an email about their concern and noted their opposition to the bill. I thought, as a local government spokesperson, that I should just put that on the record to note that it has been received.

However, I am supportive of this, and it is because I have given it a lot of consideration, to think about the impacts—positive and potentially negative—and the implications of current legislative requirements for facilities that do wish to move, and the social effects test which is significant in cost—up to \$100,000, as I understand it. That money in itself is an issue—there is no doubt about that—but the clear point for me, when I was told that the facility already owned by the SAJC, less than 300 metres away, which has been targeted for this development, has therefore been part of the planning since the development took place the first time, and that was after the closure of the racecourse. It seems to me there has been a lot of public knowledge out there about the fact that there is an intention to move.

The SAJC is a very reputable industry. The member for Morphett, in outlining just the financial implications of racing in South Australia, has put a lot of information on the record about how important it is. I respect Mayor Kirsten Alexander, and I have had discussions with her about other matters, so I understand the reason for this motion coming from the City of Charles Sturt; but I do believe, for the benefit of full consideration of this, and in the knowledge that must exist in our community, and the operation that has occurred there for decades and decades, with these gaming machines already there, and their entitlement of 40 machines already there, and considering the financial impact upon that operation, and unless there is an opportunity to move, that it is an appropriate thing for the member for Davenport to put this bill before the house.

I hope there is an opportunity for a lot of discussion to take place and questioning that will occur from the other side on this, because there has been some legal diligence taken on this. I know the member for Davenport has consulted quite widely on it. It will not be unanimous, there is no doubt about that, but it is an appropriate measure to come before the house for discussion because this is an important factor.

The member for MacKillop, in referring to the North Adelaide Football Club decision, has certainly put on record the fact that it has occurred in the parliament before. That is where discussion must have taken place and valid arguments must have been put up, and that is what should occur in this chamber. I look forward to the continued debate.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:19): I rise too to support the bill in regard to Cheltenham Park and related amendments, introduced by the member for Davenport. I think it is absolutely appropriate that this bill be debated, especially in light of the issue around the moving of the gaming machines only a few hundred metres to another site. It certainly, to my mind, seems ridiculous that, just because of this minor move, the club would have to give up 10 of its 40 machines and, essentially then, if it wanted to get them back, buy them back.

I understand the current rate, roughly, for a gaming machine is about \$65,000, so there is already a \$650,000 cost in that transaction before anything else happens in regard to the moving of these premises. I think this is certainly a fair and equitable move, and I agree in the main with some of the comments made by the member for Stuart in regard to poker machines. I have the odd flutter, but I really do not get how people can sit there for hours on end and just lose money, but I do understand how they have become part of our community.

People have built businesses—not necessarily racing venues but certainly the hotel industry—and they supply a lot of employment across the state. So, whether we fully appreciate them or not, they are part of the economy. They are certainly part of many businesses' business plans, including the racing industry. We have a racing industry which, like any business in this state, is having its moments, especially at this time.

I reflect on the proposed change at Murray Bridge with the new racing club developments there and the Gifford Hill proposal. I know there have been applications to the diversification fund for money, and we are still waiting on the outcome as to whether that will be agreed to by the new federal government. I certainly hope it will be.

There was \$5 million put up for that, and this is part of a \$36 million project on a broader scale, which will assist the racing industry not only in Murray Bridge but right across the state by having a venue that can have not only a normal grass track, obviously, which is already in place bar the fencing, but also, in the future, with a \$4 million investment—it might be a bit more than that—an artificial track, so that race meetings can be held in all weather. It is certainly applicable, given the many meetings we have recently seen having to be cancelled.

I heard of one the other day on the radio, I think in Bordertown, from memory. The officials were flying down to start the race day but, because it was so wet, apart from the fact that they could not hold the race day on that track, the officials could not land in the weather conditions. So, they certainly need an appropriate venue so that, if events like that happen, races can be transferred to somewhere else in the state.

I certainly think it is when and not if that, with the drive of the Murray Bridge Racing Club and their co-partners Burke Urban and Thoroughbred Racing South Australia, they will get there, and this will be a pristine development for racing in this state. The beauty of this development is it is not only about racing: it is about supplying housing. There will be at least 3,500 housing allotments, and it will essentially be another suburb of Murray Bridge.

Murray Bridge now already exceeds 20,000 in population, and this Gifford Hill development could certainly give the town up to 50 per cent of that again with up to 10,000 people living in that area at Gifford Hill, just south of the freeway as you head towards Adelaide.

So, anything that can assist racing—and not everyone gets involved in racing, but racing needs all forms of its operations to function so that it can function. I have noticed recently that a hotel just outside my electorate at Coonalpyn does not have live betting anymore because it is just too costly to host the facilities. These are the types of things that are happening in the industry, where these charges are reflected on businesses throughout communities.

This is a country hotel that services regional people, like many others, and gives them the chance, if they want it, to have a flutter on the races; now that opportunity is gone because it was so expensive to do. As I said, this is an industry where the cost structures can be very large. We need to do what we can to make sure that it is another industry that flourishes in this state and not one that walks away.

Certainly, in regard to the Murray Bridge Gifford Hill proposal, it would be nice if the state Labor government came up with the \$6 million they gave to the Gawler Racing Club; somehow I cannot see that coming, but I would certainly appreciate it. I would shake the Premier's hand if it were forthcoming and thank him very much for the support. I am sure the Murray Bridge Racing Club would be more than excited if it came, but one thing I have learned about politics is that there is not too much equity when it comes to handing out the cash.

The SPEAKER: Is there any chance the member for Hammond might join up his remarks to the bill?

Mr PEDERICK: Absolutely, Mr Speaker, and thank you—

Mr Gardner: A chance.

Mr PEDERICK: There will be a chance that I may get back to the absolute substance of the bill.

Mr Treloar: Talk about politics again.

Mr PEDERICK: Oh, member for Flinders! What I am saying, Mr Speaker, is that all this is linked to the success of racing in this state, and one part of this process is the proposal that could see the SAJC having to fork out hundreds of thousands of dollars in moving these pokie machines a few hundred metres. What I am trying to indicate is that the racing industry in South Australia is not just tied into the South Australian Jockey Club proposal; it is a state-based proposal. I am just talking about the issue across the state, and different race tracks, and the opportunities for racing across the state and how it can be developed.

I think it would certainly assist the South Australian Jockey Club if these state-of-the-art facilities could be developed at Murray Bridge, as I think they will be, but it would certainly be a major help if the state government would put their hand in their pocket and offer the same sort of support, the \$6 million, they gave to the Gawler racing fraternity. I do not deny them having that money, but let's see some equity across the state, instead of having a government that is just so focused on the city and does not even think of anything outside the boundaries of the city.

Members interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: You are all happy to speak, if you like. There is still a minute or so.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Ramsay to order.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. What I will say in my closing remarks—and I keep getting these interjections, these waves of disinterest from the other side—

The SPEAKER: No, 'uninterest'.

Mr PEDERICK: Uninterest, thank you. But I fully support the motion.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: A point of order by the member for Torrens.

Mrs GERAGHTY: The member's comments about waving and disinterest or whatever are quite incorrect, and it is unlike the member to make statements like that.

The SPEAKER: That is a bogus point of order and I call the member for Torrens to order. Before the member for Morialta rises, is the member for Hammond telling us that one cannot get a bet on at Coonalpyn?

Mr PEDERICK: I am, sir.

Mr Goldsworthy: Outrageous!

Mr PEDERICK: And it is outrageous. So, if you are ever travelling down the Dukes Highway, sir, and you want to call into Coonalpyn and put a bet on, it cannot happen.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Legally.

Mr PEDERICK: Legally, thank you. But you can play the pokies.

The SPEAKER: The terminator.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

COUNCIL RATE CONCESSIONS

Mr BROCK (Frome) (11:33): By leave, I move my motion in amended form:

That this house strongly urges the state government to undertake a complete review of the current pensioner concessions for local government rates to assess the viability of—

- (a) increasing the rate of concessions that are currently paid on local government council rate notices to a more realistic level, based on today's cost of living; and

- (b) any new concessions to be made available to self-funded retirees and other Centrelink income support beneficiaries and be indexed to the CPI.

I rise to speak on this motion and strongly request that the state government review the current position of the amount of concessions that are afforded to eligible persons in relation to local government council rates. I note that the value of this concession provided by the state government in 2010-11 provided approximately \$33 million to assist almost 160,000 South Australians with the payment of their council rates. Given this and the fact that the number of people receiving these concessions continues to rise, I do understand that any increase in rates concessions would have a serious impact on the state government budget. However, our constituents' budgets are also being greatly impacted.

South Australian councils have previously made repeated calls for indexation of state government concessions, particularly following the 2010 state election. The maximum concession paid for rates is currently \$190 in any financial year and has not been increased since 2002. Consequently, the original concession has failed to keep pace with inflation, eroding the true value of the concession paid to the recipients.

Prior to this increase, the concession remained constant at \$150 for 23 years, albeit that the quantum paid by the state government has been steadily increasing due to the significant increase in eligible ratepayers. I note that if you take that over the last 30 years, it has gone from \$150 per annum to \$190. The concession has increased by \$40 per annum, yet council rates and other associated expenditure for these people has increased dramatically.

I note that in 2010 the state government increased a range of pensioner concessions including energy, water and sewer and emergency services bills, but excluded council rates concessions. Once again this issue was the subject of the Local Government Association of South Australia (LGA) October 2012 AGM and it has also been a discussion at subsequent LGA meetings. Following discussion on this issue, the following resolution was passed at the LGA AGM in October 2012, and I quote:

That the Annual General Meeting request the LGA to increase pressure on the State Government to increase the pension concessions on rates to a level that maintains the real value of the concession set in 2002, and is indexed annually thereafter.

I understand that through its local government research and development scheme, the LGA engaged the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies to undertake a review of the rates and land tax remission scheme and other rate options in 2011. This review sought to:

- investigate the land tax remission scheme which provides concessions to ratepayers;
- review the recommended outcomes of the 2006 state government select committee report investigating the collection of property taxes by state and local government including sewerage charges by SA Water;
- trend mapping of the cost of living from 2002 to 2015 and provide the net present and future value of \$190 in 2002 to 2015; and
- the resultant impacts and relativity of the \$190 over time on low and fixed income earners.

Recommendations within the report included:

- a rise in the maximum concession to pensioners and low income households as the real value of the \$190 available has significantly eroded since 2002. This would require amendments to the Rates and Land Tax Remission Regulations 2009 under the Rates and Land Tax Remission Act 1986;
- providing more flexible payment arrangements for council rates to spread the lumpy nature of council rate payments;
- increase promotion of the measures which allow seniors to postpone most of their council rates; and
- advocate for a review of the Australian concessions system to be carried out by the Productivity Commission, as recommended by the Henry Report.

The SACES report also suggested that one basis for determining the level in the rise of concession rates would be the change in the Adelaide CPI since 2002. This methodology would simply imply a

maximum concession of approximately \$252 in 2012-13—and that is a far increase, even though it is not dramatic, of \$62 compared to what is currently being paid.

While such a rise would not compensate for the level of real rate increases over this period, doing so would leave room for discretion at the council level in terms of providing additional support for ratepayers. Analysis undertaken by SACES on the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey also indicates that, while the concession for pensioners is relatively well targeted, the concession for people who qualify on the basis of their state Seniors Card eligibility performs poorly. Households who qualify for the \$100 concession were found to have a mean equivalised gross household income above the average for all households in South Australia and well above the average for households who qualify for the \$190 concession.

It is suggested that any increase in the rates concession should consequently focus on the \$190 concession for pensioners and other Centrelink beneficiaries on low incomes. I also understand that in this report a survey was carried out by Onkaparinga council in 2008-09, which stated that approximately 21 per cent of the 67 councils contacted provided some form of additional consideration for pensioners, but all this does is either mean that others need to pay for the shortfall, or there is a reduced service that the council can provide.

I further understand that copies of this report have previously been provided to all councils throughout South Australia and also to the then treasurer Hon. Jack Snelling, the then minister for state/local government relations Hon. Russell Wortley, and the then minister for communities and social inclusion Hon. Ian Hunter. I ask: has this been progressed to any degree?

As we are aware, most councils calculate their rates on the capital value of properties, and these capital values are independently assessed by the Valuer-General which, I believe, and I think everybody else agrees, is the way to go. However, these values are book figures only, they do not give any increased monetary gain in daily terms to the pensioners who own these houses. The councils will set the cents in the dollar on the capital values for all residences across their council areas and apply the final rate on the ever-increasing capital value. I question how the pensioner affords to pay for these increases which are forced upon them without any extra income or rebates being allowed to offset this?

I might also add that not only are council rates based on capital values but also other government charges including SA Water sewerage rates and such like. Lastly, I note that during the 2005 parliamentary session, a select committee was established by the Legislative Council to inquire into 'all matters relating to the issue of collection of property taxes by state and local government'. During the 51st session of parliament, this select committee was re-established, and towards the end of the 51st session of parliament the committee issued an interim report.

The 52nd parliament has not re-established this committee, therefore, the select committee has only summarised the process of the original select committee but has not presented any analysis or conclusions. Where is this process going? Why have a select committee if it does not have a final report with recommendations? I think if we are going to do these things, we need to have some outcome and, if the outcome is not there, we should not have these select committees.

I wholeheartedly support the LGA's lobbying for such an increase and this motion seeks to investigate this. The October 2011 South Australian Council of Social Service (SACOSS) Cost of Living Summit Post-Summit Report states:

Utilities such as electricity, gas, water and sewerage are an essential household cost, but price rises over the last 10 years have meant that they are also one of the key drivers of cost of living pressures. This is particularly the case for low income households for whom utilities form a much greater proportion of household expenditure.

In this report on page 6, table 5, it states that utilities increases over the last 10 years for the following were: electricity, 137.1 per cent; gas, 100.3 per cent; water, 114.4 per cent; utilities, 124 per cent; and CPI, all groups, 33.3 per cent. The ABS 2003-04 Household Expenditure Survey states:

Indicators of financial stress occurred in greater proportions among low economic resources households than other households in 2003-04. For example, 38% of low economic resources households reported that within the last 12 months they could not pay utility bills on time and 26% had sought financial assistance from friends or family [or NGOs] while for other households the proportions were 11% and 8%...

The same report went on to say:

Going without meals in the last 12 months due to a shortage of money was experienced by 12% of low economic resources households, compared with 2% among all other households.

As can be seen, expenditure outside of the control of pensioners has risen dramatically, and these costs, together with the ever increasing council rates, are causing greater financial distress for those people on pensions on low fixed incomes.

When I first mentioned my intentions to members on both sides, the first question I was asked was: what is the effect going to be on the budget? It is a relevant question, but at the same time, I say let us be compassionate and at least review the current system. The current system, as with any other system, needs to be reviewed on a regular basis. To have no review for the last 10 years and one in the last 23 years prior to that begs the question. I strongly request that the state government and my fellow parliamentary colleagues support a review into this area. Let us look at how we can try to assist the less fortunate in our communities.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

PAROLE LAWS AND PRACTICES

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:47): I move:

That this house requests the state government to conduct a review of the laws and practices relating to parole.

Obviously, I would not be calling for a review if I thought I had the details and answers relating to this issue. We have a select committee (which I chair) which is looking at the causes of crime and anti-social behaviour, and how to deal with that, but realistically, I do not believe that select committee will have enough time to look at the specific aspect of parole.

I want to say at the outset that what I am doing here is not a criticism of the Parole Board or its chair, Frances Nelson QC, but I think that—and I note the point just made by the member for Frome in relation to that patient assistance scheme—government programs should be reviewed frequently, and I think it is time that the parole system in South Australia was looked at closely. I can only touch on a few points here.

What prompted my particular interest was what happened in Victoria following the tragic murder of Jill Meagher. It was revealed that they had an inquiry into the parole system, and there was some criticism of the parole organisation there and its staff. But, in fairness to them, they were dealing with something like 10,000 cases a year and had their staff reduced, and there was no way in the world that they could possibly give that important issue their full attention—with 10,000 cases a year and reduced staffing, it is not possible.

There was argument about whether Jill Meagher would have been murdered if the parole situation was different. If you look at that particular murderer, he had a track record of doing horrendous things. If he did not commit a serious crime at that particular point in time involving Jill Meagher, there was a good chance he would have, even when his parole had been completed.

I will just state a few basic facts about the Parole Board and, as I say, this is not a criticism of them. The Parole Board is an independent statutory body, established in 1970. Its role is to assess the risk and determine whether to grant, deny, terminate or revoke parole and to set appropriate conditions for parole release. It has nine members, including a chairperson. It has people from various backgrounds—a former police officer, a person of Aboriginal descent, a qualified social worker, and so the list goes on.

As I said, it has a range of functions, and this is a very demanding task—to consider applications for release on parole from prisoners serving sentences of five years or more, consider applications from prisoners sentenced to life imprisonment and whether or not to make a recommendation to the Governor in Executive Council for release on parole. I will just dwell on that point for a moment. I do not believe it is appropriate for politicians, at any level, to be involved or have a say in whether or not someone is granted parole or released. I will give an example. It is not quite in the category of parole but it does impact on this issue of MPs getting involved in the administration of justice.

It happened to someone from my area, Hawthorndene, before I was born. This particular person was described by locals as 'simple'. In today's terminology, we would say 'intellectually challenged' or 'disadvantaged'. That person was convicted of a murder, which is a serious crime. The judge and jury recommended mercy but the politicians of the day, through Executive Council, decided that that person should be hanged, and he was. That is just one example of where politicians get involved in deciding outcomes. I question the desirability of Executive Council interfering in the parole system.

If someone has been before the court, has been punished and the Parole Board (which is set up as an independent body) believes that person is able to enter the community again, then I do not think it is up to politicians to interfere with that. We have seen quite a bit of that in recent years where there is almost a competition, if you like, to see how tough the government can be in respect of someone who is coming to the end of their sentence, usually for murder. I do not think it is a good practice and I think that is one aspect of the current arrangements that really needs to be looked at and, I believe, removed.

The challenges facing the Parole Board, as I say, are enormous. They can only do the job if they have sufficient staff. Accordingly, I wrote recently to the Minister for Correctional Services (Hon. Michael O'Brien), whom I regard as a very good minister, but I got a letter this morning in answer to that question which raises some concerns for me. In fairness, I will quote the key paragraphs. He says, 'Thank you for your correspondence,' and then goes on:

Community corrections officers working within the department's various community correctional centres undertake a number of roles including, but not limited to, the supervision of parolees. For instance, they may also be responsible for the management of offenders under supervision for a number of other community based sanctions such as home detention, intensive bail, bail, community service, suspended sentences, and those being supervised in relation to mental impairment orders (on licence).

This is the sentence that I found quite concerning:

Given these factors, it is not possible to provide specific details regarding case loads for parole officers and how many parole officers are employed by the department.

Obviously, this would have been prepared for the minister. What the department is saying is that it does not know how many parole officers are employed in the department: that does raise some concerns. As I say, the minister qualified, prior to that sentence, by saying that they were engaged in a range of activities, but one would assume that the Department for Correctional Services would know how many parole officers it employed. That is a matter I will follow up with the minister, but I find that somewhat concerning.

The fundamental responsibility, I guess, of the Parole Board, as indicated earlier, is to ensure that the community, as far as possible, is protected and that people are not released who may pose a threat to society. That raises a whole lot of related issues. One is that our system of justice has an element of punishment, and one understands that. The separation from the community is meant to be the punishment. There are not meant to be other punishments on top of that. Your loss of liberty is your punishment. There are a lot of people who want revenge in a range of ways, but that is not what our system is about, or should be about.

Currently, our prison population—this is the latest advice from the head of corrections a month or so ago—70 per cent of inmates are functionally illiterate, they do not have basic literacy competencies, so one would question how these people could possibly gain meaningful employment. It will not be easy for them. One would hope and expect that whilst these people were incarcerated they would improve their literacy, numeracy and other related skills. That is happening to a certain extent. I notice in the annual report from the Department for Correctional Services, the percentage of inmates undertaking educational programs has increased in recent times, something in the order of about 60 per cent to 66 per cent, and that is just going on memory.

The emphasis on rehabilitation needs to be strengthened. We have programs for sex offenders. The Mount Gambier prison seems to be the place where most of them are incarcerated, and there are over 100 of them down there, but there are issues in relation to the rehabilitation these people undertake before they are released into the community. Some of these prisoners correspond with me. I do not condone what they have done, but I think it is worth listening to what they say about the system. They indicate to me that there are a range of issues with the availability of programs, sexual behaviour programs, that might help them change their behaviour, and I think that is something that needs to be looked at.

In Western Australia it is possible for a sex offender to be on a special program. Some people use the term chemical castration, but it is a hormonal-type program to reduce the risk of reoffending. I do not believe that is offered in South Australia, if it is I am not able to find out about it, but I think that is just one example of the whole parole system, the rehabilitation and so on, that needs to be looked at. There are very strict conditions in Western Australia for people who want to access that chemical treatment so that they are less likely to reoffend.

South Australia has quite a good record in terms of recidivism, good in the sense of less released prisoners reoffending, but there is still a challenge to improve on that. I do not want to

transgress into what the select committee is doing, but one of the main focal points needs to be on reducing the number of people who are being incarcerated through a range of measures, and that will be canvassed by the select committee in its report.

I will just come back to this point about the involvement of the Executive Council. I am told by people that there are prisoners who have served their complete time but still have to wait for Executive Council to sign off. One example I am aware of involves a chap who murdered his wife because she was having a sexual relationship with some bloke. I do not condone what he did. He served 25 years and has been a model prisoner but, despite recommendations from the Parole Board that he be released, as far as I know he is still incarcerated.

Where the process becomes a little bit off key is that he was required to do a course on how to respect women. Well, killing his wife on the spur of the moment, apparently, I do not consider is related in any specific sense to respect for women. It was anger, hostility, directed at his wife because, I guess, in his view she was unfaithful to him. As I say, I do not condone what he did. We have this anomaly once again of waiting on politicians to decide whether someone who has served a very long sentence, who has been a model prisoner and done all the things that have been required whilst in prison, still languishes there simply because we have this political interference arrangement.

Mr Pengilly: That was Rann.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Well, it still exists, it exists right at this very moment. I know that we are going to be leading up to an election—we all know that—and I trust that we do not get into an auction about who can be tough on crime. What we need is to be effective in relation to crime, particularly to reduce the incidence.

I put this motion up, but I do not have all the answers, and I am not in a position to have all the answers. What I am urging the government to do is get some highly qualified, appropriately qualified person to have a look at the parole system—is it the best that it can be, can it be improved?—and have a look in particular at the involvement of politicians in the process, especially for those who have served a life sentence.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (12:02): I rise to indicate that the government and I support this excellent motion from the member for Fisher. The member for Fisher initially referred to recent events in Victoria, and members will be aware that in May 2013 the Victorian government commissioned former High Court Justice Ian Callinan to carry out a review of the adult parole board's operations in that state. Mr Callinan completed his review and provided his report to the Victorian government in August. The report contains 23 measures, many of which the Victorian government has already commenced to implement through administrative or legislative changes.

The South Australian government resolved in September to examine the Callinan review to see if there were any recommendations that are applicable to the parole system in South Australia. The government is undertaking an internal review and a comparative analysis of the parole process in South Australia. This review will include a brief discussion paper that hopes to address the following: a distillation of the major themes identified by Mr Callinan and their relationship to his conclusion and recommendations, and a comparative analysis with the legislative and practice framework within which the South Australian parole system and the Parole Board operates. This may include interaction between the board, Correctional Services, SAPOL, and the broader criminal justice system.

The government intends to use this opportunity to identify areas for potential improvement. The government has confidence in the South Australian Parole Board and believes that many of the issues identified in Victoria are simply not applicable here. However, community safety is a paramount consideration, and for this reason we are committed to constantly evaluating the laws and practices relating to parole, and for that reason the government supports the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

PATIENT ASSISTANCE TRANSPORT SCHEME

Mr BROCK (Frome) (12:04): By leave, I move my motion in amended form:

That this house strongly urges the state government to undertake a complete review of the current Patient Assistance Transport Scheme (PATS) to ensure that the budget ensures that the level of reimbursement for rural patients is relevant to today's cost of living and that persons requiring to attend specialist services that are not available within their own location are not disadvantaged, as is the case under the current system.

Before I speak, I understand that since I put this on the *Notice Paper* the state government has instigated a review. I congratulate the government on doing that before we debate it in this house, and I am very thankful. However, I would also acknowledge that the introduction of the PAT Scheme was a great initiative when it was first introduced, and it has certainly assisted rural patients to be able to afford to visit the required specialist services in Adelaide that may not be available at rural hospitals.

At the time of the introduction, the amount able to be claimed was realistic to the cost of living; however, the cost of living—in particular, the cost of utilities and also council rates—has increased dramatically and the reimbursement has now lost the desired effect. I might add that, from my understanding, the scheme is available to all South Australians who reside within the distance required under the conditions of the scheme, irrespective of any income.

The previous review of the PAT Scheme, which was conducted in 2011, was a review of the administrative process to enable clients using the scheme to have easier access to application forms and quicker turnaround rebate times, which is arguably still not happening in many instances. A few of the other so-called benefits were also introduced as a result of that review but nothing tangible that will assist rural people to pay for their medical needs.

Recently, a constituent reported to my office that he now has to pay up-front for bus fares and accommodation and then send the receipts to PATS, waiting from four to six weeks for his rebate. This constituent is his wife's carer, and they have to travel to Adelaide regularly for her appointments. He told me that it is making it very difficult for them, on top of all the increases in power and water they have to pay. In October 2011, the South Australian Council of Social Service's 'Cost of living summit: post-summit report' stated:

Utilities such as electricity, gas, water and sewerage are an essential household cost, but price rises over the last 10 years have meant that they are also one of the key drivers of cost of living pressures. This is particularly the case for low income households for whom utilities form a much greater proportion of household expenditure.

In this report, on page 6, table 5, it was stated that utilities increases over the last 10 years for the following were: electricity, 137.1 per cent; gas, 100.3 per cent; water, 114.4 per cent; utilities, 124 per cent; and CPI, all groups, 33.3 per cent. These increases have hit the less fortunate very hard and yet the costs of the reimbursement have remained constant for the last 11 years. I ask: is this fair?

This report came out at the end of 2011, and these same utilities that were spoken of have increased enormously over the past two years, as we are all aware. The ABS 2003-04 Household Expenditure Survey states:

Indicators of financial stress occurred in greater proportions among low economic resources households than other households in 2003-04. For example, 38% of low economic resources households reported that within the last 12 months they could not pay utility bills on time and 26% had sought financial assistance from friends or family [or NGOs], while for other households the proportions were 11% and 8% respectively.

The same report went on to say:

Going without meals in the last 12 months due to a shortage of money was experienced by 12% of low economic [resource people], compared with 2% among all other households.

Fast forward nine years and many of my constituents report to me that they are in the very same position, and they have this added burden of having to travel to Adelaide regularly to attend specialist appointments that are not available in Port Pirie, Clare or other regional hospitals and trying to pay for the cost of their health care.

I would add that I am very grateful, as are the people in my electorate of Frome, for the extra services, particularly chemotherapy beds and the dialysis chairs at Port Pirie and Clare; however, there are still numerous services that are only available in Adelaide. The biggest issue with PATS is the amounts of rebates paid: the fact that people have to pay for the first \$30 of any claim and what is not covered. Access and equity should be the key points of this scheme.

I know the government may say that \$30 is equitable to what people would have to pay if they lived inside the 100-kilometre radius from the place of appointment, but what is not equitable is that people living in Adelaide or towns where treatment is available pay very little, if anything, to attend these appointments, and this in itself is not equitable. Why must there be a 100-kilometre distance travelled limitation? I certainly am not advocating that this 100-kilometre distance be increased.

Since PATS was introduced in 2001, the fuel subsidy has not increased and the scheme users are still being paid a rebate of 16¢ a kilometre, but in fact unleaded petrol has increased by an average of 72.4 per cent in rural areas across South Australia from 2001 to 2012. This information came from the Australian Automobile Association. Once again, it is a question of equity. In addition to this increase in fuel costs, general cost of living expenses continue to surpass all concessions and rebates, including the PATS rebates, and therefore these erode in value over time. So, the gesture of the PATS reimbursements ends up being negligible. I hark back to October 2011 with the SACOSS Cost Of Living Summit report that I mentioned earlier. It states:

...health expenditure can be a real challenge—with the real danger that those without sufficient income simply miss out on services. For some people, such as these with chronic illness, the cost of allied health services can be as crippling as the cost of direct health care.

It is my opinion that the limitation of claims for reimbursement from the PATS is ridiculous; so many procedures cannot be claimed for, including specialist dental treatment, specialist sport treatment and allied health procedures, such as assistance from dieticians and physiotherapy. Many of these specialist procedures are not available in rural areas or there are lengthy delays to get an appointment, and this is not beneficial to patients who have urgent medical needs.

Quite often, there are specialists who visit regional areas but a patient cannot get an appointment for six months or more, and the patient cannot claim for the PATS rebate because they choose to attend an earlier appointment in Adelaide. Or, if a person has had a previous procedure done in Adelaide, they cannot claim the PATS rebate for the continuation of the treatment appointments with that particular doctor if a specialist of that field visits the area they live, even though it may not be their treating doctor.

This is a bone of contention, especially with one of the organisations which has various specialists who, when they go to the country, are coming out for individuals, not as a doctor treating any general person who has visited one of the previous doctors there. Once again, this is an issue of access and equity.

It is a well-known fact that the most vulnerable and disadvantaged people who are on low or limited incomes are also, for the most part, more likely to suffer from ill-health and require specialist or hospital treatments that are not generally available in rural areas, which gives them no option but to travel to attend appointments in Adelaide. People who find themselves in a situation where they have to travel to Adelaide for specialist or hospital treatments that are not available to them at their local hospitals or medical practices quite often defer treatment because they simply cannot afford to travel.

I know people who have been asked to go to talk to a specialist in Adelaide and they have had to save up two or three pensions to ensure they have enough money to be able to have that pre-treatment. Those same people ultimately end up being a bigger drain on the healthcare system because they end up being admitted to hospital.

I have said to the current Minister for Health, 'Prevention is better than cure.' If you allow a person to go down and receive preventative medication and treatment, then that person does not have to go into the hospital system. For example, the \$150 allowance is not any great financial drain on their budget and it is far cheaper than having somebody in the hospital system where it costs about \$1,000 a day, and again, it is an impost which I believe is false. I know it comes out of another budget, but the point is we need to prevent these things from happening.

I strongly suggest that prevention or early diagnosis would save SA Health in hospitalisation costs. As I said earlier, there is an old saying that prevention is better than cure. The SACOSS report mentioned previously states:

There is growing anecdotal evidence that points to an increasing number of people on low and middle incomes deciding either to not seek needed medical care because of co-payment requirements at local surgeries, or not filling prescriptions in order to have money to pay for other essential services.

I would go further and say that, if the PATS rebates did cover the cost of people having to travel to get medical assistance, more people would do so and health costs would not increase: quite the opposite, in fact. By keeping people healthy and out of hospital, this state government and the new government coming in, whoever it may be, would face far less impost and financial burden.

Again, I welcome the current review, but I call on this government to play fair and make the health system accessible and equitable by giving rural people reasonable rebates through the PAT Scheme. Everyone, regardless of where they choose to live, should be entitled to basic levels of living standards, and this includes the provision of timely and cost-effective health care.

I strongly recommend to this government that the review that is being carried out look at increasing the rebates for fuel and accommodation and deleting the co-payment for treatment, to ensure that this scheme is targeted to rural patients who need it most and that the level of assistance is relevant to today's cost of living.

In closing, I again thank the Minister for Health for arranging the current review. I have had a great response from constituents in my electorate. Dr David Filby, who is undertaking the review, came into my electorate and we held public forums in Clare and Port Pirie with relevant key stakeholders, which gave him a better understanding of the issues. We were able to put facts and figures directly to him.

Those people have put in submissions, and I encourage everybody else to put submissions in, because if you do not put a submission in and do not argue about it then the government of the day will say that there are no issues. I strongly recommend that the review come out positive for constituents.

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (12:17): I certainly have supported the government in conducting this review that is in the process of being done by Dr Filby. We must bear in mind that, when Dr Filby started this review, he was looking into all the different issues that embrace the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme.

The consultation paper that he put out did not make any recommendations whatsoever. It basically addressed all the different ways that perhaps we could make the scheme work better and sought public comment so that, when he does finalise that review later in the year, there will be recommendations in that review.

On the review itself, I would not support making the distance greater than 100 kilometres. I do not agree with that at all. I also do not support having a means test for PATS, because probably the only way you could do that is by those people who are cardholders and there are a lot of people in rural communities who are not cardholders but are in need when it comes to health issues. They may have to travel and often there will be families who may have to travel, and it can put them in great financial difficulty at a time when they do not need that, so I would not support any means test.

I do support the fact that there has to be a better system of administration in place for the PAT Scheme. I also feel that there should be a more succinct and better system for pre-paying those people who do not have the money to pay for an airfare from Mount Gambier, for example, which will cost anything up to \$600 return. They just do not have that money. In talking to the financial counsellors, I am sure that a system could put in place that would work well where those people working in with the PATS administration would basically be able to say yes or no straightaway and make it much easier for them.

I have always felt that when the PAT Scheme originally came in CPI should have been attached to it. I do note that when the electoral funding bill went through this house, where the political parties would stand to gain substantially, they had no problem putting CPI on that, and there were many millions of dollars involved there. PATS costs about \$8 million a year out of a \$5,000 million health budget and I am sure that just a small increase on that \$8 million would make a big difference for a lot of people out in the rural areas.

There are quite a few anomalies with carers. When somebody brings a person up to Adelaide they are reimbursed for their accommodation that night. They go to the doctor the next day and then if he puts that person straight into hospital, that carer cannot necessarily be reimbursed for the accommodation that night. Of course more often than not, people have to come up here the day before and go home perhaps the day after seeing their doctor. That puts greater extra costs on those people because it is impossible to find accommodation for \$30 a day.

I think there should be a proper comparison with the schemes in the other states. We also have to be careful in doing that because if you look at Victoria (and a lot of our people go to Victoria for medical procedures) the health services in regional Victoria are a hell of a lot better than what we have in regional South Australia. That means that most of those people in regional Victoria do not have to travel anywhere near as much as people in regional South Australia. That does happen a bit because of the density of population but if you look at the services in south-west Victoria compared to the south-east of South Australia, the difference in population is something like 102,000:64,000, yet the health services in Victoria leave us for dead.

To give you an example: south-west Victoria has up to 10 resident psychiatrists and south-east South Australia has none. That is a mere example. They have MRI machines and many other services that we do not have in the South-East, so not only do I want to see the PATS being much fairer on country people, but I also want to see better health services in the country.

One of the other problems they have with the PAT Scheme is the fact that you basically have to fill out three forms whenever you wish to make a claim. Often there are people who have to come up here in the course of treatment over many weeks. They have to put a separate claim in every time they come with those three forms for each claim. That seems ridiculous to me and I am sure that that could be fixed. Of course there is the limitation on the types of claims where no dental services are covered and many other different types of services, so I think we have to look at that.

The PAT Scheme is certainly a good scheme in that it does help country people seek out those services and reimburses them a bit, but I am sure that if the reimbursement was more, many of our country people would have their health issues looked at at an earlier stage and perhaps save the state and those people more money. I welcome this review and I would ask everybody to look at the review in the first stage as opening up all the issues that are covered under PATS.

If there are any other issues, I am sure Dr Filby will look into those, and I look forward to seeing the end result of the review. But I must say that I feel that there is going to have to be more money put into the PAT Scheme, and perhaps if we went back to when the PAT Scheme started and attached CPI to that, it would make it much fairer for everybody.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:25): I would like to move to amend the motion, as follows:

After the words 'to ensure'—Delete the words 'that the budget ensures'.

The motion would thus read:

That this house strongly urges the state government to undertake a complete review of the current Patient Assistance Transport Scheme (PATS) to ensure that the level of reimbursement for rural patients is relevant to today's cost of living and that persons requiring to attend specialist services that are not available within their own location are not disadvantaged, as in the case under the current system.

I commend the member for Frome for putting this forward. People might wonder why, given that I have an urban electorate—or it is mainly urban. I have a beautiful piece of rural South Australia around the Clarendon area but, overwhelmingly my electorate is urban. We represent all regions in this place—we are the Parliament of South Australia, not just the parliament of the city—and I strongly believe that we should have a charter, or something along those lines, to ensure that people, as far as humanly possible and irrespective of where they live in South Australia or what they do, are entitled to good health care and education, and so on.

There is a parallel in Victoria where, with all legislation that is adopted, they ensure it meets what is called a charter of human rights. What I am suggesting is not quite the same but something that would be a benchmark to ensure that people who live outside of Adelaide, for example, are not disadvantaged in respect of health care, education and so on. I have had some direct experience in this issue as an ambassador for men's health, in particular prostate cancer.

I was in the Riverland, in the member for Chaffey's area some time back, and one of the issues that was reported to me was that people who had cancer had to travel to Adelaide for treatment because of some of the specialised technology. That may have been corrected in recent times in terms of new equipment and additional equipment in the Riverland and elsewhere, but I think there are still a lot of country people who have the disadvantage of not having ready access to the most sophisticated technologies in medicine and so on, and I think they should.

I do not think it is asking too much that the community have regard for people who live outside the metropolitan area. If you have something like cancer you do not want to burden the person and their family and carers with added concerns about the cost of travel and having the treatment in a major centre and so on, so that does need to be addressed.

The system needs to be something that is available to everyone. I do not believe you need to means test something like this. I think basic health services are right. We know that people in country areas tend to have poorer health outcomes than people in the city. We know that in respect of a lot of cancers people in country areas do not have as good an outcome as people in the city, so any system that can help people access the most advanced medical treatment or the relevant treatment, then I am all for it.

In relation to the other point made by the member for Mount Gambier, I think a transport scheme is good. The other thing is having the specialist services and latest medical technology available locally as much as possible, certainly in regional centres. I support this motion and, of course, I support my amendment.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12:29): By leave, I move to amend the motion, as follows:

Insert 'more' between 'is' and 'relevant' in line 3 and delete all words after 'are' in line 5 and replace with 'provided with greater levels of assistance.'

The amended motion would read:

That this house strongly urges the state government undertake a complete review of the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme (PATS) to ensure that the low level of current reimbursement for rural patients is more relevant to today's costs of living and that persons requiring to attend specialist services that are not available within their location are provided with greater levels of assistance.

The PATS is a vital scheme for many people in rural South Australia who have to attend specialist medical services right across the state, whether they are coming to Adelaide or going to a major regional centre. For many people, the cost of getting there and the time involved in getting there is a severe impediment to receiving prompt and top-level health care.

The cost of running a car nowadays is something we all need to be aware of. According to the RAA website, the cost of running a Commodore is around 85¢ per kilometre, a Toyota Camry is around 75¢ per kilometre, and a diesel Cruze is around 64¢ per kilometre, so the money that is being paid at the moment is less than the running costs. People are obviously being expected to pay for their own health and welfare. We all have to travel to hospitals and doctors in the metropolitan area, but when you have to travel hundreds of kilometres, sometimes several times a week for many visits, those costs can mount up.

Money that could be spent on primary health care (in other words, better nutrition, paying power bills, having heating and cooling on, looking after yourself and generally staying fit) is sometimes consumed in collateral damage, these collateral costs of getting to see a health practitioner. Of course, when you have to stay in Adelaide or a regional town away from your home overnight, the costs of staying in a hotel or motel are considerable, and the money that is paid under PATS is a fraction of the real cost.

There is a genuine, serious issue here. We do not want anybody in South Australia to be disadvantaged. We have a health system that is offering the very highest level of modern health care in South Australia. The demand is huge, and the way it is being managed by this government certainly leaves a lot to be desired, and the costs are blowing out in many areas. But the costs that should not be blowing out are for people having to access health care for themselves or their families.

This motion is one that we can support in its amended form. The government is undertaking a review; we look forward to the outcome of that review. I hope that the sentiments reflected in the amended motion I have just moved are fulfilled by the government's review. I know my country colleagues will certainly have something to say about their experiences. Their constituents are all involved in accessing regional health care and having to travel, so I look forward to listening to their contributions about this.

In the last state election, the Liberal Party did commit an extra \$4 million over four years, as well as promising an immediate review then. I will be interested to see what the state government comes up with; we have had the review, but will they put their money where their mouth is for the sake of South Australians? As we all know, South Australia does not end at the tollgate, Gepps Cross or the top of Tapleys Hill Road; it is a much bigger state than that. It is a wonderful state, and all South Australians should benefit from the opportunities they have to access health care in this state, and not be penalised by the cost of travel or accommodation.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:34): I, too, rise to speak on this important motion that the member for Frome has brought forward. I also am pleased to follow the member for Morphett who, leading to the last state election, was the opposition's shadow spokesperson for health and one of the key people involved in our policy that would have put an additional \$4 million over this term—\$1 million a year extra—into PATS if we had been elected. While I understand exactly why the member for Frome is bringing this forward, it is a bit unfortunate that he even needs to bring it forward because, if we happened to be in government at the moment, it would have already been taken care of. This is a very important issue.

Health issues are indiscriminate in regard to who they affect. It does not matter whether you are male or female, young or old, wealthy or poor, Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal, whatever you like. Unfortunately, you can be faced with very difficult health issues. If you happen to live away from specialist care that is necessary to treat those health issues, then you are disadvantaged, and the heart of the PAT Scheme is to try to contribute to reducing that disadvantage. It is an exceptionally important scheme to people in regional South Australia because there are none of us who have not either been affected with poor health requiring specialist treatment ourselves or who do not have close friends or family members in exactly that situation, and then we are affected indirectly but very meaningfully.

In regard to this motion, as members would know, there is also an inquiry looking into this issue at the moment and I, like some of my colleagues, have already made a submission to that inquiry. I also ask the house to consider a speech that I made here on 22 July 2010 on exactly this matter. This is a very important issue affecting the people of Stuart and other country areas of the state. I will not go over all the things in my submission and all the things that I said back in July 2010 because they are already on the record. Unfortunately, they have not been addressed yet by this government. They have not changed.

One thing that has changed, though, is that the government has directed the officers who oversee the payment of money to patients under the PAT Scheme not to reimburse expenses for accommodation for a carer accompanying a patient to hospital in a situation when the patient is in hospital for a few days, the carer has to come down to look after that person but, of course, the carer needs accommodation outside of hospital. The government has directed the people who oversee the PAT Scheme not to reimburse the carer's accommodation, even when the medical specialist has requested that the carer accompanies the patient.

Even when it is in writing that the medical specialist has said, 'I know you will be in hospital and I know your carer will spend most of his or her time with you in hospital but will have to stay overnight somewhere else, I would still like them to come and accompany you,' the government has said, 'Do not reimburse that carer's accommodation.' That is a change the government has made in the last few years, and that is a very unfortunate change.

Country people appreciate the support they get, but let's be quite clear: \$30 does not go very far for a night's accommodation in Adelaide. Even for the cheapest budget accommodation you can find it does not go very far, but country people still appreciate some contribution compared to what may be two or three times that in a really stock standard motel.

Country people really do appreciate the 16¢ they get per kilometre contribution to their travelling cost, even though anybody doing it for business (including any government employees who might happen to use their personal car for work use) will actually be reimbursed by the ATO at 72¢ or 73¢ a kilometre. They still appreciate the fact that they are getting a 16¢ contribution. They are glad to get whatever they can get towards the cost that the household is incurring when they have a seriously sick person.

What this is all about at the moment is the fact that it has not increased at all. It is an unacceptably low contribution, as costs have gone up and up, particularly fuel costs for country people. You get an advantage when you drive down to Adelaide in that you can fill up on some cheaper fuel, but you have to fill up at home before you go. The cost of country fuel has gone up enormously in the last few years. The cost of city fuel has gone up as well, but not to the same extent. People really do need this support.

I think it is also very important to consider what other areas of care PATS might be able to cover that it does not cover at the moment. I would suggest that the cost of dental care should be considered, not necessarily specialist, high level care as it applies via specialist treatment to medical care, but I think it would be very worthwhile for the government to consider whether if you live more than 100 kilometres away from a practising dentist that perhaps you could access some PATS support so that you can get to your regular dental check-ups, because we all know that if you do not get to your regular dental check-ups your dental health will deteriorate significantly and that will have a very significant impact on your health more broadly.

We now know that there is a very strong link between dental health and heart disease, and that is a concerning issue—alarming, surprising, I would not have guessed it, but it is true. So, I think that is a very important thing that the government could consider. Unfortunately, there are a lot of people who, if they live more than 100 kilometres away from a dental practice, just will not go. That is particularly concerning when it comes to their kids. If they do not have regular check-ups for

their kids' dental health then those kids are quite likely to be set up for poor health in a wide range of ways throughout the rest of their lives. So, I would like the government, as part of this review, to consider that very seriously.

I am also reminded of the fact that two years ago the government guaranteed me and guaranteed this house that it would do a complete review of country health via the Social Development Committee, a standing committee of parliament. It has not honoured that commitment. It is exceptionally disappointing that that has not been honoured because this exact issue could have been dealt with two years ago if it had kept that commitment.

Minister Hill (at the time) said that he was more than happy to do it. In fact, we actually sat down together and developed the terms of reference—I put some draft terms of reference to him, he made some suggested changes, which I agreed to, both our parties agreed to them, we put it forward and he said, 'I have no fear of this country health inquiry,' and yet the government has not honoured that commitment.

So, I guess I am very cautious when I deal with the government on country health issues. I am pleased that the inquiry into PATS has been established. I have put a submission on behalf of the people of Stuart to Dr Filby, who is undertaking the inquiry. I encourage all members of parliament with an interest in country matters and in health in general to put a submission forward to that inquiry, because it is a very important issue.

This is not an issue of choice. This is not about: do you want to come down to Adelaide to see a Crows or Port Adelaide football match? This is not about: is there a test on? Would you like to come down? Can you afford it? Have you got friends to stay with? This is about your health. This is about specialist health. This is about a necessity to see a specialist more than 100 kilometres away from where you live, who typically is in Adelaide.

It is about the fact that you cannot avoid it. It is about the fact that you may be any person from any walk of life in country South Australia and need to do that. It is about people getting a fair contribution from the government towards the costs they incur when they do that. I wholeheartedly support the fact that the upper house has established this committee, and I wholeheartedly urge the government to take this issue very seriously.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:45): I would also like to say a few words about this particular motion. The issue of PATS is a critical issue in my electorate, and it extends to both sides of the water. The distance is an important issue for people on the Fleurieu because some of them fall within the boundaries and others are just out of it. The ridiculous part is that if some of them drive on one particular road they qualify, but if they drive on another road they do not. That is how silly it is. However, I am more concerned about the management, or the mechanics, of how this PAT Scheme is put into operation. I say that because if, for example, you live in the electorates of the members for Giles, Stuart, or Flinders, or you are well over 100 kilometres from Adelaide, generally speaking you do not have much choice but to drive unless you are able to fly.

To the best of my knowledge—and I will stand corrected, if necessary—there has been no query of PATS claims on the road for those who choose to drive over and back. Yet, in my electorate, over on Kangaroo Island, the people who need to use the PAT system for transport are regularly getting done over by the bureaucrats in the health system over their period of travel. It is necessary on occasions for them to come up the night before on the boat or the plane—and they only get a limited fee on the plane, and I can understand that—but they are then queried. If they wish to stay longer than the day because they are required to have treatment, they are then taken to task and told, no, they must return that day or whatever. Whereas, if you drive no one really knows when you come over all go back.

I am not suggesting that people would put down the dates on the mileage claim to suit themselves, but I have ample evidence—and this is an issue that regularly comes through my door—that island residents in particular are taken to task if they choose to stay for a day or two, or three, longer than the period, because they only have the ferry to go on, or the plane, and it is an opportunity sometimes just to stay over. It is not used as a reason to go on a month's holiday or anything else. That is an issue about which I have written to Dr Filby—of blessed memory from his former days in the health commission, and from memory he disappeared in late 1993, so it is interesting to see he has been resuscitated by the Labor government to undertake this review at the moment. We will see what comes out of that.

Any attempt, in my view, to extend the distance required over 100 kilometres is blatant discrimination against country people. As the member for Stuart broadly said, you never know who

is going to get ill and it does not matter who you are—I'm not feeling too toffee today myself, actually. You do not know who is going to be ill and who is going to have to come to the metropolitan area for specialised treatment. Although in many areas of regional South Australia we are able to undertake a range of medical procedures and investigations, it is quite clear—and it is not only in South Australia—that the metropolitan areas and the capitals are where the vast majority of the medicos are, and that for intensive investigation and treatment you have to go to, in this case, Adelaide. I am hoping that this is investigated fully.

As I said, I get a bit fed up—and I am sure other rural members do as well—with country people being discriminated against by the powers that be in metropolitan areas. I think this is one of the sad reflections on what is becoming a grubbier and grubbier government, after reading the paper today. I think the centralisation, in true Bolshevik fashion, of the education department and health in particular has pushed all these decision-makers into the city and taken everything away from the regions.

I am hoping that, in this particular case, there might be a bit of fairness given to rural people. Rural people do not look for handouts, and governing, at all levels of government, is about what people need rather than what people want. There has to be a balance struck in difficult financial times. I would suggest that, once again, it will be difficult to see what comes out of this particular review, but there has to be some equity and fairness for country people—there just has to be—and I do not think that applies at the moment.

While we can spend hundreds of millions of dollars building football stadiums and \$40 million building a bridge and heavens knows what else around the traps, we scrimp and save on assisting everybody in the community of South Australia, and that annoys me intensely. I do not know why this attitude prevails. I guess I do know why: it is purely political. The PATS review that is currently taking place will be an interesting exercise. I have encouraged my constituents to make submissions. I think they closed last Friday.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Dr Filby said they could take another two weeks.

Mr PENGILLY: Okay. They have extended it by two weeks, so perhaps I will remind my people again via various means that they should put in a submission. As members representing all electorates, we have the opportunity to speak in this place and put a few things on the table and, as a member representing a rural electorate, I strongly urge the government to take notice of this.

If they can stop fighting amongst themselves for a while and what not, they might be able to sort a few things out. In the best interests of my electorate, I ask that, firstly, it is not extended beyond 100 kilometres and, secondly, that little bureaucrats sitting in Hindmarsh Square do not make decisions that are blatantly discriminatory against people in my electorate.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:52): I too rise to support the motion and also the amendment put forward by the member for Morphett today. PATS is obviously a very important part of the health system for people who live in the regions and who are seeking medical treatment. It was brought to my attention in my first term as the member representing the people of Chaffey that the reimbursement process has serious flaws.

It has serious shortcomings with the way in which those people are, I guess, put in a position of having to seek medical treatment and the hardship that they go through to undertake that treatment. In many cases, as the member for Stuart has said, we have seen the shortcomings in country health over a number of years. Those shortcomings continue to manifest and cause people some serious angst when seeking medical treatment.

The burden of needing medical treatment and having to travel is one of the issues, but it is what the people from the regions have to go through to get to a place of medical help and undertake that treatment, which primarily means having to travel to Adelaide. I see that the constituents of the member for Mount Gambier have the luxury of deciding whether they travel to Victoria for help or whether they travel to Adelaide.

It all comes at a price, and that price might be, potentially, taking time off work, having to take a carer with you, and the cost of travel. Since the last review in 2001 on the reimbursement, particularly with the fuel reimbursement, looking at 2001, the cost of fuel was about 90¢ a litre. If we look at what the price of fuel is today, it is around \$1.55 and we are receiving about a 16¢ rebate. So, I think that that is one of the issues. Obviously, the cost of accommodation—\$30 a night is such that hardly anyone is going to profiteer when it comes to reimbursement.

I did hear the member for Morphett talk about primary health care, particularly in the regions. If only the government weighed up more of a long-term strategy rather than trying to appease people for the short-term gain. Why are we not looking at increasing our health care in the regions, rather than trying to centralise a lot of procedures when people do have to travel to Adelaide?

I will use the sad example of cancer treatment, and it is ongoing—whether it is the diagnosis, having to visit doctors to set up that medical procedure, and particularly having to make multiple trips down to Adelaide for treatment, whether it be chemotherapy, radiation treatment or ongoing treatment for people.

When they are travelling and having to take time off work, they are going through a very emotional time, particularly with cancer treatment, and that is an extremely challenging time, not just for the patient but for the family, and usually that carer that travels with the patient is a family member. So, again, it is the hardship that they are going through but it is also the emotional strain that they are encountering over that time.

Looking at the upgrade of regional hospitals is something I will also touch on, because we are lucky enough that the regional hospital in the Riverland is undergoing a facelift at the moment, increasing the amount of facilities in that hospital. But, sadly, we had a \$41 million upgrade which was then reviewed down to a \$36 million upgrade with, potentially, no less facilities with that reannouncement. The chemotherapy unit, for instance, has been put in place, but it does not have any furniture. We have a chemotherapy unit without the ingredients for people to sit down and be treated.

Mr Pengilly: No chairs.

Mr WHETSTONE: No chairs. I think I spoke in this place a short time ago about when I went out on a fundraising exercise to raise money for a chemotherapy chair. We have seen people, out of the goodness of their hearts, bequeath money to the hospital to put in chairs. We have seen the Lions Club in the Riverland up in Berri raising money through a calendar program for another chair.

Where are this government's priorities? They need to be looking at the primary health care within the regions so that people do not have to travel to help with their health procedures and it is not going to cost the government. They really need to look at the cost benefit of putting the chairs, for example, in that chemotherapy unit without having to have people travel to Adelaide and then claim back on PATS. That is another way that people will be able to utilise the PATS facility without increasing the budget particularly with PATS.

Again, I revert back to the cost of living and just exactly what people are having to go through to travel from the regions down to the city and go through that very hard time. I have a number of friends at the moment who are travelling from Chaffey or the Riverland down to Adelaide to undergo cancer treatment, and I am seeing what they are going through. It really does pull at the heartstrings, just looking from the outside in at what those families are going through: the hardship, the time that they are taking off work, the time that their carers are taking off work to go with them, and the cost. But, it is also to the detriment of their business, so it is having a flow-on effect.

The member for Stuart has said that he approached the previous health minister with a review of Country Health. That was actually going to happen, but it never did, so that is a very sad indictment on the current state government that does have 26 seats, 25 in metropolitan or almost metropolitan Adelaide. One seat, in Giles—

The Hon. L.R. Breuer: I can carry the load, as can my colleagues from the country!

Mr WHETSTONE: You can carry the load, member for Giles, so stand strong on the review and stand strong on lobbying for more money to be put back into PATS. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

SWAN REACH HOTEL LOTTERIES AGENCY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey): Presented a petition signed by 190 residents of Swan Reach and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to reinstate the SA Lotteries Agency at the Swan Reach Hotel.

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION (COVERT OPERATIONS) ACT

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: In April 1995, after the High Court decided an appeal in *Ridgeway v The Queen* in favour of the accused, the parliament passed the Criminal Law (Undercover Operations) Act 1995 with the support of all sides of politics. The object of the legislation was to place the law of police undercover operations on a legislative footing and to ensure certainty in the law. The High Court ruling on entrapment by police of drug dealers and other criminals had created uncertainty for the police and the courts.

As honourable members may be aware, one of the safeguards that was built into the legislation, which significantly extended police powers, was that there should be a notification of authorised undercover operations to the Attorney-General and that there should be an annual report to parliament.

The Criminal Law (Undercover Operations) Act 1995 was incorporated into and replaced by the Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009. That new act added reporting obligations about other legislated aspects of covert operations.

The current statutory provisions have not been the subject of any noteworthy comment by any court. The details of the police notifications form the basis of the report that the statute requires me to give to parliament. I now table that report.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade (Hon. T.R. Kenyon)—

Forestry SA—Annual Report 2012-13

Primary Industry & Regions SA (PIRSA)—Annual Report 2012-13

By the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills (Hon. G. Portolesi)—

Response by the Department for Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology to the Economic and Finance Committee Report entitled *Workforce and Education Participation*

QUESTION TIME

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:05): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development: in relation to the student wrongly accused of accessing pornography at a regional school, can the minister confirm that one of the conditions of the education department's \$30,000 settlement was that this student not file a report with the police?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:06): I would have to go and check the agreement that was signed. That's not my recollection, but I am happy to take that question on notice.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): A supplementary question: this may also be a matter that the minister may wish to take on notice, but is the minister aware that Don Mackie wrote to the wrongly accused student on 16 February 2012 stating, 'What steps will now be taken is a matter for us. You have agreed not to take any further steps and that includes filing any further report with police.'

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:06): Again, I am happy to take that on notice. I have had a look at some of the correspondence that has gone backwards and forwards. In the correspondence that was referred to yesterday was a letter from Mr Costello to this young person, and I have gone back and had a look at that correspondence.

I want to make the point that in that correspondence it referred to the fact that there would be a meeting between that young person, Don Mackie, and the regional director. The strong overtone of that letter was about focusing on the support and any direct costs that this young person had incurred.

I got the sense that what the department was really looking at was how it could compensate this young person for the lack of education that he had received and helping him to complete his SACE certificate. Now, we may question the agreement that was signed and some of the content of that, but I do think that perhaps for many of those people who were involved in the discussions with him, it was about providing him with some support to get his life back on track.

Mr Pisoni: A supplementary sir.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary I would like to welcome to Parliament House students from Glossop High School, classes of which have been in parliament I think every day this week as guests of the member for Chaffey. Supplementary: member for Unley.

QUESTION TIME

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:08): In the letter referred to by the Minister for Education, can she advise the house why the first offer was for \$10,000, closely followed by a second offer of \$20,000, and with a final offer of \$30,000—how that \$30,000 was arrived at; if it was meant for compensation?

The SPEAKER: That is not supplementary to the deputy leader's question. The member for Little Para.

ADELAIDE CASINO

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:09): Can the Deputy Premier please inform the house about finalisation of agreements with the operators of the Adelaide Casino?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:09): I thank the honourable member for his question. On 11 October, the government finalised a new casino duty agreement and approved licensing agreement with SkyCity in regard to the Adelaide Casino. The approved licensing agreement was the conclusion of many years of hard work by a number of people and a number of areas across government.

Its conclusion cleared the way for SkyCity to announce a \$40 million investment in the Adelaide Casino. This investment is a major step in the process for SkyCity to announce a full \$350 million expansion in the coming months. Such a significant private investment in the Riverbank redevelopment is expected to create more than 500 jobs during the three-year development, and 1,000 ongoing positions.

Specifically the approved licensing agreement establishes a considerable responsible gambling program within the Adelaide Casino's operation. It will see the Casino introduce pre-commitment and risk monitoring systems to its gaming machine operations early in 2014. These are initiatives which were not supported by the parliament earlier this year but which the government was able to secure nevertheless through negotiations with SkyCity.

They will come into effect more than three and a half years ahead of planned commonwealth reforms and lead to the strongest responsible gambling measures applied to any casino in Australia. The agreement also provides \$300,000 per year to be provided by SkyCity for gambling rehabilitation funding.

Through the finalisation of the approved licensing agreement, the government will receive a \$20 million payment, with gaming taxation generated by the Adelaide Casino project to more than

double once the full expansion of the facility is completed in 2016. This is another key piece of the revitalised Riverbank that will provide South Australians with a world-class facility.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question again is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Was the matter in respect of the student wrongly accused of accessing pornography at a regional school ever referred to the police by your department and, if so, on what date?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:12): To my knowledge, it was not referred to the police. I understand that it was an investigation that was undertaken at the school level. We are talking here about someone in the school accessing pornography on a departmental computer, as I understand it. I doubt very much whether police would have been interested in that, but I do understand that the young person himself had approached police at different times and is now engaged with the police in relation to another matter.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): So, is the minister saying that, apart from the young man himself, to your knowledge, no-one in your department or any member of the school community, ever reported this issue to the police?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:13): The chief executive is still working through all of the issues in relation to this but to my knowledge, accessing pornography—and we are not talking about child pornography—is not a criminal offence.

Ms Chapman: What about fraudulently using the account?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Well, that is entirely another matter and, again, from my understanding and from what I have heard from this young person, we are talking about \$3 from his account.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: I don't think it is about the money.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I'm sorry, but the deputy leader just said it was.

Mr Gardner: I don't think that is the issue.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The issues are being revisited by the chief executive, and the matter will be thoroughly investigated.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): I have a question to the Minister for Police.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: When was the first time that the police spoke to the education department in the matter of the student who was wrongfully accused of accessing pornography?

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) (14:14): I will have to come back to the house in respect of that particular question, but I can inform the house that my office was informed by SAPOL today that police are actually investigating this matter and other associated matters and that an investigation is currently underway.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): A supplementary to the minister—and I thank him for indicating that he will provide some further information on the matter. My question is—and it may be something that you also wish to take on notice, minister—but we would like to know what information the education department gave to police when this contact was made.

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) (14:15): Again, deputy leader, I will take that matter on notice, and return to the house with a comprehensive reply.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): A further supplementary, and I promise it will be my final one, to the Minister of Police.

Ms Bedford: What, ever in your whole life?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is warned for the first time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, it is in addition to previous offending before lunch. Thank you.

Ms CHAPMAN: How fair you are, sir; thank you. My supplementary to the minister is: do you, minister, as Minister for Police, consider that it is acceptable that anyone is asked to sign an agreement or enter into an agreement that they not go to the police on any matter?

The SPEAKER: Is that meant to be a supplementary?

Ms CHAPMAN: To the police minister, yes.

The SPEAKER: I don't think it is supplementary. It is not supplementary, but you can ask it as a separate question.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: So you will let it go? Okay. Member for Frome.

SOLAR FEED-IN SCHEME

Mr BROCK (Frome) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister please advise the house whether or not a decision has been made regarding a request for electricity users, Mr and Mrs Greg Collins of Port Pirie, to be eligible for feed-in tariffs for their workshop? Mr and Mrs Collins applied for the application for the feed-in tariff at the time the minister changed the regulations. We had written to the minister's office back in March 2012, had an acknowledgement on 27 March, and have had no response since that date.

Mr Pengilly: You've got the answer, Tom?

The SPEAKER: The member for Finnis is called to order. We had an interjection from the member for Kavel yesterday suggesting that a question without notice was not really a question without notice, when in fact it was. We shall see. The Minister for Energy.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:17): There is no prepared answer at all. The member for Frome is a dedicated local MP who fights for his constituency. I know that members opposite don't like the fact that he sits in this parliament—

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is absolutely right to take a point of order, and to give me the opportunity to call to order the members for Heysen, Stuart and Hammond, who are disrupting the house. That was the point of order? No?

Ms CHAPMAN: That wasn't, but I am sure that you will bring the minister—

The SPEAKER: No? Mon Dieu!

Ms CHAPMAN: —back to the issue, to answer the member's question.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the minister will be strictly relevant.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, earlier in the year the government introduced legislation which was sent to deadlock between the houses. The former energy shadow minister,

the former deputy leader and I were working through some solutions for people like the constituents the member for Frome is discussing. The reason those correspondents were not replied to was because they were on hold during the entire process of debate.

I am not sure if the constituent that you are speaking about is one of the constituents that is caught up in the amendments passed by the parliament early in the year. They should have received notification from SA Power Networks. If they haven't, and the member for Frome has indicated that they haven't—because a whole range of people in regional South Australia who had issues regarding their meter were indeed given the new feed-in tariff, as the old feed-in tariff is now closed for entry.

So, I am not sure whether or not your constituents have been informed. If they have not, I will chase that up and get a response to the member very, very quickly. I apologise to him for the delay in response, but I assumed that all those inquiries were being dealt with, with the amendments that were before the parliament as they passed. I know a large number of regional electricity users were satisfied with the outcome. So I will get some details for you and let you know very, very soon.

SALARIED MEDICAL OFFICERS ENTERPRISE AGREEMENT

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Can the minister update the house on the South Australian medical officers' enterprise agreement?

The SPEAKER: Is the minister sure this is not in readily available documents of the Industrial Relations Commission?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am reasonably sure, sir. Because the matter is yet to go to ballot, it would not be publicly available.

The SPEAKER: That is different, yes. Away you go.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:20): After 32 months of negotiation, I am pleased to tell the house that the state government and South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association (SASMOA) have agreed on the terms of offer for the new enterprise agreement for South Australia's public sector salaried medical officers.

This is a positive result for South Australia's healthcare system and builds upon the recent employee agreement with nurses and midwives. The government and SASMOA have been working closely to reach an in-principle agreement which provides fair and reasonable outcomes. Our priority has been to ensure that patients and their families have access to high quality health care, and this proposed agreement will ensure that that continues.

Reaching agreement with our nurses, midwives and now the medical officers will ensure we continue to provide the South Australian public with specialised care and treatment. The proposed agreement includes a voluntary flexible hours arrangement for medical specialists, which will mean more specialists are available to provide care for patients when they need it. This flexibility will help to improve the time in which patients are seen, diagnosed and treated so they can get home—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I'm hearing a voice, sir, out there in the distance somewhere.

The SPEAKER: Maybe Banquo's ghost!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: This vague voice, a voice crying out in the wilderness. Under the three-year agreement, medical officers will receive salary increases of 9 per cent from 14 April this year, 3 per cent from 14 April next year, 3 per cent from 14 April 2015 and 2.5 per cent from 14 April 2016. The last pay increase was in April 2010. The 9 per cent pay increase from April 2013 takes into consideration the three years since the last pay rise.

They will also receive increases and reimbursement rates for professional development, remote call and recall payments, and managerial allowances, as well as an improved job planning structure to help balance their clinical and non-clinical commitments. This agreement will allow doctors to continue to care for patients in safe and effective ways in our public hospitals.

SASMOA will recommend to its members at a meeting this evening that they accept the offer. Medical officers from across the South Australian public health care system will be able to vote on the proposed enterprise agreement by ballot, starting tomorrow. Subject to that ballot, a formal agreement will be sought from the Industrial Relations Commission and then, I would imagine, sir, the information will be available on the Industrial Relations Commission website.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the President of SASMOA, Dr David Pope, for his leadership and willingness to help bring this negotiation to a close. I would also thank SASMOA, SA Health and Department of the Premier and Cabinet staff for their efforts to find a positive way through complex negotiations. South Australia will continue to enjoy the best healthcare services in the country.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Police. Does the Minister for Police agree that it is acceptable that anyone, including the student falsely accused of the pornography matter, should be requested by the government not to refer a matter to the police or, indeed, to enter into any agreement to that effect?

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) (14:24): I was going to say I am reluctant to comment. I think I am incapable of commenting, because there are two investigations underway, one being conducted by SAPOL and one being conducted by the chief executive officer of DECD. That is my understanding. So it would be inappropriate for me to express a view one way or the other.

POLICE, UNDERCOVER OPERATIONS

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (14:24): My question is to the Attorney. Can the Attorney enlighten the house in general terms with regard to the type of offences covered in the tabled report entitled, 'Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009', under the category of undercover operations?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for his question. The type of offences that are contemplated here are, as the honourable member would be aware from reading the report, first and foremost offences which seem to be relating to the Controlled Substances Act. In other words, we are dealing here with operations that are involved in the apprehension of people involved in the marketing or production of drugs of some description.

It is probably also important for members to understand that what we are talking about here, in effect, is people who are going undercover assuming different identities for the purposes of investigating a matter. Under the provisions of this act they are in a position where even if they perform what would otherwise be an illegal act in the course of that covert operation they are given a degree of immunity.

So, it is a very specific and unusual policing tool, only used, as I understand it, in the most serious of circumstances, hence the relatively small numbers of people involved. I think the honourable member noted there that there might have been 10, for example, in the reporting period which weren't specifically to do with the Controlled Substances Act. So, it is a very small group of offenders or investigations that we are talking about.

The only particularity provided in the act is that it is either an indictable offence or an offence under the Controlled Substances Act, and then there are particular offences under the fisheries act, the Lottery and Gaming Act and the National Parks and Wildlife Act, none of which are mentioned in the report because presumably there were no such investigations.

What I can do for the honourable member is see whether it is possible for me to ascertain in the broadest possible sense what the classes of indictable offence were that were being investigated here, but my expectation is that we would be talking about things which would include things like blackmail and serious financial crime associated with very serious criminal activity in the broader sense.

In fact, it might well be that there is quite an overlap between those indictable offences and the Controlled Substances Act offences, but I will try to find, in a generic way, a list of the sorts of

offences. By the very nature of this report, it is not reasonable or, indeed, proper for me to provide much detail because clearly it is an extremely risky business for the individuals concerned.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:27): My question is for the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills. When the member for Hartley was education minister did she authorise a payment of \$30,000 to the student wrongly accused of accessing pornography at a regional school?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:28): The advice I have received from the department since a question was asked yesterday about ability to authorise payments such as this is that the delegated authority with the CE is such that it would not have required any ministerial authorisation, and it appears that there has been no reference whatsoever to the minister at the time.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:28): Does the education department have an annual budget for ex gratia payments to students, and if so how much?

Members interjecting:

Mr PISONI: It's a supplementary question.

The SPEAKER: It is ex gratia, and who is it to?

Mr PISONI: It's a supplementary question, sir.

The SPEAKER: So, anyone can take it. Alright. Minister for Education, I imagine.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:28): I don't have any detail around that, but I'm happy to take that question on notice.

CHILD PROTECTION INQUIRY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills. When did Kate Baldock first advise her minister, the member for Hartley, when Ms Baldock became aware in February 2012 of the rape conviction of the western suburbs out of school hours care worker at the centre of the Debelle inquiry?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:29): I need to go back and check the records the department holds, so I will take that question on notice.

JETTIES

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will the minister inform the house of how the government is ensuring jetties will be around for future generations to come?

The SPEAKER: I'm sorry, I didn't quite hear the question.

Dr CLOSE: How will the government ensure that jetties are around for future generations?

The SPEAKER: Jetties—excellent! Minister for Transport.

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): I thank the honourable member for her question. I can happily inform the house that restoration works for the Vivonne Bay jetty on Kangaroo Island—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —they may want to pay attention; get the ear horn out and have a listen—were completed just last month.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry, sir?

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You are a very silly man, I know. The Vivonne Bay jetty—

The SPEAKER: Has the member for Finniss taken offence?

Mr PENGILLY: No, sir, he hasn't, but he wasn't getting away without an answer.

The SPEAKER: The minister for Transport. Billy Hughes had an ear horn.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He did, and they have a lot in common. The Vivonne Bay jetty upgrade is what I was talking about. The government invested approximately \$600,000. The works included the installation of steel piles, the replacement of defective structural timbers, and the replacement and widening of the jetty deck.

This upgrade further builds upon the state government spending \$8 million since July 2010 upgrading, strengthening and restoring the following jetties across the state, including the Granite Island Causeway—another one in the member for Finniss' electorate—the Screw Pile jetty, the Rosetta Head wharf at Victor Harbor, Kingscote, Semaphore, Streaky Bay, Port Broughton, Moonta Bay, Largs Bay, Southend, and Cape Jaffa.

The government is committed to ensuring state-owned jetties will continually be maintained to be safe and have safe standards that provide continual enjoyment for our children and our children's children as an iconic part of our coastline. It is an issue that is very important for our local community in attracting tourists and holiday-makers. I will also take this opportunity to say that not only is the Vivonne Bay jetty a great attraction for visitors holidaying on Kangaroo Island but it is also an important commercial facility for the rock lobster fleet that operates in the waters off southern Kangaroo Island.

Whilst speaking of Kangaroo Island, it would be remiss of me not to mention the upgrade of the Penneshaw jetty, completed last year. Part of those works included the construction of a cruise ship tender landing platform, which was used during the cruise ship season over last summer to deliver international passengers to the delights of Kangaroo Island, including, probably, the member for Finniss. The design and construction of the tender landing platform was undertaken by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, with funding support from Tourism SA. I would like to acknowledge at this juncture my colleague the Minister for Tourism for his contribution to promoting Kangaroo Island.

Additionally, the government has spent approximately \$12 million in the past two years refurbishing the Port Bonython jetty, which is crucial in ensuring the state's export potential is secure and has the capacity to grow. It is a very important piece of economic infrastructure for the state, serving to generate export dollars from the wonderful potential we have helped unlock in the Cooper Basin. What is evident and what is clear is that jetties play an important economic and social role in our state and should be preserved to ensure our future prosperity. I hope all members enjoy our jetties in the future.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Supplementary, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A supplementary from the member for Davenport.

JETTIES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:33): Could the minister update the house on the status of the Port Stanvac jetty? Has the government resolved negotiations with Mobil as to who will own the jetty after the closure of the Port Stanvac oil refinery and who will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (14:33): Those negotiations are still ongoing, and we continue discussions with Mobil Exxon.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Employment. Does the minister agree with the Premier that the number of South Australian jobs has grown in the last four months?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:34): The Premier made the point that there has been jobs growth in our state and that the South Australian economy is in a strong

position. What I can say is that since this government came to office in March 2002, we have seen more than 117 jobs created—

The Hon. M.F. O'Brien: Thousand.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —117,000 jobs created.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That was them!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: No, I'll get to them in a second—including nearly 65,000 full-time jobs. Just for information, the last Liberal government created about 5,800 full-time jobs, and that's around as many full-time jobs as we have created each year, on average—that period is March 2002 to September 2013. So, I think we can be very proud of our jobs record and jobs achievement.

We have a very strong agenda here in South Australia. If we want South Australians, especially young South Australians, to be positioned for the future, one of the key things you do is invest in education and skills. I may have the opportunity to talk about this later, but I was very pleased that the South Australian government has reached, ahead of time, our training target. We have invested heavily in education. We have invested heavily in skills for the following reasons:

- people with post-school qualifications work around seven years longer;
- young people with qualifications have an unemployment rate that is almost three times lower than those without; and
- lifetime earnings/income are around \$1 million higher with a cert III qualification or higher.

So, certainly, in relation to jobs, we are a government that is unashamedly pro jobs. Like every government, we know that you have to work hard to create jobs, but we have a strong plan to do that.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:36): Supplementary, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, yes.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: My question again is to the Minister for Employment. Is the reason the Minister for Employment won't confirm that she agrees with the Premier's statement that the number of South Australian jobs has grown in the last four months because the ABS statistics show that, in trend terms, South Australia has lost 12,000 jobs in the last four months and, in seasonally adjusted terms, they show that they lost 17,600 jobs in the last four months?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:36): The first point is that the Premier answered that question. He addressed that question. The second thing about ABS statistics is that we have original data, we have trend data—we can all use statistics to suit our particular argument. I note that the unemployment figures came down from 6.8 per cent to 6 per cent. The point the acting minister made at the time was that these figures do jump around but, certainly, we are committed to future jobs growth and investment.

The SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary?

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:37): This is a supplementary question, sir. The minister just said in her answer that there are all sorts of statistics we can use to back up our argument. Can she provide the house with the statistics that the Premier used to make his statement?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:37): That is a very mischievous question, but I will be—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I didn't say it was an intelligent question, but I will be very happy to assist the member if I can.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:38): My question is again to the Minister for Employment. Following the minister's answers re jobs created under the government, can the minister advise how many South Australian jobs have been created since the last election, given that the government has increased debt by \$5 billion?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:38): I believe I answered that question earlier. Since March 2002, we have seen more than—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Well—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It's still the same government.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Yes, precisely—still the same—

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: But the minister appears confused. The question was from the 2010 election, not the 2002 election.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Davenport to order. That's a bogus point of order; it's an impromptu speech. The minister.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Thank you, sir. As I said, since March 2002 we have seen more than 117,000 jobs created, and that's in the period March 2002 to September 2013, including nearly 65,000 full-time jobs.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:39): A supplementary, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Following the minister's answer for jobs created since March 2002, can the minister provide to the house how many jobs have been created since the March 2010 election in a period in which the government has increased the debt by \$5 billion, and is the answer 2,900 jobs?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:39): I am happy to take that on notice.

Mr Pisoni: Not in the script.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the first time. The member for Davenport.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:40): Again to the Minister for Employment, will the minister confirm that South Australia must create jobs at a rate 50 times the rate that it currently is since it made its promise to create 100,000 jobs by 2016?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:40): We have always acknowledged, the Premier has acknowledged, I have certainly acknowledged, that this is an ambitious target. This is an ambitious target. We absolutely acknowledge that, and everybody in this place acknowledges that there have been minor matters, like global financial uncertainty and a high Australian dollar and commodity prices, all of which have had an enormous impact on the state of our affairs here, not only in South Australia but in our nation.

However, we remain as focused on jobs creation as we ever have been. Recently, as members would know, we released a jobs and skills strategy, which is about positioning us for the future and keeping people working. This initiative will reach about 40,000 South Australians and specifically will do the following. It will target:

- 14,000 people to be supported to find a job in their local community through Skills for Jobs in Regions;

- 20,000 unemployed South Australians and those without qualifications will be able to gain a qualification through a Skills for Jobs entitlement; and
- up to 8,000 workers in industries affected by restructuring—and we are not alone here in South Australia—will be supported to gain new skills as they prepare to transition to give them the best chance of securing work in other industries.

So, we do remain committed to that target. It was an ambitious target at the time. Clearly, it remains ambitious, but we will remain as steadfast as ever in our commitment to South Australians.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:42): My question is again to the Minister for Employment. What is the minister's explanation as to why the northern Adelaide region has the second highest youth unemployment rate of all 78 Australian regions?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:42): Can I just ask the member to repeat the question; do you mind?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: What is the minister's explanation as to why the northern Adelaide region has the second highest youth unemployment rate of all 78 Australian regions?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: All of us in this place—certainly on this side—want all young people in South Australia—and I have talked about skills and I have talked about education and training—to be supported to follow their chosen career pathway and find gainful, meaningful employment. It is important to keep some factors in mind in relation to these matters. It is important to remember that we know that most young people are not looking for full-time work. The figures that the opposition likes to quote do not say anything about young people who are already either working full-time, studying full-time or participating in a combination of part-time work and part-time study. In terms of the figures that have come out today—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Goyder talking to himself or interjecting? You're interjecting. Okay, well, I call the member for Goyder to order. Minister for Transport.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: In terms of the figures that were released today, I can report that the youth full-time unemployment to population ratio has not changed dramatically. In September 2012 we were looking at 6 per cent and in September 2013 we are looking at 7 per cent in northern Adelaide, with the total balance in South Australia of 5.3 per cent, going down to 3.2 per cent. So, I would ask the opposition to work with us when it comes to not talking down our region and when it comes to supporting our young people, firstly, to access education and training and then find gainful employment.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen has interjected almost continually; I warn her for the first time. And I treated the member for Unley harshly: he should have been called to order rather than warned a first time. The deputy leader.

GOVERNMENT LEAKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): Thank you for your mercy, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Is the minister aware of the identity of the leaker of the Premier's policy release schedule?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:46): No, I am not.

GOVERNMENT LEAKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Supplementary, if I may, sir.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

Ms CHAPMAN: Has the minister inquired as to all of his staff to confirm whether they were responsible?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:46): No, because I don't think it would be necessary.

GOVERNMENT LEAKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Is the minister aware of the identity of the leaker of the Premier's policy release schedule?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:46): I have no conclusive evidence.

GOVERNMENT LEAKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:47): Supplementary to the Minister for Transport.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary, I call the member for Flinders to order and I call the members for Kavel, Adelaide and Hammond to order, who erupted as one. Deputy leader.

Ms CHAPMAN: Has the minister inquired as to all of his ministerial staff—

Mr Gardner: Or any.

Ms CHAPMAN: Any of his ministerial staff—to confirm if they weren't responsible or one of those that might be a suspect?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:47): I have complete faith in my staff and I stand by every single one of them. Unlike the deputy leader, I have never betrayed anyone.

GOVERNMENT LEAKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:47): My question is now to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney aware of the leaker of the Premier's policy release schedule?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:48): I thank the honourable member for the question. Like my colleagues, I am not able to answer that question either, because I don't have that information. However, I do make this observation: when I first saw this in the paper and I understood the attending kerfuffle that was going on, I did say to myself, 'Actually, this is not what people should be worried about,' because it says we have a government that is busy, we have a government with ideas, we have a government that wants to speak in plain English, we have a government that has fiscal responsibility central to what it is doing, and we have an opposition with no policies at all, except that they are going to repeal the law that prevents people eating dogs and cats.

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: No, I have to do some warnings before then. The member for Finnis is called to order, the member for Davenport is warned for the first time, the member for Adelaide is warned for the first time, the member for Hammond is warned for the second and final time and the member for Morialta is called to order. Thank you for your patience, deputy leader.

GOVERNMENT LEAKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My supplementary is to the Attorney—and I thank him for his earlier answer about not being concerned about this matter. So, has the Attorney actually requested advice from the Crown Solicitor's Office on this matter of staff disclosure of this information?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:49): It is my practice generally not to seek advice in a vacuum or in the abstract, and because I do not know anything in particular about anything in particular in relation to this matter I would have thought it is premature to put pen to paper to ask for advice about something that I don't know what I am asking about. So the answer is no.

The SPEAKER: A further supplementary, deputy leader?

GOVERNMENT LEAKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): If I may, to the Attorney: have you made any inquiry of any of your staff as to whether they are involved in this matter so as to exclude them?

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:50): Actually I have not, and I would like to take this opportunity to place on the record what a fantastic office I do have and what excellent, hard-working people I have in my office. Given the fact that they are there putting in extraordinary hours, supporting the government, supporting me and all of my colleagues on this side of the house—they offer great support to everybody—I would have thought for me to ask such a question of them would have been insulting.

Ms CHAPMAN: A supplementary question.

Mrs Redmond: The audition's not going well, John.

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is warned for the first time. Deputy leader.

GOVERNMENT LEAKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): Given the Attorney's answer as to not undertaking investigation, why is it appropriate to undertake an investigation when the Sustainable Budget Commission report was leaked and not on this occasion?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:51): I am not really quite sure how I can answer that other than to say that apples and oranges are different.

ROLLING STONES CONCERT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:51): My question is for the Minister for Tourism: can the minister confirm that the taxpayer is contributing to the Rolling Stones concert to be held at Adelaide Oval next year and is the fee being paid \$1 million?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:52): No, I can't confirm that.

ROLLING STONES CONCERT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:52): A supplementary question: is the reason the minister can't confirm it because the agreement with the Rolling Stones is confidential, or is the reason that you can't confirm it because there is no payment being made to the Rolling Stones?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:52): I can't confirm it because there is no deal with the Rolling Stones.

STATE GOVERNMENT CONCESSIONS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion: why has the Auditor-General criticised the government's concession payment scheme for five consecutive years and what has the government done to remedy the criticisms?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for his question. The Auditor-General has highlighted that issue in a number of audit reports. You will need to ask him why he thinks he has had to raise it. However, nothing in his report—and I have read his comments—would indicate that anything I said to this house I should be concerned about. As I have indicated, in terms of the project, we anticipate it should be mid-November when I can brief the house on the outcome of those inquiries.

CASIS SYSTEM

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion: can the minister confirm that the CASIS project started out in 2009 as a \$600,000 proposal to deliver a system by 2010 and that it has blown out to more than \$3.7 million and is yet to be fully functional?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:54): I thank the honourable member for his question. I can confirm that the figures provided are correct. I can also confirm to the house that the scope of the project has changed as the number of concessions we try to bring online has changed as well.

This government is trying to support people doing it tough. We have a very broad concession scheme where we have about 200,000 customers on our concession scheme and over \$100 million in concessions. We are trying to ensure that we deliver the best possible outcome for taxpayers—both as recipients of the concessions but also as taxpayers—and that will require a good scheme and we will have one.

CASIS SYSTEM

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:54): The Auditor-General suggests there is a further \$780,000 required to complete the CASIS system. Can the minister guarantee that that will be the final amount to complete the project?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:55): I would like to thank the honourable member for his question. On current advice, that would be correct.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house the reasons for education executive Jan Andrews not having her contract renewed?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:55): That was totally the prerogative of the chief executive officer and I understand that he has expressed some of the reasons in his more recent media conference when he announced that the contract would not be renewed. It had no influence from me whatsoever.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir: my question was for the minister to inform the house, not to refer to media.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is entirely bogus and the member for Unley is warned for the first time. The member for Frome.

CLARE POLICE STATION

Mr BROCK (Frome) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Police. Is the minister aware of any proposed staff reductions at the Clare Police Station and, if there are any proposed moves to reduce staff there, what effect would it have on the Clare Police Station operation?

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) (14:56): No, I am not aware of any planned reductions at the Clare Police Station. I will make inquiries and I will come back to you with a detailed response.

FLIGHT TRAINING ADELAIDE

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing Innovation and Trade. Can the minister inform the house of the upgrade to facilities at Flight Training Adelaide based at Parafield Airport?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (14:56): Happily I can, and I thank the member for Ramsay for her question, bravely battling on through laryngitis. Last week I had the pleasure of opening a new multimillion facility at Flight Training Adelaide based at Parafield Airport.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Who negotiated that?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: I am sure it is a very well negotiated agreement and arrangement. Being so well negotiated, it probably involved the Minister for Infrastructure somewhere, but I will confirm that to the house at some stage. This multimillion dollar investment ideally positions our city as a pilot training hub for the Asia-Pacific region.

Flight Training Adelaide is a great local example of a flexible, innovative business that continues to survive and grow in competitive international markets. The new multimillion dollar simulators will ensure that the company remains one of the major pilot training schools in the southern hemisphere. They will provide the most up-to-date training for a new generation of commercial airline pilots.

The jet simulation centre is a state-of-the-art building housing two jet aircraft training simulators, one replicating an Airbus A320 aircraft, while the other has dual functionality and can replicate a Boeing 737-800 aircraft, as well as an ATR 42-500 turbo propeller aircraft.

A highlight of my visit was being given the opportunity of 'landing' an A320 Airbus on the simulator. I am told pilots have a saying that any landing that you can walk away from is a good landing and, given that we were on a simulator, we were always going to walk away from it, so it obviously turned out quite well! It gave me a real insight into the highly skilled and complex technical training needed to pilot one of these highly sophisticated passenger planes. Needless to say, we all 'landed' safely if not all that smoothly.

FTA also has a third multimillion dollar aircraft simulator located in another hangar, and the company now has 170 employees and a fleet of 46 training aircraft. The company has been training pilots for the world's leading airlines since 1982 and graduated more than 200 cadets just last year. Since 2011, FTA has undertaken a \$16 million capital upgrade program, which includes the new simulation centre.

The company has adopted an innovative approach to training in purchasing more than 200 iPads for use as 'all-in-one' training devices by cadets and installing fibre optic cabling through the Parafield campus for quick and easy wi-fi access. This innovation and adaptability has played an important role in attracting many of the world's major airlines, including Cathay Pacific Airways, Dragonair, Hong Kong Government Flying Service, QantasLink and Virgin Australia.

A strong selling point has also been the on-site, full board accommodation offered to cadets on FTA's training campus, with around 80 per cent of the company's students coming from overseas. FTA was named the winner of the Business SA Export Award for Education and Training and was a finalist in the National Export Awards in October last year. I congratulate them on that, and I commend the FTA for its commitment to our state and their innovative approach to growing their business; it is a real local success story.

FALSE IMPRISONMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:59): Can the Attorney-General please advise if there have been any cases where a person was held in prison custody in error in 2012-13 and, if so, how many?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: They all say they're innocent.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport is called to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for that question. It is actually an important question, because any circumstance in which there have been situations where a person is wrongly detained against their wishes are matters that we need to be mindful of and seek to avoid at all costs.

I am not in a position to quote exact numbers and figures, but it is my understanding that there have been identified in recent times a couple of instances, I think essentially by reason of administrative errors, where perhaps Corrections officers, for example, have thought the date of release, for whatever reason, was supposed to be a particular day and it is in fact the day before, or things of that nature. Those things have occasionally occurred.

In any system, there will be errors. I am pretty confident we don't have anything remotely like *The Count of Monte Cristo* to worry about, but we do have the occasional error which is not malicious. It is not intentional but, yes, there are occasionally errors. In order to provide you with more details, I will have to come back to you about that.

I want to make it clear: any error in that situation is really not good enough, because individuals who are detained against their will should be detained only because they are serving a valid sentence of imprisonment imposed by a court. If that sentence has expired and the individual is still detained, then obviously that is not good. I will get back to the honourable member about that and see if I can provide more detail.

FALSE IMPRISONMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:02): Supplementary, sir: given that the minister said that there are some cases—and I appreciate that he will get back with detail—where people have been held too long due to administrative error, is he aware of any where prisoners were let out too soon?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:02): Again, I thank the honourable member for his question. Normally, they don't become the subject of a complaint, I have heard, but no I am not. I will ask whether any prisoner has recorded a complaint of that nature, and I will get back to the honourable member.

Mr Pisoni: It might be the victims that complain, John.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the second time. The member for Stuart.

FALSE IMPRISONMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:02): Supplementary: can the Attorney please advise if he is aware of any cases where compensation has been paid to prisoners who were detained in error?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:03): Can I just clarify whether the honourable member means compensation paid by reason of the false imprisonment for a duration or paid for any reason at all?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: For mistaken false imprisonment.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am not aware, no, of any such payment having been made, nor am I aware of any action seeking such a payment to have been brought, but I will check.

GOVERNMENT LEAKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): My question is to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney aware of any investigation that is currently underway in respect of the leaked documents of the Premier's schedule?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:03): I am not aware of any particulars about any investigation, but nor necessarily should I be. First of all, SAPOL is, I think, generally the relevant organisation for investigations of this type; secondly, if what there is of the Government Investigation Unit were involved in some matter by way of investigation, I would not necessarily be aware of that either. So, the answer is that I am not aware of any particulars about any investigation.

That said, I don't think anybody would say that having unauthorised release of material—except for the fact that this was actually quite beneficial because it showed up the lack of policy on the other side, but aside from that—generally is good thing. It would generally be the reaction of any government that somewhere within government there would be an exploration as to what

happened. That is not something that I have taken control over, nor is it anything about which I have been briefed or given any detail.

GOVERNMENT LEAKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): Supplementary, sir. I ask the Minister for Police: is the minister aware of any investigation that is currently being undertaken in respect of the unauthorised release of documents?

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) (15:05): No, I am not.

RIVERLAND SPECIAL SCHOOL

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house what will happen to the \$850,000 covered outdoor learning centre constructed in the Riverland Special School in Berri under the BER scheme at the same time the decision was taken to relocate that special school?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:05): No, I can't at this particular point in time, but I certainly would hope that we can come to some agreement that that facility remains for the benefit of the community.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:06): Today I talk about the tawdry tale of school porn hush money and the department bagmen. Almost unbelievably, there was revealed this week yet another tawdry tale of a cover-up by the education department under this Labor government where the interests of preventing embarrassment for the minister and covering their tracks often takes precedence over the interests of children and young people.

A deal was made to pay a student (now 23 years old) \$30,000 hush money for a false allegation of accessing pornography in 2004 on his school computer—an accusation which had dire consequences for his education and future life but apparently had little effect on the career of the teacher who did access the porn using the student's internet account. The teacher, only stood down once the issue became public, is still employed by the department despite the fact that in an email to the victim by one of the department bagmen negotiating the deal, head of legal services Don Mackie, says:

...unofficially I share your concerns regarding the teacher and will be doing everything I can to remedy the situation as people like that shouldn't be in the teaching profession.

He was in the profession for nine years after the offence. It is indeed tragic that such is the state of education under the Labor government that top departmental bureaucrats can only show their concern for such behaviour unofficially, but it is this culture that consistently has let down students, parents, and hardworking principals and teachers in our schools.

Of course, now it is in the media, the minister has ordered an urgent review, and the Premier—still reeling from his own failures as education minister—has graciously on radio this week waived the confidentiality clause, 'The victim can keep his compensation and we won't ask for it back.' Well, that is really big of him, after what the student has gone through during the last nine years.

As with the case of the western suburbs school rape, the sexual assaults at a southern suburbs school, and other cases highlighted in recent months, consideration of and concessions to victims under the Premier's government seem only to occur when the opposition and media focus attention on their plight.

Given the circumstances of this case, the Premier's concession comes across as a little grubby and even, some would suggest, sleazy. But it is the image of departmental bureaucrats travelling the state offering hush money and contracts with confidentiality clauses to victims to prevent scandal for their political masters that should be of most concern to South Australians.

How often has this happened under this tainted Labor government administration, and how much taxpayers' money has been spent in this way? How many more victims of the education

department have been paid hush money not to tell their stories? Most importantly, how much damage has been brought on these victims because of this forced silence? In going through some of the correspondence that the victim, whom we will describe as 'John', has provided, we can see that an email was written by Mr Don Mackie to the victim in which he says:

Some draft words you may wish to consider as part of seeking an apology as we discussed on Friday. I am running late at the moment but will give you a telephone call in the next hour. Please send a confirmation that you received this email.

The draft goes on to suggest, it is actually a written letter, a letter that Mr Mackie wrote, that the victim should write to Mr Mackie to ask for the apology. Of course, Mr Mackie wrote back—an extraordinary situation. Mr Mackie advised, or wrote the letter, that the victim wrote to Mr Mackie to ask for the apology. Obviously, that was done so that the letter conformed and asked the right questions that Mr Mackie had the answers for to make sure that the department was protected.

It is an extraordinary situation that we have here in South Australia with the Department of Education. What an extraordinary 12 months it has been since the opposition raised the situation in the western suburbs school of the rape of a seven year old that was hidden from parents until it was raised in this place on 30 October of last year.

POSITIVE LIFE SA

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:11): One of the quiet achiever organisations in Ashford is Positive Life SA. Although I am waiting on the most recent figures, in 2012, 406 of the 634 people who are known to be HIV positive in South Australia have been using the service. Unfortunately, 350 of the known HIV positive people in our community, or 86 per cent of these people, are known to be on low incomes and eligible for a health care card.

I was impressed to hear that in 2011-12 Positive Life SA provided over 7,000, what they call, episodes of service, including 2,132 visits to the actual centre itself and associated activities. They provided cheap lunches to 1,720 HIV positive people in the community. They have a shop at the centre and they claim that 1,356 'shops' were made by at least 137 people in the community.

The sad point that was made—I was a little bit surprised to see this store in the Positive Life centre—is that in some cases people need to choose between, I am told, food or medicine. The sad fact is that, particularly when you look at the low income that the number of people who are HIV positive in our community have, they need some support to actually buy food and different things that are needed to run a household.

There is also another scheme that I had not known about called the Red Ribbon Fund where ambulance subscriptions for low income people are provided. In the last year, 105 of those were provided through Positive Life SA. They conduct a number of training workshops for community workers, health workers, medical students and particular groups, including new arrival groups (new arrivals as in people who come to South Australia). They have specific multicultural training workshops and workshops for people of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander backgrounds.

There were 120 individual information, support, advocacy and/or referral sessions. I am also advised that the centre provided many rural services, both on an individual basis, particularly for people who had reported as being HIV positive, and also holding weekend treatment workshops. Again, training programs were made available to rural workers in health and community services and also some medical students.

There have been a number of different HIV treatment forums, and also activities like Pos Day Out family events, where the friends and family who surround people who are HIV positive get an opportunity to be involved in programs, and there have been many research programs that they were telling me about.

Part of the work, of course, of being the sort of organisation that they are, and with the sad closure of our AIDS Council in South Australia, is that Positive Life SA is being called on more and more to provide information to different panels, forums, reference groups and other organisations; so it is flat out. Although I know that the AIDS Council work has been taken up by other organisations, this has put an extra burden on Positive Life SA.

One of the things that I think we need to be reminded about, with regard to this organisation and other organisations, is that treatment as prevention reduces the cost to South Australians in this area. I am told that HIV treatment reduces the infectiousness of someone with HIV, and then also can reduce the risk of transmission. Each new HIV diagnosis costs the public health system around \$1 million over time. It is obviously a very needed treatment, but it is also a

very expensive one on the public purse. And HIV treatment sooner rather than later reduces the risk of other diseases and problems.

FALSE IMPRISONMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:17): Today in question time I asked the Attorney-General about whether he was aware of any cases where people have been falsely imprisoned in our corrections system. He did say that he would get back to the house and to me with specific details, and I am sure he will do that, and I am grateful for the information that he will provide. However, I would like to say how concerned I am about the fact that this could actually happen.

The Attorney told us that this came up because of administrative errors. The hypothetical example that he used was that prison officers might think that a person was due to be released on a certain day and that it might be incorrect and they should have been released sooner than that. I understand that there is one person who in the 2012-13 financial year was mistakenly imprisoned for 20 days.

Now, Mr Speaker, I am sure you would agree with all of us that that is a terrible imposition to place on any person. I think that it is totally separate from the reason that they might have been there. Whether it is for the most minor crime that would lead to imprisonment or for something at the maximum end of the scale, spending an extra 20 days in prison that you are not due to spend in prison is a dreadful penalty for anybody to pay.

The Attorney did say that he would also look into whether any sort of compensation had been made to any of the eight people who, I am led to believe, have been falsely imprisoned within the last financial year. I am not suggesting that for any one of those cases there should be financial compensation paid, because I am not familiar with the details and, with the work I have done with FOI, I do not have enough detail to be able to say that, but I think it is a very important question to ask: whether that is appropriate.

What is absolutely critical to this issue for me is that if it could happen to one person it can happen to another person; it could happen to anybody who happened to be in prison. It could happen to a person who was due to be released on one day and was released too late, as the Attorney said he understands can happen. It could happen to a person who perhaps was not meant to go to prison at all. It could happen to a person who might be in the custody of police or the Department for Correctional Services for some reason but was not actually meant to be imprisoned.

So, it can happen at either end of the scale and, at either end of the scale, I think it is terribly important. If we think of any one of our friends or family members who could end up falling foul of the law, I am sure that we would think it was appropriate for them to pay the appropriate penalty, but I am sure that we would all be dreadfully concerned to think that they could pay an inappropriate penalty—that they could be imprisoned inappropriately. We would all be very concerned and worried about the physical and mental impact that that might have on them.

I urge all members of this house to consider this issue very seriously. I look forward to receiving the information that the Attorney will bring back to me and to this house, providing details of the times that it has happened in the last financial year. Of course, and perhaps most importantly, I urge the government and I urge the Department for Correctional Services to do whatever they can to make sure that it does not happen this financial year or next financial year. This is a very important issue that must be taken seriously.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC TEACHING AWARDS

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:21): I rise today to share with the house the excellent results of northern suburbs schools in the SA Public Teaching Awards. In August, more than 70 teachers and staff were named as winners in their regions. The award recognises dedicated and hardworking teachers, leaders and support staff for public schools and preschools. The categories are: School/Preschool Leader of the Year, Secondary School Teacher of the Year, Primary School Teacher of the Year, Early Years Teacher of the Year, Lifetime Achievement Award, School/Preschool Support Staff Member of the Year, and Innovative Engagement with Business and Community.

We had an exceptional result with Salisbury High having three regional winners. The regional winners were principal Anne Prime, teacher Evan Polymeneus and the senior special class. The senior special class was a regional winner in the Innovative Engagement with Business

and Community category. Also in the northern area, Paralowie R to 12 had two regional winners: Mary Jo Bellew for school support, and Deidre Murphy as a primary school teacher. Since 2011, Salisbury High School has had seven regional winners, which is actually a new record in this category.

In October, the actual state winners were announced and Evan Polymeneus was awarded the Secondary School Teacher of the Year. Evan is a teacher at Salisbury High School. He has been teaching in the northern suburbs since 1999 and is known for his 'take a walk in their shoes' teaching philosophy. He encourages students to empathise with people around the world in different cultural and social circumstances.

Evan also runs an aviation unit where he links curriculum to the real world by teaching students about the aeronautical history of Parafield Airport and builds model planes. These public teaching awards are to encourage excellence, enthusiasm and innovation in our teachers. The winners of these state awards received up to \$20,000 towards professional development.

I would like to make a little bit more of a mention of the senior special class at Salisbury High School, because not only have they recently been a regional winner for Innovative Engagement with Business and Community but they also took out some special mentions and top honours at the Royal Show. They had 10 awardees out of a total of 14 entries in the Junior Technology competition. With a particular concentration on photography, there is a significant list of winners.

The first place photography winners were Alicia Moore, Natalia Jara and Tayla Denk, who received two first place prizes. Second place went to Alicia Moore, Claire Jarvis, Madeline Lucas and Sallie Mahoney, and Brittany Tonkins and Natalia Jara placed third. Dual winner, year 12 student Alicia Moore has studied photography for three years. She received first place for a colour portrait and second place for a classical black-and-white portrait.

We know and we have just heard in the house today how important education is to having a successful regular income and to lowering unemployment rates. We have a great commitment with our government to supporting people to finish their schooling.

It is really fantastic to see that our teachers, who are at the forefront of supporting our students to complete their schooling, are being seen as the best in their category and the best not just regionally but to go on then to win this state award. So, I am very proud to be a northern suburbs MP, I am very proud of our schools and I encourage them to keep up the good work.

REGIONAL AWARDS FOR HILLS AND COASTS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:25): I would like to spend a few minutes talking about the regional awards in my region, which were held last Friday night at McCracken at Victor Harbor: the Regional Awards for Hills and Coasts. I enjoyed the company also of the member for Heysen and the member for Hammond, who were allowed into my electorate for the purpose of the event.

I would also like to very much congratulate Karen Raffan, the Chief Executive Officer of Brand SA. It was a particularly good night. These shows are tightly run—extremely well run. McCracken put on a great meal and it is a great site. Karen and her team from Brand SA do an excellent job and they keep things running to schedule. It was due to finish at 9:30pm and it did on the knocker, so it was very pleasing.

More to the point, the people from my electorate who participated—the companies and individuals—all deserve a mention. The finalist in one section for small business was Surf & Son; for large business, Kangaroo Island Pure Grain; community group, CLASS Inc., which operates across the hills both at Strathalbyn and Victor Harbor. In premium food and wine from our clean environment: Island Pure, the sheep dairy people; and Kangaroo Island Shellfish, which is American River oysters; and the finalists in the premium food and wine were Ballast Stone Estate. Kangaroo Island Outdoor Action, which are four-wheel drive motorbikes—what do you call them?

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Quad bikes.

Mr PENGILLY: Thank you, quad bikes. They have done a terrific job down there. Leah Pippas was a finalist in the youth category. The winner of the Westpac Small Business Award was Kangaroo Island Spirits, run by Jon and Sarah Lark. If anyone is on the island, they should go and visit Jon and Sarah. They have done a terrific job. They celebrated in style Friday night and they were not at all well at the Victor Harbor market on Saturday morning, I might add.

The Westpac Large Business Award winner was Ferguson Australia. Despite the best efforts of the government to wipe out the fishing industry, it came home first. Congratulations to Andrew and Debra and their family.

The winner of the Seniors Card Community Individual Award was Leah Pippas from the South Australian Whale Centre. She is the manager down at Victor Harbor. Leah is an outstanding young lady. She does a terrific job. She is mixed up with the Port Elliot Country Fire Service and plays hockey and a few other things. She is certainly a great proponent for the Whale Centre. She is quite often on the radio during the whale season, particularly on Saturday mornings, and I congratulate Leah on her efforts there.

The Flinders University Education Award winner was Kangaroo Island Community Education. This deserves a special mention. The principal, Mr Ian Kent, was there and a couple of the other staff. This is an amazing achievement: bringing three schools together into one school with three campuses. Despite the best intent of a few around the place to try to disrupt education, they came out to the fore. From an isolated location like that, to win that particular category was certainly a great credit to them.

Hindmarsh Valley Dairy—Denise Riches and her husband who run the Hindmarsh Valley goat dairy (goat and cow milk, cheeses and dairy products)—were the Food SA Premium Food and Wine from our Clean Environment—Food Award winner. They conduct a very successful business and I was absolutely delighted to be there with them on the night.

In the Thoroughbred Racing SA Sport Award, the winner was Franklin Island Triathlon, run by the inimitable Sid James. Sid James is a quadriplegic and is an amazing man. He has won a multitude of awards. He runs not only this particular Franklin Island Triathlon but also the Victor Harbor Triathlon in March, all from the confines of a wheelchair. He has very little movement of any kind whatsoever. He can talk the leg off a chair and he has no hesitation in rounding us up for sponsorship, to help him or anything else.

As I said, it was a good night. It was well run. I know there have been other regional awards around the state, but it is something that I always look forward to. Again, congratulations to Karen Raffin and her team, and my congratulations to all the finalists, participants and the award winners on that night.

STUART HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (15:30): Today I want to congratulate a school in Whyalla, Stuart High School, which is celebrating its 40th anniversary at the weekend, and I will be involved in the celebrations. We have four excellent high schools in Whyalla. My colleague, the Minister for Finance, who is sitting in front of me, and I both attended Whyalla High School, and Whyalla High School is very dear to my heart, but Stuart is a very special school in Whyalla. It is a school that I am very proud of and proud to be associated with.

Stuart High School has always been at the forefront of practical learning and teaching programs. It has had a chequered history with students who have come from very difficult backgrounds, very often, and has provided programs that have suited those students and enabled them to thrive. The school has had excellent facilities to implement the programs that have been put into the school and many areas of the school have recently been upgraded.

The school has always prided itself on involving the community in these education practices and that tradition still lives on today, with the school continuing to offer pioneer programs that offer practical skills and knowledge that students can carry with them into the future. They have had a program in the last five years called the Youth Opportunities Personal Leadership program, and this has had great success among the students. It has also provided aquaculture and horticulture programs, which are particularly relevant to our part of the state.

The school has offered the community opportunities for involvement through tourist tours. We are able to purchase smoked fish there, which are bred and smoked there on site. They are very involved in the Activ8 program. They deliver the South Australian Aboriginal Sports Training Academy program, because they have a very high proportion of Indigenous students. They made international headlines last year with the opening of the world-first Albert Ellis Professional Learning Centre at the school.

On Saturday, I am really looking forward to hearing the first-ever Stuart High School principal, John Lyons, who will be a distinguished guest on the day. He will be addressing the students and the people that will be attending. John Lyons was a teacher of mine at Whyalla High

School and stands out in my memory as the teacher who most influenced my life, because he actually taught us to think and not just accept things. The minister in front of me is nodding and agrees that he was an outstanding teacher. So, I am really looking forward to having John back to celebrate the 40th anniversary. It is wonderful for the school.

I also pay tribute to the principal, Veronica Conley, because a lot of the things that have happened at that school would not have happened without steering from Veronica Conley. I understand she is up for renewal of her contract. I would be very, very disappointed if she was not to get that role, because I know that the school has flourished under her, that the teachers are very happy with her, and so are the students. I am certainly keeping my fingers crossed that she stays on as the principal, and she is happy to stay there, which is very good. So, good luck to Stuart High School. I am sure we are going to have a wonderful weekend and I look forward to spending a lot more time with you in the future.

Today I also acknowledge the sisters of the good Samaritan in Whyalla, who will be leaving Whyalla in December after many, many years of dedicated service in the community. The sisters of the good Samaritan were founded in Sydney in 1857 in response to the needs of the early colony. The sisters have a vocation to go out and be neighbourly to all, especially the poor, the marginalised, the suffering, Aboriginal people, women, youth and children. This is certainly a tradition that they have upheld in Whyalla in the many years that they have been there.

In 1941, the Bishop of Port Pirie wrote to the Superior General Mother and asked if she would send sisters to Whyalla as they desperately needed a Catholic school. There were more than 100 Catholic children and the number was constantly increasing with the arrival of new families. Well, they arrived and they have remained ever since.

They started St Theresa's School in Darling Terrace; later, they moved on to St Francis Xavier's primary school and later went into the Secondary School for Girls. When in 1962 the Christian Brothers opened St John's College, there was a separate girls school, but eventually the girls were amalgamated with the boys and now we have Samaritan College, which is an amazing college in Whyalla.

These sisters have provided work in Whyalla for many years, working with the community in Centrecare, performing midwifery at the Whyalla Hospital, where they also visited the sick and elderly. They have always been a pleasure and wonderful people to work with, but they are moving away and closing in Whyalla. I wish them all the best and thank them from the bottom of my heart from the people of Whyalla for their service to Whyalla.

CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) (SENTENCES OF INDETERMINATE DURATION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:37): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988. 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) (15:37): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to insert the second reading explanation into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Bill amends Division 3 of Part 2 of the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*.

The present legislative scheme

Part 2 Division 3 was enacted to deal with offenders of a particular class; namely, sexual offenders. The government of the day believed that an offender who has been assessed as being incapable of controlling, or unwilling to control, his or her sexual instincts, is a grave enough risk to warrant an overturning of the fundamental principle of proportionality in sentencing in order to protect society from the likely recidivism of the offender.

Section 23 of the Act currently provides that, if a person has been convicted of a relevant sexual offence, the Supreme Court may order that the person be medically assessed as to whether they are incapable of controlling, or unwilling to control, his or her sexual instincts. On receipt of the reports of this assessment, or if the offender refuses to cooperate with an assessment ordered by the Court, the Court may order that the offender be detained in custody until further order (known as an indeterminate sentence).

The purpose of an order under section 23 is principally for the protection of the community and not for the punishment of the offender. It has been held that the power to make an order under section 23 is exceptional and should be exercised with caution and where there is cogent and acceptable evidence justifying the making of the order. A release on licence under section 24 involves the exercise of a discretion on similar criteria to those under section 23(11) but has been granted more readily than a discharge of the order itself. The Supreme Court has held that a determination of an application under section 24 involves balancing the interests of the applicant on the one hand and those of the community on the other.

Community Safety

The Government is of the view that this test, involving a balancing of the interests of the applicant and the community, is not acceptable. The safety of the community must be regarded as the paramount consideration when the Supreme Court considers either an application for discharge of an order under section 23 or an application for release on licence under section 24.

Accordingly, the Bill makes amendments to the current test for the discharge of an indeterminate sentence order and imposes a new test for a release on licence under section 24. When considering such applications, the Court will be required to take into account the safety of the community as the paramount consideration. This test is akin to the test included in section 67 of the *Correctional Services Act 1982*, which provides that the paramount consideration for the Parole Board when determining an application for the release of a prisoner who is not eligible for automatic parole must be the safety of the community.

In addition, the Government is taking the opportunity to make amendments to the test for the making of an indeterminate detention order. Once again, the Bill will require the Court to take into account the safety of the community as the paramount consideration.

Reports

The Bill amends the matters that the Supreme Court must take into account when determining an application for a discharge of an indeterminate sentence order or an application for release on licence under section 24. Previously, the Court was only required to consider the report of at least 2 legally qualified medical practitioners when determining an application for a discharge of an indeterminate sentence order. The Bill imposes the same requirement in relation to an application for release on licence. In addition, the Bill inserts a requirement that the medical practitioners be nominated by a prescribed authority.

The Bill also imposes a requirement for the Court to consider a report furnished by the Training Centre Review Board or Parole Board (as the case may be) when determining an application for a discharge of an indeterminate sentence order or an application for release on licence. This provision will give the relevant Board an opportunity to present its opinion to the Court on the effect that the applicant's release may have on the safety of the community, and the probable circumstances of the person if released (either through discharge of the indeterminate sentence order or release on licence).

Finally, the Bill reduces the frequency of the relevant Board's reporting requirement under section 23(9) to annually rather than bi-annually.

Relevant offence

The Bill amends the definition of *relevant offence* in section 23(1) to include an offence of failing to comply with any reporting obligation relating to contact with a child without a reasonable excuse where the defendant is a registrable offender under the *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006*.

Transitional provisions

The Bill inserts Schedule 2. This Schedule contains a transitional provision to enable the Supreme Court to conduct what is essentially a re-hearing of a prior decision to release on licence a person subject to an indefinite detention order. The Schedule gives the Director of Public Prosecutions a discretion to apply for the cancellation of an existing order for release on licence. When considering such an application, the Court must take into account the same matters that must be taken into account when determining an application for release on licence as provided by the amendments provided for in the Bill.

Ultimately, the purpose of this Bill is to ensure that the safety of the community is the paramount consideration for the Court when determining any applications under this legislative scheme.

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 *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*

4—Amendment of section 23—Offenders incapable of controlling, or unwilling to control, sexual instincts

This clause amends section 23 to separate the provisions relating to the making of an order to detain a person who is incapable of controlling, or unwilling to control, his or her sexual instincts in custody until further order from the provisions relating to the discharge of such an order.

The amendments clarify that, before determining whether to make an order that a person to whom section 23 applies be detained in custody until further order, the Supreme Court must direct that at least 2 legally qualified medical practitioners (to be nominated by a prescribed authority for the purpose) inquire into the person's mental condition and report to the Court on whether the person is incapable of controlling, or unwilling to control, his or her sexual instincts.

The amendments emphasise that the paramount consideration of the Supreme Court when determining whether to make such an order must be the safety of the community.

The list of other matters to which the Court must take into account when determining whether to make such an order is as follows:

- the reports of the medical practitioners (as directed and nominated under proposed subsection (3)) furnished to the Court;
- any relevant evidence or representations that the person may desire to put to the Court;
- any report required by the Court under section 25;
- any other matter the Court thinks relevant.

Proposed new subsection (5c) is similar to current section 23(5)(b) except that it now includes a reference to the paramount consideration being the safety of the community.

The clause also adds to the list of offences that constitute a *relevant offence* (as set out in current section 23(1)) the offence of failing to comply with a reporting obligation relating to reportable contact with a child without a reasonable excuse where the defendant is a registrable offender within the meaning of the *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006*.

Other amendments are of a minor nature.

5—Insertion of section 23A

New section 23A includes the provisions (with additions and amendments) from current section 23 that provide for the discharge of orders for detention under section 23.

23A—Discharge of detention order under section 23

Subsection (1) of this new section is similar to current section 23(11) and provides that, subject to the Act, a person subject to an order for detention under section 23 will not be released from detention under that section until the Supreme Court, on application by the Director of Public Prosecutions or the person, discharges the order for detention.

The Supreme Court must, before determining an application for the discharge of an order for detention under section 23, direct that at least 2 legally qualified medical practitioners (to be nominated by a prescribed authority for the purpose) inquire into the mental condition of the person subject to the order and report to the Court on whether the person is incapable of controlling, or unwilling to control, his or her sexual instincts.

This new section also provides (as in the proposed amendments to section 23) that the paramount consideration of the Supreme Court when determining an application for the discharge of an order for detention under section 23 must be the safety of the community.

Similarly to what is proposed to be inserted in section 23, the Supreme Court must also take into account various other matters when determining an application for the discharge of an order for detention under section 23 as set out below:

- the reports of the medical practitioners (as directed and nominated under proposed subsection (2)) furnished to the Court;
- any relevant evidence or representations that the person may desire to put to the Court;
- a report furnished to the Court by the Training Centre Review Board or Parole Board (as the case may be) in accordance with the direction of the Court for the purposes of assisting the Court to determine the application, including—
 - any opinion that the relevant Board may have about the effect the discharge of the order may have on the safety of the community; and
 - a report as to the probable circumstances of the person if the order is discharged;
- the reports resulting from the periodic reviews under section 23(9) by the relevant Board on the progress and circumstances of the person tendered to the Court;
- any other report required by the Court under section 25;
- any other matter that the Court thinks relevant.

A copy of a report furnished to the Supreme Court under this new section must be given to each party to the proceedings or to counsel for those parties.

6—Amendment of section 24—Release on licence

This clause makes amendments to section 24 that are consistent with the amendments to section 23 and new 23A and an amendment that is consequential.

7—Amendment of section 25—Court may obtain reports

This proposed amendment is consequential on the proposed insertion of Schedule 2.

8—Insertion of section 25A

It is proposed to insert a new section 25A that is substantially the same as what is currently provided for in current section 23(4).

25A—Inquiries by medical practitioners

New section 25A provides that where, for the purposes of Part 2 Division 3 of the principal Act, the Supreme Court directs that at least 2 legally qualified medical practitioners (to be nominated by a prescribed authority) inquire into the mental condition of a person and report to the Court on whether the person is incapable of controlling, or unwilling to control, his or her sexual instincts, each medical practitioner so nominated—

- must carry out an independent personal examination of the person; and
- may have access to any evidence before the court by which the person was convicted; and
- may obtain the assistance of a psychologist, social worker, community corrections officer or any other person.

9—Insertion of Schedule 2

This clause inserts Schedule 2:

Schedule 2—Reconsideration of authorisations to release on licence under section 24

Schedule 2 provides for a scheme by which the Supreme Court may, on application by the Director of Public Prosecutions, cancel or confirm the release on licence of a person to whom clause 1 of the Schedule applies (being a person subject to an order for detention under section 23 who, before the commencement of the clause, has been authorised by the Supreme Court under section 24 to be released on licence). The scheme is consistent with the proposed amendments to Part 2 Division 3 of the principal Act set out above.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

YOUNG OFFENDERS (RELEASE ON LICENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:38): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend 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) (15:39): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to insert the second reading explanation into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

It was recently brought to the Government's attention that it would be beneficial to amend section 29(4) of the *Young Offenders Act 1993* (the Young Offenders Act) to reflect both the Government's intention and the current practice of the Supreme Court that any youth sentenced to life imprisonment for the offence of murder is sentenced as an adult. Further, there is a need to resolve the potential conflict between the operation of sections 29(4) and 37 of the Young Offenders Act and section 32 of the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988* (the Sentencing Act).

In certain circumstances, a court, when sentencing a youth, has the discretion to deal with that youth in the same way as an adult because of the gravity of the offence for which they are to be sentenced, or because the offence forms part of a pattern of repeated offending (see section 17 of the Young Offenders Act).

As it currently stands, if a youth has been found guilty of murder, then in accordance with section 29(4) of the Young Offenders Act and the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*, that youth must be sentenced to life imprisonment.

The courts have taken the view that, when sentencing a youth to life imprisonment for murder, it is only appropriate that the youth be sentenced as an adult. However, this position should be clearly reflected in the statute.

The Government supports this view. The crime of murder is so serious that any youth convicted of this offence should be sentenced as an adult.

The Bill therefore makes an amendment to section 29(4) to provide specifically that, when a youth is being sentenced to life imprisonment for murder, they are being sentenced as an adult.

This amendment will also ensure that, in all cases where a youth is being sentenced for murder, the court will continue to apply section 32 of the Sentencing Act due to the operation of section 31A.

When it commenced, the Sentencing Act did not apply to the sentencing of children.

Section 31A was inserted into the Sentencing Act in 1996. Section 31A was amended in 1998 and has not been amended since.

Section 31A states that Division 2 of the Sentencing Act (regarding the setting of non-parole periods and which includes section 32) does not apply in relation to a youth unless:

- the youth is sentenced as an adult; or
- is sentenced to detention to be served in a prison; or
- is otherwise transferred to or ordered to serve a period of detention in prison.

Section 32 of the Sentencing Act states that, subject to the section, if a person is not subject to an existing non-parole period, the court must set a non-parole period. In all but the rarest of cases, this results in the setting of a non-parole period.

Once a non-parole period is set, at the conclusion of that period of time, the offender may apply for release on parole.

Section 31A makes it clear that, when a youth is sentenced as an adult, then section 32 applies regarding the setting of a non-parole period.

Therefore, the amendment to section 29(4) of the Young Offenders Act will ensure that any youth sentenced to life imprisonment for the offence of murder is sentenced as an adult, meaning the court will continue the practice of applying section 32 of the Sentencing Act regarding the setting of a non-parole period.

However, the Young Offenders Act contains a further provision which appears to have complicated the sentencing of young people for the offence of murder.

Prior to the Young Offenders Act, a youth sentenced for murder was subject to the *Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979* (the 1979 Act).

Under section 55(1) of the 1979 Act, a child convicted of murder could only be detained at the Governor's pleasure.

Pursuant to section 55(4) of the 1979 Act, the child, while 'detained in a training centre', could be released on licence by the Governor upon the recommendation of the Training Centre Review Board.

In *R v Marshall* (1986) 43 SASR 448 at 499 White J recommended that the Supreme Court be given the power to fix an appropriate sentence and a non-parole period (see page 500). Section 55(4) provided that the Governor may on a recommendation of the Parole Board or if the child is detained in a training centre, on the recommendation of the Training Centre Review Board, discharge the child on licence.

The 1979 Act therefore required a mechanism by which a youth sentenced for murder could be released. The release on licence was the mechanism by which release occurred.

By 1990 the 1979 Act had been amended so that a child who was convicted for murder had to be imprisoned for life (see section 55(1)).

But section 55(2) stipulated that 'a non-parole period cannot be fixed in respect of a sentence of life imprisonment imposed under this section'.

The absence of a power to fix a non-parole period therefore required a separate mechanism by which a youth convicted of murder could be released.

The 1979 Act was therefore also amended to include the precursor to section 37 whereby a child who had been sentenced to imprisonment for life and who was being detained in a training centre, could be released on licence by the Supreme Court.

The Sentencing Act commenced in 1988 and did not apply to the sentencing of children and the Young Offenders Act commenced in 1994.

The Young Offenders Act retained certain aspects of the 1979 Act, in particular it required that a youth sentenced for murder be sentenced to imprisonment for life (see section 29(4)) and did not expressly prohibit the fixing of a non-parole period for a youth sentenced to imprisonment for life.

The Young Offenders Act also retained the power of the Supreme Court to release on licence a youth sentenced to imprisonment for life who was detained in a training centre (under section 37).

Section 37 of the Young Offenders Act provides that if a youth has been sentenced to life imprisonment and is being detained in a training centre (as opposed to in a prison) then the youth may apply to the Supreme Court to be released on licence.

It was in 1996 that section 31A was inserted into the Sentencing Act which embedded in statute the practice that a non-parole period could be fixed for a youth sentenced as an adult. At that time, section 37 was untouched.

It was in 1998 that the courts took the view that any youth sentenced to life imprisonment for the offence of murder was sentenced as an adult.

However, both section 37 of the Young Offenders Act and sections 31A and 32 of the Sentencing Act remained.

The Government adamantly opposes the idea that a youth convicted of murder can be released before the applicable non-parole period has expired. Therefore section 37 has no work to do.

A non-parole period represents the minimum period of incarceration which the gravity of the crime committed requires and which is transparently set for that purpose. The initial sentencing process would be completely subverted if an offender, who is a youth, serving a sentence in a training centre, could be released on licence before serving that minimum period.

This Bill has been drafted reflecting this view. The remnant section 37 of the Young Offenders Act should and will be deleted.

The Government is of the view that section 32 of the Sentencing Act should cover the field with respect to potential early release on parole, by way of the fixing of a non-parole period, of any young offender:

- sentenced as an adult; or
- sentenced to detention to be served in a prison; or
- otherwise transferred to or ordered to serve a period of detention in prison.

A transitional provision has also been included that reflects the Government's clear position.

Under the transitional provision, any right that has accrued under section 37 that has not yet been exercised is extinguished.

In addition, any right that has accrued, that has been exercised but not yet determined, is also extinguished.

This means that any application that has been made by a youth under section 37 but not determined prior to the commencement of this Act is defeated by force of the Act.

In addition, under the transitional provisions, any youth who has been sentenced to imprisonment for life, and who is being detained in a training centre, will not be able to make an application for release on licence under section 37 once the Act commences. This provision will apply regardless of whether the youth could have made such an application before the commencement of the Act.

So there will be no future applications for release under section 37.

Any release on licence of a youth under section 37 that has not been cancelled at the time of commencement of the Act will be taken to continue in accordance with its terms, even once the Act has commenced. In addition, section 37 of the Young Offenders Act, as in force immediately before the commencement of the Act, will be taken to continue to apply in relation to a release on licence continued under this transitional provision as if section 37 had not been repealed.

This is an anomaly with potentially poisonous and unintended consequences. It should be closed down at once.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Young Offenders Act 1993*

3—Amendment of section 29—Sentencing youth as an adult

This clause amends section 29(4) of the principal Act to clarify that a youth sentenced to life imprisonment for murder is being sentenced as an adult.

4—Repeal of Part 5 Division 2

This clause repeals Part 5 Division 2 of the principal Act, thus repealing section 37 which allows youths convicted of murder and serving a life sentence in a training centre to apply for release on licence.

5—Amendment of section 42A—Training Centre Review Board may direct youth to surrender firearm etc

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Interpretation

This clause defines 'repealed section', namely section 37 of the principal Act.

2—Applications under section 37 of *Young Offenders Act 1993*

This clause extinguishes any applications for release on licence under section 37 of the principal Act that are currently on foot, and prevents future applications from being made, including in respect of youths who could, but for this measure, have made an application but did not.

3—Youths currently subject to licence

This clause provides for the continuation of any current releases on licence under section 37 of the principal Act in accordance with their terms, and continues the effect of that section in relation to dealing with the licences in future, for example where they are to be cancelled or the youth discharged.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

ELECTORAL (FUNDING, EXPENDITURE AND DISCLOSURE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 4, page 21, after line 42 [clause 4, inserted section 130Y]—After subsection (4) insert:

- (5) If, after a certificate has been lodged by the agent of a party in accordance with this section, a candidate who—
- (a) is a member of Parliament; or
 - (b) is a member of a group a member of which is a member of Parliament,
- ceases to be endorsed by the party in relation to the relevant election, the agent of the candidate will be taken, for the purposes of this Part, to have lodged a certificate in accordance with this section at the time specified in subsection (2)(aa) unless the candidate, within 48 hours after ceasing to be so endorsed notifies the Electoral Commissioner (in a manner determined by the Electoral Commissioner) that he or she does not wish to be taken to have lodged a certificate in accordance with this section (in which case the agent of the candidate may not lodge a certificate in relation to the relevant election).

No. 2. Clause 4, page 22, lines 39 to 43 [clause 4, inserted section 130Z(2)]—Delete subsection (2)

Consideration in committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The opposition agrees with these amendments. For clarity, the member for Mount Gambier raised an issue during the committee stage in this house, and this amendment goes a small step to what he was talking about.

In relation to the other issues the member for Mount Gambier talked about, the advice from parliamentary counsel was that they would be better dealt with in regulation because they were too complex for the legislation proper, and we have agreed that those regulations will not be brought in without agreement between government and opposition. Naturally, at that point, prior to bringing those in, we would consult with the member for Mount Gambier, who raised the issue initially. So, in fairness to the member for Mount Gambier, I put that on the record.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I agree with everything the member for Davenport has said.

Motion carried.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST BILL

Received from the Legislative Council with a message drawing the attention of the House of Assembly to clauses Nos 55 and 61, printed in erased type, which clauses being money clauses cannot originate in the Legislative Council but which are deemed necessary to the bill. Read a first time.

LATE PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT DEBTS (INTEREST) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 June 2013.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:45): I rise on behalf of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to place on record our support of the government's Late Payment of Government Debts (Interest) Bill 2013. The reason we are supporting this bill is that some months before the government announced this particular measure, the Liberal Party had announced this principle as policy. So, every day in question time the government ministers stand up and say the Liberal Party has not put out any policies, and yet they have introduced this legislation on the back of a Liberal Party policy.

We are pleased that the government is playing catch-up. We are pleased that, after 12 long years of having an atrocious payment record to small business out of its departments, it is finally getting around to paying within terms. We are pleased that the government has decided that, if it cannot get itself organised enough within its departments to pay on time, then small business would ultimately receive some form of interest payment. This is an idea that has been adopted federally by the commonwealth government under both colours; the scheme works well there.

What the bill does is say, in simple terms, that if the government does not pay its bills for goods and services on time, then ultimately the provider of the goods or services, if they are a small business (which is, from memory, a turnover of \$5 million), then they can get interest paid on the outstanding debt at a rate set by the bill, unless of course it is subject to some form of formal dispute or there are contractor terms that set the terms of trade at a different rate than 30 days or less. That is the simple purpose of this bill.

The opposition consulted with the Law Society, and the Law Society came back with some comments on the bill. For the sake of the minister's interest, I will go through some of the points made by the Law Society. The Law Society raised the point that the government is using an overly complex method of introducing this bill. I mentioned earlier that the commonwealth has this principle, and it has been in place for many years. The commonwealth's definition of small business provides:

...small business means an enterprise that employs less than the full time equivalent of 20 persons on the day that the written contract under which payment is to be made is entered into ('full time equivalent' is defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics). If the enterprise is an 'associated entity' as defined in section 50AAA of the Corporations Act 2001, this test is applied to the group of associated entities as a whole.

The government has taken a different definition of small business. This state government has defined small business as:

...a business carried on by a qualifying person or a qualifying body where the annual turnover of the business does not exceed \$5 million (or if a greater amount is prescribed—the prescribed amount) in the financial year immediately preceding the financial year in which the relevant qualifying day occurs;

The Law Society makes the point: why are we setting up a law with two definitions? These businesses are going to trade with both state and commonwealth governments, and the reality is that they could be eligible under one law and not eligible under the other law, even though they could have outstanding amounts owed by the government. The Law Society raised that issue, saying, 'Wouldn't it make more sense to simply adopt the commonwealth legislation definition and, therefore, the businesses know they are on one set of rules which makes it easier for everyone?'

It also raised that the definition in the state government's bill is in some ways narrower than the federal finance department's definition. It argues there are a number of small businesses that would have fewer than 20 employees that may have an annual turnover of more than \$5 million. This could possibly lead to a situation where a business is a small business for the purposes of a commonwealth contract but not considered a small business for a state contract.

It also raises the issue that it believes the definition would exclude small businesses that may have not had any annual turnover in the previous financial year. If you are a start-up business

and you have had no turnover in the previous financial year, the Law Society believes this bill excludes you from the operation of the bill. In your first year of operation, the Law Society says this particular bill would exclude you.

The requirement to cross-reference the definition with a number of other defined terms in the state bill (for example, 'qualifying person', 'qualifying body' and 'qualifying day') also adds, in the Law Society's view, an extra layer of complexity to the definition which could possibly be simplified with some fine tuning and drafting.

The opposition will not propose any amendments to the bill. The government obviously would have consulted all the business groups in regard to the bill and I will ask the minister to confirm which groups were consulted in the preparation of the bill. Suffice to say that we are absolutely delighted that the government has adopted the same policy principle as the Liberal Party, some months later. I draw it to the attention of the house because, when ministers stand up in question time in the future and say the opposition has released no policy or has no policy, I will be taking a point of order and drawing the house's attention to this very bill.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: We'll have to say in future that you have got one policy.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Elder, please. The member for Elder well knows that there is a dispute within the house between the government and the opposition about which South Road policy is of greater value to the state, so there is a second policy where the government is in error. I just make the point. Small business will welcome this. It really should not have had to come to this, in my view. The state government should have been organised enough, and the department should have been organised enough, to simply pay their bills on time.

This government has spent hundreds of millions of dollars on setting up Shared Services, designed to get the accounts paid on time, and now we find, having spent all the money on Shared Services, we ultimately have to bring in legislation to make sure the bills are paid on time. Of course, businesses should be paid on time. The government should be a model citizen and pay its bills on time. We welcome the legislation, we welcome the government copying our policy, and we look forward to its speedy passage through both houses.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (15:54): I am pleased to make some comments in relation to this piece of legislation, being the Late Payment of Government Debts (Interest) Bill 2013, and I obviously speak in support of the position the member for Davenport has enunciated on behalf of the opposition.

The member for Davenport, I think, covered all the pertinent aspects of the bill and made some very good points. Actually, this is pretty much a copycat version of the opposition's policy released some months ago, with a little bit of tweaking, a few changes at the edges, but basically it is quite a similar policy to that which we released some months ago. The member for Davenport makes the quite relevant point that we are seeing the government play catch-up in relation to this particular issue.

In relation to Shared Services, that has proven to be a failed model, I think, in this state. We have seen evidence that it has not worked efficiently in Western Australia. My understanding is that they have dismantled Shared Services in that state and gone back to the previous manner in which they managed their business. All the evidence points to Shared Services not in any way, shape or form realising the benefits, if you like, that were highlighted by the government at the time, and really with some quite significant and bad outcomes.

There are a couple of examples I would like to highlight. Whilst we do not come into this place to talk about particular issues relating to our own individual operation as a member, in my own office we have had some issues with bills being paid in a timely manner, to the extent that I had a piece of equipment that I use to access information and as a communication tool and the availability of that equipment was cut off. That service was cut off by Telstra because the bill had not been paid. For me to recommence the availability of those services I had to pay the bill myself. That was not necessarily a major issue, it was not a huge amount of money, it just goes to the point that there are some serious flaws in the way the government goes about paying its bills.

Also, the local newsagent that delivers newspapers to the electorate office. They are good people. It is a small business. They are struggling under the current economic climate that the state government has been responsible for. They have made comments to us that some of the accounts have gone 60 to 90 days before they have been paid. Whilst our bill with the local newsagent is not necessarily enormous, it is still a debt that that small business should not be expected to carry, in

view of the fact that the government cannot get its act together, as the member for Davenport pointed out, and pay its bills in a timely manner.

I recall, under the previous Liberal government, that each minister had the responsibility of a reporting structure to them where they would oversee the payment of bills their office had the responsibility for. There was a schedule provided to each minister every month showing what bills had been paid and what bills were still outstanding. Any bills, from memory, that were 30 days outstanding, there had to be a damn good reason why they were not being paid on time. That just goes to show, I think, how focused the Liberal Party (a Liberal government) is on supporting small business.

I am not sure what system this government has in place to oversee the payment of accounts, invoices, bills that come its way. I would be pleased if the minister would shed some light on that issue because there is not a lot of evidence that there is any system in place for the oversight of payment of bills in a timely manner, particularly with the state that we find Shared Services in and the way it operates.

We also had the example of the mechanic business in the Mid North. The owner of that business publicly came out and made a statement that his business failed as a consequence of the government not settling its accounts in a timely manner. Obviously he was not able to extend his overdraft at the bank, or whatever the situation may have been in relation to that, for his business's financial arrangements. That person came out publicly stated that his business had failed as a direct consequence—

The Hon. M.F. O'Brien: He's a bloody fool!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Wow! That is an interesting interjection from the minister, and I hope Hansard has picked that up, because it is quite unbecoming of a minister to use that language in the house; but the minister is responsible for his own actions.

The Hon. M.F. O'Brien interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Don't get upset, minister; you have got the chance to have right of reply, to close the debate, and you can put your position and that of the government. I am just highlighting the fact that that person made public statements that his business failed as a consequence of the government not paying its bills on time. As the member for Davenport stated, we are, on the side of the house, happy to support the legislation. As has already been stated, it is pretty much a copycat of our policy, apart from a little bit of adjustment on the edges. I understand the interest will be calculated on the RBA cash rate plus penalty interest of 5 per cent.

I presume, doing some calculations, that that will be around the overdraft rate that a business may be charged by their trading bank. If businesses have to carry this debt, as a consequence of the government not paying their bills in a timely manner, it would mean that if the business had an overdraft arrangement that debt would form part of the overdraft debt. I would hope that the interest that the government is pitching is equivalent to commercial overdraft rates. As I said, the member for Davenport, our lead speaker and the shadow treasurer, has indicated that the opposition is prepared to support the legislation in an unamended form.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:03): I rise, too, to support the Late Payment of Government Debts (Interest) Bill 2013. It is amazing that we have come to this, where the government has to virtually copy opposition policy; but, not only that, we also have a bill in this place where the government has to make sure that it might do something about the debt that it has to small business. It is very commendable in some ways that there is a commitment to the interest on this debt, but why do we get in debt, Mr Speaker?

That is a very, very good question. We have got here because of the total incompetence of the Labor government, we have got here because it is a government that does not understand how a small business works. Sadly, what has happened in the preceding years of this government is that businesses have suffered due to their bills not being paid and, in fact, some of them are going out of business due to their bills not being paid in a timely manner.

Sadly, you see in the corporate world that some people think, as this government has thought, that they can get away with stringing people out to 60, 90 or 120 days, and it is just wrong. It is just wrong in the world of any business to string any business out for anymore than the appropriate 30 days, which are standard trading terms, but too often we see that happen.

What we have seen with this government is the Shared Services debacle. This was supposed to save millions of dollars for the state, but Shared Services is costing the state tens and tens of millions of dollars more than what was originally budgeted. It has been a complete mess. It has taken people away from regional jobs throughout this state—jobs throughout my electorate from Murray Bridge and other areas.

Those jobs have gone because, oh yes, we are going to put all this into a central block in Adelaide, and life will be merry. Well, life has been far from merry with Shared Services. In fact, the place should just be rocketed and got rid of. We should just get rid of it.

The Hon. M.F. O'Brien interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: You will get your response, minister—that's fine—but it is an absolute disaster that you have presided over. I must say that, over time, as the member for Kavel indicated, we have had equipment in our own offices to operate for our own needs either threatened to be shut down because bills have not been paid, or ones that have been shut down so members of parliament cannot even make sure that their work is carried out effectively. It is just ridiculous.

It got to the stage, actually, in my office where I got sick of not just what was happening internally with the payments but the small businesses, like the newspaper vendor, coming to me and saying, 'Our bills are not getting paid.' I said, 'Enough is enough; we will send copies of the bills straight through to the minister's office,' which we did and I am sure he received them. I just had to make the point about what was happening and the abuse we were getting from people who deserved to have their bills paid.

I know the minister suggested, 'With some of your internal accounts, you could pay them and then we will pay you back.' I said, 'I don't think I am going down that path.' Certainly, as an opposition member, I am not stumping up the government's debt, especially when we see it burgeoning out to \$13.75 billion by the year 2016.

It is just ridiculous that it has got to this because, in the whole machinery of government, we cannot get enough people together to actually pay the bills on time. I ask the question: what do we have a bureaucracy for? What the heck do we have a bureaucracy for? It is supposedly to run the functions of government and everything around it but, no, it is a complete disaster—an absolutely abject disaster—that we have got to this stage where the government have even had to come forward, pretty well copy our policy proposal and say, 'We will pay for interest on bills that are over 30 days overdue.'

As I said, that is one measure. I note the Small Business Commissioner will become involved if there are disputes but, if people are still hung out to dry for over 30 days, it is not just the interest they are wearing: they are also wearing the principal, so that comes at a huge cost to suppliers to government. Certainly, I note that we are agreeing to the bill. I think it is disgraceful that we have got to this stage, but I certainly support it because we, on this side of the house, understand the support that small business needs in this state.

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) (16:09): Just picking up on a few of the comments made by opposition speakers, probably the first that ought to be addressed is who is following whom? I did a quick google, and I can be corrected but the Liberal Party website indicates that the opposition leader indicated agreement, if you like, or an initiative of the opposition being a bill similar to this on 22 February 2013.

The government received the so-called McCann report on June 2012. It went to cabinet and was endorsed by cabinet on 8 October 2012. One of those recommendations was the Late Payment of Government Debts (Interest) Bill. On my calculation, the cabinet decision is probably five to six months in advance of the opposition arriving at the similar policy position, so you have actually followed us on this matter.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: What was the date?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: It was 22 February 2013 when you made the policy statement; 8 October 2012 was when cabinet received the so-called McCann report, the payment of accounts review undertaken by the Office of Public Employment and Review and largely authored by the Commissioner for Public Employment, Mr Warren McCann.

The member for Kavel, and also the member for Hammond, raised what was a tangential issue in relation to what happens. I am not really sure if I follow whether the member for Hammond

was talking about the situation prior to or the position that is still in place prior to the issuing of purchase cards. We, the government, and I, the minister, became aware that there were issues with the late payment of accounts, and I do not resile from the fact that there was an issue. People were having their mobile telephones discontinued—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Newspapers?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Newspapers. I think Australia Post were giving us a hard time, as well. I am going to accept the responsibility, but in part the issue was the slow processing within electorate offices, but then it went into a bureaucratic—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: No, I said that I accept responsibility. Then it flowed into a bureaucratic maze and, after weeks and weeks and weeks, finally arrived in Shared Services; in fact, Shared Services were not the culprits. It was the way the whole structure had been set up for a series of approvals.

So, I organised for application forms and an explanation to be sent to all electorate offices to give them the option—it was not compulsory—of taking on a purchase card, and with that application there was a series of fields that could be filled out that covered, among other things, telecommunication charges and newsagent accounts. The EOs now (those who have taken on board the purchase card option) actually have the opportunity to pay those accounts on the day they arrive in the EO. So, as far as I am concerned, there is really no excuse for any EO not to be able to pay the bulk of day-to-day accounts in a timely manner.

In relation to the recommendations of the McCann report—and I asked that this work be done—when I became the minister, I was aware that Business SA in particular over a number of years had been raising the problems being experienced particularly by small business with the slowness of payment by government. I come from a small business background myself, and the bane of my existence was the end-of-month telephone calls I had to make to slow payers to get money into my bank account to pay for all my outgoings.

Without any disrespect to public servants, unless you have run a business and are aware of the fact that, come month's end, you have a whole series of invoices to pay yourself and that on an ongoing weekly or fortnightly basis you have to cover the payroll bill, it is a little difficult to understand why businesses are crying out for prompt payment. I was of the strong view, and I still am, that it is a cultural issue, and that is one of the reasons that we have introduced this particular piece of legislation—to bring about in a highly effective manner a change in the cultural mindset of the public sector.

As a result of the recommendations of the McCann review, we also introduced automatic escalation. What I discovered, and what Warren McCann discovered, was that invoices were going to a particular public servant, the public servant was then going on leave and the invoice was sitting there for three or four weeks while the public servant was on leave.

To overcome that issue, Shared Services went into each agency and mapped out the chain of command for the payment of invoices so that, if an invoice is sent by Shared Services into the agency and not responded to within a matter of a day or two, it automatically escalates by way of an email to the next person in the chain of command, ultimately reaching the desk of the chief executive officer for payment. So, there is no ability for agencies to hide now under the excuse of people being on leave because ultimately, if there is no response through the chain of command, it ends up with the CE having to give approval for payment of the invoice.

We also requested a change in the direction of invoices. Rather than going to the agency in the first instance, invoices go to Shared Services, where they are now scanned electronically and then transmitted back to the agency to be approved and reconciled with the purchase order. We believed that that would overcome the problem of invoices lying around the place because people really did not understand the importance of getting the invoices processed and back to Shared Services in a timely manner.

We also made a decision that, rather than allowing invoices to queue for payment by the bank on 30 days, as soon as the invoice was approved—and that might be a matter of two days, as opposed to 30 days—they would be paid when approved. So, we have sped up the process of payment: we no longer hold back invoices for payment until they reach the mandatory 30 days. As a result of that, the most recent report I received for the non-health sector indicates that we pay 98 per cent of invoices within 30 days.

I think that is a remarkable result and can be attributed largely to the work of Warren McCann and to the strong endorsement from all of the chief executives and cabinet that we wanted to get this right. We have also instituted an arrangement whereby CEs and ministers receive a monthly report which outlines the performance of their agency in respect of the timeliness of payments. So, there is no getting away from the fact that CEs and ministers are ultimately responsible for ensuring that invoices are paid within 30 days.

Additionally, and I think importantly, we set up the My Invoice website. Small business can go onto the website and determine where their invoice is in the overall scheme of things and get an indication of the timeliness of payment. They will be able to determine whether the invoice has been received, whether the invoice has been reconciled with the purchase order, whether the invoice has been approved—and it would be approved on the basis of the quality of good or service being as ordered, and other matters. Ultimately, the website gives an indication as to when payment can be expected. I believe that the hit rate on that website is now running at thousands per month, which is an indication that small business see this as a highly beneficial tool to assist them in the management of their cash flow.

This government is very much aware of the size of the overall government entity in the South Australian economy. We are the largest employer and we are the largest purchaser of goods and services and it is incumbent upon us to actually outdo the private sector in the payment of invoices. As I said, a range of around 98 to 99 per cent for non-health is far in excess of what is occurring in the private sector. I cannot give the exact figures that we have received from Dun and Bradstreet, but I think they are around the upper 70 per cent. So the private sector is in the upper 70 per cent and we are 98 to 99 per cent.

So that is the suite of reforms that we have introduced and the outcomes that we have achieved and I am very pleased that we have been able to achieve this suite of reforms. They have been so effective in driving significant improvement in the performance of the public sector. In relation to the bill, I am pleased that the opposition is endorsing the bill without any amendment. I think it will serve the public sector well for the next decade or two. It sets a clear set of cultural norms that we want to see cemented into the public sector culture, and I appreciate the support of the opposition in respect to this bill.

Bill read a second 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) (16:21): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 September 2013.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:22): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Transport Portfolio) Bill 2013 and confirm that I will be the lead and probably only speaker on this matter. I read with interest that this is a bill to provide amendments to the Road Traffic Act to cover pedelecs. This was an entirely new word to me and I thought I would Google it and look at the Oxford Dictionary. It didn't exist in the Oxford Dictionary, members might be disheartened to hear. Given my knowledge of what a pedelec is, my oration on this subject will be very brief, for which I am sure the minister will be mercifully relieved.

My understanding is that currently in South Australia, power-assisted bicycles with a power output of up to 200 watts are treated as bicycles and therefore do not require registration, insurance, or the person operating the bicycle to hold a driver's licence. Pedelecs are a motor-assisted bicycle where the motor is only accessible when the pedals are manually operated and cuts out when the speed reaches 25 km/h. They have a power output of up to 250 watts which takes them above the aforementioned threshold. However, as they do not comply with Australian design rules, they cannot be legally registered and therefore cannot be used.

This is a bill to amend the Road Traffic Act to include power-assisted bicycles. Under the definition of bicycles this will remove the requirement for a pedelec to be registered and the user to have a driver's licence. What a relief. Given that I think I have more 60-year old blokes in my

electorate who run around in lycra pants on bicycles, I am sure that it would adversely affect many of my constituents. Therefore I am rather pleased that this bill has been brought to our attention and that it will be promptly remedied.

I think it raises a question of what we might do with other faster and faster mobility vehicles on the road as well. I think that that is an area which needs to be looked at in due course. I am not at all advocating for people who use these vehicles to have to wear helmets or be licensed or be registered and so on—that would be onerous—but I think it is fair to say that these pieces of equipment have gone from being a replacement for people's legs for walking, to actually a vehicle for use.

Although provided they are under a certain speed limit they can still travel on the footpath as if they were in electric wheelchairs and the like, the speed of these vehicles is quite significant, and I think it is fair to say that there is an increasing use, and there is certainly an industry built around them. More and more we are seeing conflict between people who are on these vehicles and other motor vehicles and/or pedestrians.

That is disappointing in itself but I think that, with an ageing population and frailty becoming more common, the use of these vehicles is becoming more common, and it is something that we need to look at in due course. Anyway, no doubt I will be able to consider that matter in other legislation or the reviews of this matter in due course. The other aspect of this bill is amendments to tidy up inconsistencies or areas that have perhaps been overlooked when the principal legislation was passed on matters arising under the Motor Vehicles Act.

Many of these relate to probationary licence points, and I am at a bit of a loss as to why they were not covered in the graduated licensing scheme reforms that we dealt with several weeks ago, but it is quite possible that these are areas that have been identified over a period of time. They have accumulated in a file, and then when somebody comes in with a miscellaneous bill such as this to tidy them all up, they get caught, but a number of these relate to probationary licences.

In summary, the reforms include, firstly, to increase the time spent on a probationary licence, namely, to double it where a person has been disqualified for a serious drink driving offence and has then regained their licence but is exempted from the mandatory alcohol interlock system, for example, on medical grounds. We agree with this.

It is similar, for example, if someone faces an offence in which they might have a fine and/or community service and a magistrate in those circumstances might say, 'Look, the offender is unemployed and so placing a huge fine on them is going to be oppressive' and, therefore, they will make some other provision, say, by community service.

Similarly, this is an amendment which allows for a double period probationary licence if you cannot undertake the alcohol interlock system. For example, someone might have asthma and, therefore, may be exempt from having that, so they have to be penalised in some way, and we agree with that.

Secondly, it provides power to the registrar to disqualify a probationary licence holder when they accrue two or more demerit points. We are told that currently for a probationary licence holder to be disqualified for a breach of licence, the police must register an offence, such as speeding, and then a second offence, such as the breach of a licence condition, for the probationary licence holder to be disqualified. This is sometimes overlooked and results in not all probationary licence holders who accrue demerit points being disqualified. Clearly that needed to be tidied up.

Thirdly, it removes the ability for a person who holds a probationary drivers licence to enter a Safer Driver Agreement instead of disqualification if the offence was committed while on a learner's permit but they have since moved to a probationary licence before being notified of the offence. Again, it is a satisfactory tidy up. Fourthly, it removes the option of a probationary licence holder who has allowed their time to apply for an SDA—that is, a Safer Driver Agreement—to lapse from appealing their disqualification in the Magistrates Court.

Incidentally, I see that there is also some provision in the bill for the publication of a magistrate's reasons on an appeal, and that tidies that matter up. Fifthly it introduces an explicit approval mechanism for photographic detection devices, that is, speed cameras, to bring them in line with traffic control devices that must be approved by a minister.

I have taken that to be, for example, that in the way that a minister approves red light cameras which are currently placed for going through a red light or something of that nature, then

similarly for speed cameras their placement needs to be approved by a minister. I was surprised that did not exist already, but if it does not then we do not object to it being covered.

The final amendment is to provide power to the Registrar to conduct investigations and refuse registration of a vehicle where the Registrar believes part of the vehicle may be stolen. Currently, the Registrar must believe that the vehicle itself is stolen. I am assuming, in the absence of any explanation, that this is to cover a vehicle where, for example, it is believed that the tyres have been stolen or some other piece of the vehicle has been stolen, because if it is not the whole of the vehicle then they are not covered. Again, it sends a rather strange anomaly, but it is being tidied up by this bill. With those comments, I indicate that the opposition will be supporting the bill, and we do not require to go into committee.

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) (16:30): I appreciate the comments from the member for Bragg. I will be brief. Pedelects are what one would describe as a phenomenon in the extent of their uptake in Europe. The figure for 2012 was the purchase of 1.2 million pedelects. They are a device which is now becoming commonplace on European streets, and it is my view that, with the passage of this legislation and the move to align our wattage restriction to that of the Europeans, we will see a significant uptake in South Australia, and in particular in Adelaide, of these pedelects.

They are a bike that is not embraced by the lycra-wearing set; these are bikes that are basically ridden by people to and from work. The attraction is that you can get to work without having to put on sporting gear. They reduce the amount of energy, exercise and stress involved, and the amount of perspiration expended in getting from point A to point B. For that reason, they have been widely accepted by the Europeans as an alternate means of transport to the motor vehicle.

The Europeans are now linking the pedelect culture with the public sector networks that they have throughout Europe, and are putting in place recharging stations that have solar panels on the roof. The idea is that you ride to the railway station or tram station, dock your cycle for the day securely in one of these docking stations, and the battery recharges during the day by way of solar energy generation.

This is a European phenomenon that I think will grip the South Australian imagination over the next decade, and I am of the view that within 10 years we will see thousands, if not tens of thousands, of these bikes being ridden by South Australians, particularly within the CBD. What we will also see is a change in our attitudes to cycling, and ultimately the provision of far more extensive cycling infrastructure than is currently the case.

South Australia now brings itself into alignment with all of the other Australian states with the 250-watt requirement, up from 200. As I said, this now aligns us with the EU standard, which means that pedelects can come in, particularly from Europe but also from China and elsewhere, and be ridden on our roads.

The other section of the bill deals with driver licensing and miscellaneous changes, and I believe that the member for Bragg dealt with that in a highly adequate manner and have no intention of ranging over her comments because I was very much impressed with her understanding and appreciation of all the provisions. I think she has done the bill justice in relation to the driver licensing and miscellaneous changes contained within the bill.

Bill read a second 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) (16:35): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EVIDENCE (DISCREDITABLE CONDUCT) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendment indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

Clause 4, page 2, line 11—Delete line 11 and substitute:

Section 34P(4)—after 'evidence' insert:

that relies on a particular propensity or disposition of the defendant as circumstantial evidence of a fact in issue

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The government agrees with the amendment.

Ms CHAPMAN: I welcome the government's indication that it will support the amendment of the Legislative Council. This resolves a difficult matter and I thank all those concerned in the negotiations for coming to what has been a sensible resolution.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

CAMPBELLTOWN CITY SOCCER CLUB

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:38): It gives me absolute pride and joy to be able to inform the house that in the year of their 50th anniversary the Campbelltown City Soccer and Social Club, the Red Devils, were successful in becoming premiers this year in the South Australian National Premier League. They are the SA National Premier League champions for 2013 in their 50th year.

They have not spent too many of the last few years in the finals and, indeed, it was a massive improvement on their performance last year. They were last premiers more than 20 years ago and on that occasion they defeated the Blue Eagles, the Azzurri. A couple of weeks ago, the Campbelltown Soccer Club, the Red Devils, were again successful over the Blue Eagles.

I particularly enjoyed their preliminary final win over the MetroStars, which I am sure the member for Torrens was absolutely devastated about at the time. It was an enjoyable visit to Klemzig that day in the member for Torrens' electorate, and a very successful outcome as the Red Devils defended a 1-0 lead for much of the game.

Don Leombruno, the proud president of the club, has passed on the following message for me, which should be recorded for posterity, about the soccer club celebrating 50 years in 2013. There was an open gala day on 17 February 2013. There was a function at the Rezz Hotel, which was a reunion of members of former teams of the soccer club, and I know they managed to get along a good number of people from the original team from the early 1960s, which was terrific. The year culminates in the gala night on 25 October, which I am certainly looking forward to.

As champions in 2013, Don has asked me to say congratulations and thanks to the many volunteers and supporters associated with the club over its 50-year history, especially to the current board and committee. Also, thanks to Arthur DiFede, honorary president and chairman of the 50th organising committee, and the members of his committee. The club would like to thank the Campbelltown City Council for its support and, of course, the many great sponsors that the club is proud to be associated with.

I suppose I should happily declare a conflict of interest there as one of the sponsors that they are thanking, and I am very pleased to be so. I acknowledge the work done by all of the committee: patron, Aldo Perilli; chairman, Don Leombruno; vice chairman, Paul Centofanti, who is an excellent MC and often MCs the functions; treasurer, Tony Centofanti, who has held that position for a number of years now; secretary, Julie Ciccocioppo, who I think has held that position for longer; marketing director, Italo Zanatta, whose parents are my landlords at the Morialta electorate office and do a fantastic job; Ugo Fantasia, the sports director; and Nancy Perugina, the social director.

The coaching staff of the seniors have done very well: Joe Mullen and Joe Lagana. Joe Mullen came on board with the Red Devils this year and it has been a remarkable achievement to take the team, which was a good team for a number of years, to basically take a large group of the same players and make them into a great team so that they won the championship this year. They are a great team that did so well this year. They worked particularly well on their fitness. They had far fewer injuries this year than they have had in recent years. So, I congratulate all of the people who worked through the preparations that have culminated in the successful year.

For posterity I will put into the *Hansard* the names of that team: Angelo Arambatzis, Shannon Claridge, Michael Costantini, Nicholas Green, Jake Halliday, Shaun Harvey, Sebastian Isabel, Yaman Jamal, Dion Kirk, Stephen Maio, Frank Marafioti, Tomas Maricic, Michael Matricciani, Nathan Mauriello, Calvin Mbarga, Todd McSorley, Michael Menechella, Michael Paleka, Vasilis Parhas (the captain), Adam Piscioneri, Les Pogliacomì, Josh Thomas, Peter Tirimacco, Oliver Totani and Haris Vukic. They have a lot to be proud of. Our community has a lot to be proud of, and we are certainly proud of them.

In conclusion, I would also note that this year has been similarly successful for people in Morialta who are following the Australian code in the South Australian Amateur Football League. Congratulations to the Rostrevor Old Collegians, who, on a second attempt, won that premiership too; the first one being tied. Coming back a week later, which was very confusing for all present, and seeing that success was absolutely terrific.

DE LISSA ORATION

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:43): I would like to speak to the house this afternoon about the de Lissa Oration, which I attended last night on behalf of the Minister for Education. Every year, the University of South Australia hosts a free public lecture called the de Lissa Oration for parents, educators and other professionals interested in early childhood education and development. This year the oration was held at the Amy Wheaton Building at the Magill Campus.

Prior to that, we witnessed the launch of the book celebrating 100 years of Montessori education in Australia by Dr Susan Feez. The book is called *Montessori—The Australian Story*. How many people do not realise the proud traditions that we have in education in South Australia through our very wonderful Lillian de Lissa, who was involved in early education here in 1905, being one of the first people involved in the kindy movement in South Australia.

I am sure that in the past other members have put a great deal of effort into learning about de Lissa, who introduced preschool here and became the first director of the free Adelaide kindy, which was in a cottage in Franklin Street, where she was assisted by young women volunteers.

Very early in the piece, Lillian de Lissa recognised the importance of the Montessori method of education. Maria Montessori's methods, of course, are still being used today and, in a world where we look at education, I wonder why we do not pay more attention to this important way of nurturing our children and bringing to them and through them a happier and more peaceful world. The people involved in Montessori education were very concerned with the social justice issues of the day, and this continues to be their aim through their educational processes.

On the evening, we were welcomed by Professor Geraldine Castleton and the head of the de Lissa school, Professor Pauline Harris. She in turn introduced Christine Harrison, who is the President of the Montessori Australia Foundation. The room was full of wonderful women who have been involved in moulding and nurturing little minds for many years.

We also had the launch of the Montessori Materials Collection by Dr Glenn Cupit, a collection which is going to be on display and available to people at the Magill campus. There is a wonderful brochure on it, and I am sure that by getting in touch with the school you will be able to work out a way to go and see it. They have also produced a marvellous booklet, called *The de Lissa Historical Collection*, and some of those early pieces of equipment have been with the school, I believe, for almost 100 years, when the first parcel arrived. It is really something worth having a look at.

Apart from that, my great interest in the Montessori method is because of Muriel Matters, who was trained as a Montessori teacher in Barcelona in 1916. She has been included in the book, and quite a good coverage is given to her time with Montessori.

From her earliest days here in South Australia, Muriel was given the benefit of education and was very involved in early childhood education and, of course, took that one step further, through Sylvia Pankhurst and helped the poor children of the slums of Bow Street in England. Muriel's attachment to the Montessori method was lifelong and, of course, was the main reason for her return to Australia in 1922, when she lectured on the Montessori method in Perth, Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney.

It has been a big week for Muriel in many ways. Her docudrama has debuted at the Adelaide Film Festival. I recommend members and, of course, the long-suffering staff of Parliament House who have helped me over the last five years to bring the Muriel story to life, to have a look

at the docudrama called *Muriel Matters!*, which was screened on *Artscape* last Tuesday evening at 10pm; you can still have a look at that.

Muriel Matters' story is still as relevant to South Australia and the world as it was 100 years ago in her fight for the vote for women and equality for women in every area we could possibly manage. As you know, the grille is still here on display in Parliament House—something that is a real coup for us, as the museums of London and Westminster, particularly Westminster, very, very rarely lend their objects or even send them this far away.

Mr Gardner: Have they asked for it back?

Ms BEDFORD: No, they haven't, and that's another story I will regale the house with on a later occasion. In recommending both the Muriel Matters docudrama—

Mrs Geraghty: And they can't have it.

Ms BEDFORD: —I'll have it secreted on my person—and Montessori's 100 years in Australia to the house, I thank you for the opportunity to bring these important issues to the attention of members and the wider community of South Australia, who I hope will embrace this Montessori centenary and go to have a look at the work being done at the University of South Australia.

At 16:49 the house adjourned until Tuesday 29 October 2013 at 11:00.