

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12 November 2013

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

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

MAJOR EVENTS BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Ms CHAPMAN: With all the noise in the chamber, I did not even hear which bill was being read, but I think it is the Major Events Bill—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): It is indeed the Major Events Bill.

Ms CHAPMAN: —and I think I heard the Attorney indicate that he is accepting the amendments from another place, and so do we.

Motion carried.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (11:04): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business—Bills, Orders of the Day Nos. 20 and 22, set down for Thursday 14 November, to be taken into consideration forthwith as items of Government Business.

The SPEAKER: You need an absolute majority present. There not being an absolute majority present, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:06): My understanding is that a motion has been put and seconded to deal with these items that are currently listed in private members' time.

The SPEAKER: Correct.

Ms CHAPMAN: On inquiry, my understanding is that they are being presented here in government time, which is of no consequence to us, but I would seek some clarification on why they are being transferred across, who intends to move these bills which are already on the *Notice Paper* in private members' time (I think they are Nos. 20 and 22), and what process is to occur for the deletion and transfer. I can only assume that, as the Attorney-General is present, he will actually be moving these bills because the original proposed mover—

The SPEAKER: Well, they stand in the name of the member for Fisher.

Ms CHAPMAN: Indeed—and he does not know anything about it.

The SPEAKER: I am sure the member for Fisher can speak for himself on that point. Member for Fisher.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:07): I am a little puzzled, too, at how these have undergone a transformation. I am putting them on behalf of the honourable member in another place (Mr Mark Parnell), and I now simply endorse the bill that has been drafted and sent down by the Hon. Mark Parnell.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: I think the member, with respect, is starting to present his argument for the support of a bill. I am speaking on the motion that is before the house.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the motion is a motion for suspension. The member for Bragg is right.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Fisher have anything to add on that score—the suspension of standing orders to bring these bills into government time?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: No, sir, I do not want to add anything.

Motion carried.

DEVELOPMENT (INTERIM DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 May 2013.)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (11:09): We are talking, as I understand it, about the Development (Interim Development Control) Amendment Bill which was moved in the other place by the Hon. Mark Parnell. Just so members can be clear, the intent of this legislation is to ensure that, in effect, the capacity of any planning minister to issue an interim development plan amendment is removed, other than, I believe, in the context of interim development plans to protect heritage or prevent destruction of built form.

This is a serious assault on the range of policy initiatives available to any planning minister, and it is something which is fiercely opposed by virtually all of the industry. In fact, Mr Parnell, in doing this, I guess is moving in the direction of what perhaps none of us would find remarkable, as being Greens policy in respect of development. They do have a fairly consistent approach about these matters and it is probably a very conservative approach about all planning matters. This is not, in other words, an atypical bill to be coming from the Greens.

However, what concerns me significantly is that when this matter was before the other place, the opposition there, in the form of the leader in that chamber, Mr Ridgway, made a very remarkable statement to the Legislative Council. This is what he said, and I will quote from *Hansard*:

I indicate that the opposition will be supporting the Hon. Mark Parnell, although I always put the caveat that we do not necessarily think that this is something that we would necessarily do in government.

I have a number of concerns about this. First, had the opposition consulted with any of the industry groups before forming the opinion that they were prepared to vote in the other place and, if they had consulted with them, why did they choose to ignore the opinions expressed by industry groups? I understand that the industry groups, in particular the Housing Industry Association's Regional Director, Mr Harding, stated in his regional director's report for September of this year—and I quote:

...as a result of HIA submissions, the Liberal Party will now not support the Bill.

This is the opposition that constantly has a refrain about the government failing to adequately consult with communities or industry groups or whoever and, in this particular instance, we have an example where, in the other place, the opposition has been prepared to vote with this proposition from the Greens, make the interesting admission that even though they are voting for it they might not actually do that again if they were ever in government, they then apparently receive a submission from the Housing Industry Association and, according to the industry association, as a result, they then reverse their opinion.

This, as I said, is the group that constantly berates the government in relation to consultation. There are only a couple of conclusions that one can come to in relation to this. The first one is that before forming the opinion that they just roll along with the Greens on this particular issue, they had not bothered to make any effort to consult with the HIA or any other relevant industry group and, in that case, how hollow are their bleatings about consultation which they make regularly about government decisions?

Secondly, if they had consulted with them, why did they choose to ignore them and, nevertheless, vote with the Greens on this proposition and finally come to the point where they then—if they had actually consulted with them and had ignored them—backflip on the proposition and decide that at some point they are now not supporting the Greens in relation to this matter?

So, this does raise some issues about whether the opposition actually has any policy position on this bill or, indeed, a great many other things at all. Remember, Mr Speaker, that the opposition would have the people of South Australia consider them fit to potentially assume office as a government of this state in March of next year, and on a matter as absolutely fundamental as this key issue about planning policy, they clearly have no idea. Not only do they have no idea, but apparently they have not even consulted with the relevant industry group, or if they have, they have ignored them and then felt a bit of a squeeze and decided to do a backflip.

It is very important, so far as the government is concerned, that the industry in this state has some confidence that measures such as this—which are designed by the Greens to achieve a certain outcome, but inevitably will lead to uncertainty and some degree of concern in the construction industry around the state—are completely dealt with and removed from the political agenda. At the moment, it appears that the opposition is actually supporting this proposition. That is their last recorded position as far as the vote in the other place is concerned. We need to know—

Mr VENNING: Point of order: standing order 120 prohibits debate of debate in the other house.

The SPEAKER: The custom of the house is that one does not reagitate debate in the other place; but a bill has come from the other place to this place, and the Attorney is canvassing the merits of the bill and illustrating the path that the opposition has trod on this matter. I do not think that violates the custom of the house as long as he does not go into who said what to whom in the other place.

Mr VENNING: I will just read the standing order to you.

The SPEAKER: No, there is no division; you do not need to cover your head.

Mr VENNING: 'A member may not refer to any debate in the other house of parliament or to any measure impending in that house.'

The SPEAKER: Well, I presume that the Attorney will now not canvass the merits of the debate in the other place, but he is free to canvass the opposition's position on the principle. Attorney.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It would be an odd situation indeed when receiving a message or a bill in this house from the other place if one could not argue about whether the bill was any good. Anyway, getting back to the proposition, here is the thing: the industry wants certainty and the government certainly wishes to guarantee that certainty to industry. We want to see a unanimous vote—a unanimous vote—in this chamber to say that this bill is not where we want to go (and by 'we' I mean all of us as members of this chamber) and that we do not endorse this retrograde proposal.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: The President would have to resign, wouldn't he, if this is voted against?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Who can say? This is a very retrograde proposal, it is a damaging proposal; in fact, it is the sort of legislative vandalism which gives great concern to industry in South Australia because they want a steady hand. They do not want people who flip-flop around the place and who, on a whim, vote for a proposition which one would have thought an alternative government would have found absolutely repugnant; but, anyway, there we go. The question is really about this: we brought this bill on today to give absolute certainty about what is going on. As the government, we make it very clear that we oppose this bill and we call on all members of this house to unanimously vote against this bill today.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:20): It is with pleasure that I stand to speak on the Development (Interim Development Control) Amendment Bill 2012, which has been dealt with in another place and which has been now presented by the member for Fisher for our consideration. I appreciate the government's initiative in bringing this matter forward to be aired and dealt with and thus rescuing it from the unhappy end which occurs to most things listed under private members' business in the last six remaining days of the parliament.

Unlike the government's view that this is an instrument of legislative vandalism—you must feel terrible, Mr Speaker. I have never heard of the member for Fisher introducing a bill to the parliament that could be described as legislative vandalism, but in his many years in the parliament I am sure that he will receive that as a badge of honour, as distinct from some kind of intimidatory remark by the Attorney-General as to his mala fide in bringing forth such a bill.

The bill that is under consideration was introduced by the Hon. Mark Parnell to amend the Development Act 1993. It is important to remember that, under that act, the Minister for Planning has the power to use an interim development power pending an amendment to a development plan. This was a power that was introduced by the Hon. Don Hopgood in the late 1980s with the objective of protecting heritage that is both built and natural. The classic example that I used was that, pending the review and process to amend a development plan that might adversely affect the fate of a large, significant tree or a piece of heritage building, there would be power for the minister of the day to step in and issue an interim order to ensure that there was some protection.

That, I think, the Hon. Don Hopgood had prosecuted when presenting this amendment, which, for good reason, was successful, and it has been applied appropriately by governments since that time. What is very disappointing is that, notwithstanding the minister's assertions against the opposition, it is his government that has brought this power to a new level and we think utilised it in a manner which has been inconsistent with its original objective and which has been effectively an abuse of power in its application.

There are a number of projects under the wing of the current Minister for Planning, which, to some degree, were under the previous minister for planning, the Hon. Paul Holloway. I think, overall, the Hon. Paul Holloway had quite a good approach in relation to a number of initiatives under his watch and I think he has left the parliament with some regard as a minister. What has actually occurred under the watch of this minister has been vandalism, as he has described it, which this bill helps to try to cure.

Even after the debacle of Mount Barker (a legacy of this government which will be long-lived) and the Auditor-General's stinging report as to the conduct of government and members of the government's staff, the current minister has not been inspired to do anything to try to remedy that mess. Still he goes on to act in his new role as the Minister for Planning without any care for the rules as they apply, and with this interim power that he has utilised in a manner which has been identified. The capital city DPA is another example under his regime of attempting to promote particular developments; namely, the Mayfield development. There was the statewide wind farm DPA, and, of course, there is the now infamous inner-metro DPA—and I will come back to that in a moment.

In essence, the utilisation of this power by this particular minister would be of great concern to the original mover of this amendment (Hon. Don Hopgood) as it was born in an environment of good intention. It has been fairly applied by ministers prior to this government: under the Bannon government—I do not think it was ever applied under the Arnold government because it was a bit short—the Brown and then Olsen governments. It was utilised as it was intended and this government's legacy of excuses for using it is shameful.

This is a bill designed to stop a minister from bringing a DPA into operation immediately so as to fast-track his favoured developments. Essentially the bill seeks to limit the use of the interim powers to stop inappropriate development ahead of that public consultation. In particular it does three things: it requires the minister to consult with DPAC before declaring interim operation; it requires that any development application lodged during the interim operation must be put on hold pending the finalisation of the DPA, unless the outcome would have been the same; and it will also effectively prevent the use of the interim operation to downgrade public participation rights, that is, the appeal rights.

What is also very interesting is that the minister bleats some concern that the opposition has apparently failed to consult with what he describes as 'the industry'—and I notice he identified one party as 'the industry'. I do not see anywhere from the government any presentation, announcement or provision of what Mr Brian Hayes QC says about this. As members would be aware, Mr Hayes has been appointed by the government to do a review of the Development Act and to provide some report back to the minister sometime late in 2014. He has also apparently been consulted on other legislation of the government, for example on the new proposed powers (statutory rather than regulatory) for the Urban Renewal Authority.

He was also consulted on the introduction of a regime for the provision of precinct planning. He provided a report, and after some months of pleading he provided the report to us so that we might consider it. We ultimately supported the government in that initiative, but as he was conducting his review—and that has not been completed—it was entirely proper for the government to get some information from him. When we finally got the response from Mr Hayes, which I noted the government had been keeping secret for a few months, it was not quite as glowing in its support as the government had claimed; but, nevertheless, he was at least consulted.

Where is the government's consultation with the very person who had been involved in the original development in 1993? In fact, I think he was one of the early drafters. As someone mentioned the other night at a function which the minister also attended, Mr Hayes has probably been involved in many of the famous cases since then on development law that have effectively raised questions about the original applicability and the necessary amendments.

In any event, he has been given this task by the government to undertake that review and yet where have we got any indication from Mr Hayes whether this should be wholly dismissed by the government—in fact, rushed into government time to attempt to rebuke the opposition, whack us with a wet lettuce leaf and say how unacceptable it is in our consultation which he alleges, and then come into the house and not even come to us with any indication whatsoever of his own appointed Queen's Counsel who is conducting a review on the Development Act at all?

Do I speculate to think that Mr Hayes has probably not even seen this bill? Do I speculate that he has not had a view on it? Do I speculate that there has not even been one iota of consultation about this bill before the government makes the decision that they are going to come in here and say, 'No, this is completely unacceptable. We are not going to accept this.'? Talk about consultation.

I mean, what a joke! Talk about the incredible double standards of the government when they come in here to try to whack us around with a lettuce leaf about lack of consultation, and what have they done? Nothing. They have just decided that this is something that is going to try to clip the wings of the minister who has acted out of order in the application and abuse of this role and not taken the slightest bit of notice and just continues to press on.

For example, what did he do in introducing the inner metro growth? That was a great DPA. We had an announcement just before Christmas last year; more recently we have had the proposed DPA confirmed. We have had the Burnside Council crushed out of consideration. We have had Prospect council handing over their role by the then mayor who, of course, is now the Labor candidate for the next election in the seat of Adelaide.

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: No, no, no, well, the Attorney shouts out that there was an interim DPA, but his process, his operation, his application of the Development Act ought to tell this parliament about how unsafe it is for planning to be left in the hands of this minister. It is ridiculous that he should even try to assert to be the bastion of consultation and protection of orderly development in this state. To add to it, we were both mutually at a dinner the other night—the Planning Institute of Australia dinner actually, at which a number of town planners from across the state were rewarded in recognition of their service to the state—and the Attorney—

The Hon. J.R. Rau: I was very nice to you.

Ms CHAPMAN: —interjects to say that he was very nice to me. I think I recognise the member for Bragg was the phrase he said, but I had to almost laugh when he said, 'There are two things important to my government: transparency and the wise application of taxpayers' money,' or words to that effect. I nearly choked on my hors d'oeuvre to hear this. Transparency? What a joke! Look at the inner metro DPA process. It is a joke. If the Attorney is proud of that, he should be ashamed.

The incredible thing is that when he finally comes out with it, when an area of criticism comes from people in the constituencies—that is, ratepayers who might be concerned about things who raise their correspondence to their local council or to the minister or to me, which inevitably they do—what does he do? When he makes the announcement for the final DPA, he cuts out the bit that is actually an area of vulnerability to the government. He cuts out Anzac Highway and all those people down there who are complaining about it. He cuts out that piece in the West Torrens council region which, of course, is conveniently in the seat of Ashford.

How inconvenient! The West Torrens council is thinking, 'Thank goodness for that. We've got all these problems there. We'll just keep massaging the population and we'll deal with this.' So, the seat of Ashford gets protected. There has been no indication from the government as to when that is going to be progressed. There has been no commitment to tell the people of South Australia under that DPA about what is going to be happening in that region before the—

The Hon. J.R. Rau: It's a council DPA. It's not mine.

Ms CHAPMAN: It's a council DPA, the minister interjects. Isn't that interesting? Did the council in the seat of Unley wholly support the government's position? Did the council in the area of Norwood wholly support the government? No, but the government had to come out and introduce the DPA to cover their regions, bearing in mind the other two are out of the picture anyway. No, they were there. The government has conveniently excluded the DPA of that little storm of discontent because of a marginal seat. Of course, where is the other area? Where is the other area that it takes out? Henley Beach Road. Mr Speaker, you look up with interest. It was not actually your area.

The SPEAKER: I thought it was Croydon. I thought we were out.

Ms CHAPMAN: No, you have a little bit of Port Adelaide. We will come to you in a minute if you like, Mr Speaker. The member for West Torrens, the minister for urban planning or whatever he is—

Mr Gardner: Development.

Ms CHAPMAN: Urban development. That's right. He is the sort of second minister. It is a bit like we have a real transport minister and then we have a transport services minister; we have a real planning minister and then we have a sort of urban planning minister. He was the person who got bumped in even debating the last bill on this development act, which was the precinct planning issue, and the Minister for Planning (the real minister) has to come in and do it. So, the Minister for Housing and Urban Development—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education will not interject out of her seat and is called to order.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you, sir, for your protection. The Minister for Housing and Urban Development also happens to be the member in the state seat of West Torrens, which covers the Henley Beach Road area of concern. It is a precinct which is under consideration for considerable urban infill and development and which has, unsurprisingly, elicited some concern in the region around it, particularly of residents who have a variety of views on what should be occurring there.

How convenient that that is missed out. That is simply taken out of the picture. That is still under consideration by the West Torrens council. That is an area of potential conflict in the community. That is an embarrassment for the government as we lead up to the election, so that just gets wiped out. This is the way this government operates.

Bring in the Prospect council and get them to agree to hand over their powers so that they are out of the picture and there is no embarrassment to their potential candidate for the seat of Adelaide, who has now come out of the closet on that; squash Burnside, because everyone loves to bash Burnside; then tiptoe around West Torrens to protect two vulnerable seats.

The SPEAKER: And Croydon?

Ms CHAPMAN: As for Croydon, sadly, sir, as much as I love repeating the statistic of getting more primary votes than you did at the last election, which I am so thrilled about, I have to say that in the spectrum of opportunity for the opposition at the next election Croydon will probably just evade us—just. We may not be able to secure that seat. I will work on it, but I think probably it is going to be just beyond reach.

I am sure that we will have an excellent candidate down there. You were not seen, I think, by your own political party as being in a vulnerable area, so they seem to be quite happy to introduce a part of the DPA, if you have had a look at it, which covers a little bit into Port Road. You can have a look at that and see that—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That's my electorate.

The SPEAKER: Not me?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: No, it's all mine.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it all yours? It's all yours. Perhaps I was mistaken then that they are not worried about you at all. They probably don't care, actually. I will go back to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. That little piece is actually all in his electorate, he interjects to tell me helpfully. Again, no area of controversy or opportunity is necessary. It is appropriate, so they are happy to throw that into the plan. Where it gets hot, where the fire is brimming there, they are

prepared to do that. I just say that in the light of all this the government says it wants to be transparent. Where is the structure plan for Roseworthy, for goodness sake? Two years we have been waiting for that! That is the inconsistency of this government and hypocrisy of this submission.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (11:40): I quote:

There is a world of difference between the Greens and, as far as I am concerned or aware, just about everyone else contesting this election, because everyone else in this campaign supports economic growth and supports a more prosperous economy.

Who said that? It was Prime Minister Abbott. Here we are debating a bill that members opposite supported in the upper house, moved by who? The Greens. Who supported it? The Liberal Party of South Australia. They voted for the bill, supported the bill, and spoke in favour of the bill. Indeed, I understand the Greens were so overwhelmed with joy that the Liberal Party had supported their bill and spoke in favour of it that the Hon. Mark Parnell thanked the opposition for their support. Such is their resolve, by the time it gets to the lower house—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Such is their resolve, they are now against the bill. I look forward to the resignations of the frontbench of the Liberal Party, the Leader of the Opposition in the upper house, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the upper house and all the members who voted for this bill, because of their repudiation by members in the lower house.

I think of the structure of the Liberal Party. There is a bill to be debated in the parliament. The shadow minister for planning takes it to the parliament, takes it to the caucus room, and they say, 'We should support this bill. Absolutely, we should support this bill. We will support this bill.' It goes to the parliament, they make speeches, they vote on it, and they put their name to the bill. It comes down here and then they vote against it. This is—

Ms Chapman: Excuse me; we support the bill.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, that is not what the Liberal Party has told the HIA. Robert Harding stated in his original director's report in September 2013, 'As a result of HIA submissions, the Liberal Party will now not support this bill.'

What we have just heard now is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition say, we say one thing to the industry groups, so they can report that in their magazines, and do another thing in the parliament. Isn't that a fascinating turnaround? Isn't that a fascinating turn of events, that the opposition says one thing in the parliament and another thing to key industry groups? The Liberal Party is lost at sea. It is in chaos; it is in absolute chaos. Their prime minister is at war with the Greens and here they are in a state parliament in bed with them!

One minute they are out telling their donor base, 'We won't be supporting this bill.' They publish it and the HIA, on the basis of conversations they have had with the Liberal Party, publicly say that they will not be supporting the bill, but we have just heard from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that they will support the bill. Talk about confusion! Talk about anarchy and chaos! This lot is not fit to govern, let alone be in opposition. How can they possibly say to an industry group, 'We won't be supporting the bill publicly,' and then in the parliament turn around and vote for it? How can they possibly do that?

Surely, this needs to be sorted out and sorted out quickly, because I will be calling Mr Harding directly after this debate and showing him the *Hansard* with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition saying that he is wrong. The Liberal Party is indeed supporting this bill after having told them that they would not. It goes to the point that there are fewer than 100 days, I think, to the next state election—or thereabouts—and the opposition has plans. It has plans for hospitals, it has plans for schools, it has plans for roads, it has plans for all sorts of things. It is not prepared to tell us what those plans are. They are secret plans, lest the public find out what those plans are and be horrified and vote against them. So they keep them quiet. That is why we have quotes like this, Mr Speaker:

I indicate that the opposition will be supporting the Hon. Mark Parnell, although I always put the caveat that we do not necessarily think that this is something that we would necessarily do in government.

Well, that is something you can bank on. Talk about certainty for industry! Let me paraphrase: what the opposition is really saying is, 'We want to wreck the economy until we become the government. When we become the government we don't want to wreck the economy.' That is not a loyal opposition: that is economic vandalism. What kind of person actually says, 'I'm going to vote for this, but I'm against it'? What kind of morality is that? What kind of politics is that?

Only the Liberal Party of South Australia can go into the parliament and say, 'I'm opposed to this, therefore I'm voting for it.' How do you sleep at night, thinking like that? How do you sleep at night when you act that way? I stand by every vote I have made in this parliament; every, single one. What I do not do is turn up and say, 'I'm going to vote for it, even though I oppose it,' because that kind of behaviour is immoral. Everyone in this place knows that.

The Independents know that. If they oppose something they vote against it and if they support it they vote for it. What they do not do is tell an industry group, in private, 'We oppose this bill,' and, in public, vote for the bill or, even worse, in one chamber vote for the bill and in the other chamber vote against it, and then say 'Make us the government.'

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Grow up? Name any other time that the Australian Labor Party has moved a bill in the upper house and voted against it in the lower. What a disgrace! I look forward to speaking to the HIA directly after this vote, because I would be very interested to know who Mr Robert Hardy actually spoke to, when he said, '...as a result of HIA submissions, the Liberal Party will now not support the bill...', given what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has put on the record.

She talked about a whole series of DPAs. She talked about the Unley DPA; the West Torrens council DPA, and the Malvern and St Peters DPAs as all being the fault of the government. One part that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not let anyone in the parliament know was that they were all council DPAs. That slight detail, that slight nuance of language—that 'Well actually we support the bill, but we are voting against it,' or 'We're opposed to the bill, but we're voting for it,'—it is those sorts of nuances that people should automatically and intuitively understand from the Liberal Party.

The reality is this: the Liberal Party should do what the Prime Minister says, 'Say what you mean and mean what you say.' Do not use weasel words; do not say one thing to an industry group and do another. Be committed—

Ms Chapman: They'll still give you their preferences, the Greens, don't worry. They are sucking up to you, they are in bed with you, they are sleeping with you. You can have them.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have to say that that little outburst says so much about the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. She is in here arguing for a Greens bill, and then lashes out at us because we are voting against it. Let us think that logic through: I am in bed with the Greens. The Greens did not preference me at the last state election. Who did they preference in Bragg?

Ms Chapman: Ben Dineen, actually; the Labor candidate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did they? We will check to see, but I know that they did not preference the Labor Party in the seat of West Torrens, and I suspect they will not preference it again. Quite frankly, so be it. The Labor Party is about prosperity and jobs; always has been and always will be.

Ms Chapman: Your job.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, not my job; other people's jobs. We exist to create wealth and prosperity in our community, to help aspirational people achieve those aspirations. I have to say that on this issue the Liberal Party has behaved in a way that shows it is not fit to govern. Perhaps it is just the inexperience of a first-term MP wanting to become Premier; perhaps that is what the issue is.

Perhaps it is someone who has been in this place for only 3½ years who has the audacity to think that they can be elected on the basis of saying one thing to an industry group, voting a certain way in the upper house and then voting a different way in the lower house. Now, apparently, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has just committed the opposition to changing that vote in the lower house. So I look forward to when a division is ultimately called—and I am sure it will be—to see exactly how the opposition votes on this measure.

Ms Chapman: We'll be making sure it's recorded.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Excellent. I am glad. I look forward to telling all the industry groups that the Liberal Party has spoken to saying that it will not be supporting this bill about what they can surmise from its actions. You can only surmise one thing: that the Liberal Party cannot keep their word and cannot say what they mean and mean what they say.

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (11:50): I rise to speak on this bill, which amends section 28 of the interim operation of the Development Act. I have always had problems with these interim DPAs, and I must say it is something of a new experience for me to rise in support of a bill that has originated from the Greens. I will speak for the bill considering what I have seen within my own electorate.

We have never had troubles with interim operations as far as housing and other developments go, but when it comes to wind farms we had a classic example at Allendale East where a wind farm was approved, it was then quite rightfully objected to, it went to the Environment, Resources and Development Court and the objectors were successful in having that wind farm stopped in a community and in an area where it should never have been, as far as I am concerned.

There was a reaction then from the government to immediately bring in an interim DPA which completely changed the way that wind farms could be assessed and, of course, with this bill I think it goes the right way about what should happen when those interim DPAs come in. I heard the minister refer before to these DPAs being council DPAs. I have had a lot of experience in local government and I find that quite a joke in the respect that at the end of the day it is the planning minister who determines what is in that DPA, not the council.

There is a lot of toing and froing and consultation, but at the end of the day it is the minister who signs off on those DPAs. Most often it is done in an orderly fashion but, as far as I was concerned, with the wind farms it certainly was not. The way that I read it, with this bill if there is an interim DPA brought in there can be no assessment done on that interim DPA for applications and those applications must be made once that DPA has basically been annulled and a new development plan amendment report has been agreed to.

As far as I am concerned, it still gives the community a say on what can happen within their areas and I think that is paramount. We must also make sure that development can happen in an orderly fashion so that this state can grow stronger all the time, but the community itself must be consulted with and must have a say in whether they agree with applications or not. When we start bringing in interim DPAs that basically take the right of appeal away from a community, I cannot agree with that, so I will be supporting this bill.

The SPEAKER: If the member for Fisher speaks, he closes the debate.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:54): Thank you, sir; good ruling! This bill, as members would be aware, originated from another place by the Hon. Mark Parnell. He asked if I would introduce it in this house, and I have done so. I am a believer in the democratic process; I think this is a very important issue, and I think it should be canvassed. Irrespective of how people eventually vote on it, I think it is an important matter to be debated in this chamber.

There is quite a bit of disquiet in the community about some of the planning decisions that have occurred in recent times. Right throughout the community, there are elements of disquiet about the planning process and what has been happening, and about the lack of opportunity for people to have a say; that is probably more in respect of the next matter to be considered.

Many sections of the public feel as though they are shut out of the planning process and that the planning minister and planning authority are able to intervene in a way which takes away many of the sound elements of the planning process. So, we have not necessarily a knee-jerk reaction, but a hasty overriding imposition from above on the planning process.

What this bill does, I think, is reasonable; it would not stop development. I can read the numbers in this house so I am fairly sure that the bill will be negated but, if passed, it would not have brought the state to a halt. The minister just now indicating that it would lead to doom and gloom, and the economy basically going into freefall, I think is stretching things somewhat.

I will conclude by saying that, in essence, I think this measure puts the handbrake on the planning minister and planning authorities, and in that respect I think it is sensible and reasonable. I will be supporting this measure.

The house divided on the second reading:

AYES (18)

Brock, G.G.	Chapman, V.A.	Evans, I.F.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Goldsworthy, M.R.	Griffiths, S.P.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	McFetridge, D.	Pederick, A.S.
Pegler, D.W.	Pisoni, D.G.	Redmond, I.M.
Sanderson, R.	Such, R.B. (teller)	Treloar, P.A.
Venning, I.H.	Whetstone, T.J.	Williams, M.R.

NOES (22)

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Breuer, L.R.
Caica, P.	Close, S.E.	Conlon, P.F.
Geraghty, R.K.	Hill, J.D.	Kenyon, T.R.
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	O'Brien, M.F.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Portolesi, G.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R. (teller)	Sibbons, A.J.
Snelling, J.J.	Thompson, M.G.	Vlahos, L.A.
Wright, M.J.		

PAIRS (6)

Marshall, S.S.	Weatherill, J.W.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Pengilly, M.	Fox, C.C.

Majority of 4 for the noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

**DEVELOPMENT (DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS) (NOTIFICATION) AMENDMENT
BILL**

Second reading.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:05): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This is a short bill. It is fundamentally about informing people who may or can be affected by development to ensure that they get information about that development and are able to make some input in respect of what could well impact directly on them.

In supporting this bill, I point out that a lot of members of the public are concerned about current provisions which effectively shut them out from having any meaningful say in a proposed development. The example of the shopping centre at Flagstaff Pines comes to mind where, from memory, only people within 60 metres of that development can have any input. Obviously a shopping centre that has a bottle shop of something in the order of 1,000 square metres, a supermarket of 2,000 square metres, a doctor's surgery, and a childcare centre, etc., will have an impact that is greater than 60 metres.

There is a lot of concern in the community about the fact that the public does not have an opportunity to have a meaningful say or any input in respect of a development. I was contacted recently by someone from Glenelg who found that he was going to have a huge development right next to his house, but apparently he is unable to have any say whatsoever in that matter. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (12:07): I will speak fairly briefly about this piece of legislation. It really is part and parcel of the same couple of bills which were moved by the Hon. Mr Parnell in the other place some time ago and which received support from the opposition at that time. Again, I note—at least, according to the remarks made by Mr Harding—that the opposition has at least indicated to the HIA that they

now have a different point of view and are not supporting this bill, so I guess we will have to find out whether that remains the case or whether they have returned to supporting it again.

First of all, I pick up on the honourable member for Bragg's comments in her last contribution where she interrogated the government rhetorically about to what extent we had engaged with Mr Hayes and his committee on this topic. Can I say that it is not our normal practice to interrogate anybody about bills that are either bills that originate with another party—in this case, the Greens—or, even more particularly, bills that are the joint work of the Greens and the Liberal Party.

In those circumstances, we would have thought that if there were any interrogation of Mr Hayes to be done, that interrogation would have been done by those who are supporting the bill in the other place. To come here and suggest that it is somehow our responsibility to make inquiries about a bill that has been put up and supported by the would-be government-in-waiting, their rhetoric about consultation is pretty empty when you consider the fact that none of them, apparently, thought to speak to Mr Hayes about the matter.

The reason I am opposing this is that we think that this matter might legitimately be a matter for consideration by Mr Hayes and I do not think it is appropriate for us, at this point in time, to go mucking around with the Development Act while Mr Hayes is in the middle of his inquiry. I could say the same thing about the previous bill, for the same reason.

Ms CHAPMAN: What about your bill on precinct planning?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That was discussed with Mr Hayes, as you well know, because you obtained a copy of the correspondence about that. My preliminary view is that this would create a significant workload and resource issues for government and councils and the Development Act already currently provides for direct notification of DPAs in some circumstances. As I said, the government has established the Expert Panel on Planning Reform and this is where this matter should be sent for them to give consideration to it, along with all the other matters that they might be considering.

Again, the opposition, in particular, is happy to chastise me for having put a bill into the parliament which was nearly finished before Mr Hayes' committee was established, and was the subject of comment by Mr Hayes' committee. They criticised me for that but support this measure, moved by the Greens in the other place, without consulting Mr Hayes. If that is not the pot calling the kettle black, I do not know what is.

The same problem is exposed: the opposition supports this in the upper house, they say, 'We may or may not support it if we ever get into government,' they tell Mr Harding they are not supporting it any more, it comes down here and we bring it on because we want a bit of certainty. Can I say that I would be happy for both these matters to go to Mr Hayes. That is where they should go, not be peremptorily dealt with in this place while Mr Hayes is still doing his job.

What a discourtesy to Mr Hayes to try to amend the act underneath him—literally underneath him. We are trying to hold the status quo for Mr Hayes. I undertake to the members of the opposition and to the Hon. Mr Parnell that I would be happy to forward these bills to Mr Hayes, if they have not already been forwarded, for consideration as part of his project, because I am sure he is interested in it.

Can I say this, as a matter of interest. I understand there is another proposal floating around about putting signage on development sites. I personally do not think that is a bad idea. Why should you not be able to walk past a place where the building has just disappeared and see a little sign saying, 'By the way, this is what's coming'? Why should you not have that? It seems sensible to me. Again, I think that is probably something Mr Hayes should be looking at. We are not going to be able to get it through this parliament, I do not think, anyway, even if we wanted to, but it is another worthy idea—more worthy than these, even—but, again, one that I think Mr Hayes should be looking at.

For the reasons I have just explained, I do not support this bill. I understand why the Hon. Mr Parnell moved the bill. He has a longstanding and deeply held conviction about planning matters, and he and I have agreed to disagree about a number of these things many times. He believes that there should only be an opportunity for preservation orders, in effect. I think that is perhaps not an unreasonable summary of his view: it might be too simplistic but it is generally something like that. I understand where he is coming from but I respectfully think that there are

opportunities and times when a strong statement on the basis of interim DPA arrangements is important.

I will give one example: we had a lengthy consultation with the Adelaide City Council about the Adelaide City DPA which came out in March last year. We thought that in order to give the property sector, the investment sector, the banking sector, and the building and construction sector a clear message, having consulted with the council, we would do that on an interim basis, but we excluded all of the residential precincts of the city and almost all of North Adelaide from that so that they could then go through the DPA process in the ordinary way, which they are doing now. It is wending its way through the system, managed by the Adelaide City Council, not by the planning department.

That is one example of where some clear initiative needed to be given and, since that decision was made, we have in excess of \$3 billion worth of projects which are either in case management or have been approved—

Ms Chapman: Except Roseworthy.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and a number of them are already under construction as a result of that initiative. The honourable member mentions Roseworthy; I would be interested to know what the honourable member's particular interest in Roseworthy is because it would be nice to have on the record whether the honourable member is suggesting that in circumstances where we have 18 years' supply of fringe-rezoned land, six years of which is shovel-ready—and we have said that we do not want to see Adelaide becoming an endlessly sprawling single-dimensional city and that we have to start to grow up and not out—they would immediately rezone Roseworthy? Is that what the honourable member is telling me: that in spite of that, that is the opposition's official policy?

Is that what the opposition is saying? Because if it is, that should be on the public record. Everybody should be in a position to know if that is where the opposition stands on Roseworthy. That is a very interesting and revealing comment because, at the moment, Roseworthy is a very, very long way from the metropolitan fringe and it may or may not be that, within the forward horizon of the 30-year plan, Adelaide grows to a point at which it is necessary to turn our minds, in an immediate sense, to land which is beyond Gawler. It may or may not be.

If we had a population of two million people in this city, that might happen a lot more quickly. However, I saw a ludicrous idea in the paper the other day from the CE, I think it was, of the Light Regional Council, and this is an absolute burster of an idea: 'Rezone it and they will come.' It is this sort of philosophy of 'just rezone everything in the 30-year plan, just rezone the whole lot; don't worry about who is going to pay for it; don't worry about what that will do in the forward estimates, and beyond the forward estimates, to future taxpayers; don't think about that, never turn your mind to that; just rezone it and it will just work itself out.'

As I have said before, I have acknowledged that, in the past, when governments (through lack of experience, I should say, not mala fides) have embraced the 'Rezone it and it will work itself out,' guess what that was called?

Ms Chapman: Mount Barker.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Exactly.

Ms Chapman: And you didn't fix it up.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That is something that I have been berated about for the last 3½ years, and I made it clear within a few months of becoming minister that there would be no more Mount Barkers on my watch. If you boil it all down, what is the thing that has made Mount Barker infinitely more difficult than it might have been? It is exactly what the Light Regional Council is calling on me to do right now, and that is, rezone and do not have any heed of the consequences, just let it all rip and let the poor old future taxpayer, lumbering under the burden of enormous imposts generated by a minister who did not turn their mind to the consequences of rezoning and letting it all rip, deal with it.

In 20 or 30 years, somebody will be able to say, 'Who was that crazy person who rezoned all this land and burdened the state with this infinite infrastructure burden?' At that stage I know what the answer will not be: me, it will not be me.

It is about time the opposition came out from the cave and said where they stand on this. Are they into infinite urban sprawl? Do they think that the arable land surrounding the city should be preserved for purposes other than being submerged under quarter acre blocks? Do they think that we need to get to the point in time where Adelaide becomes sophisticated enough to have a mix of housing, not just endless greenfield development put on the never-never for future taxpayers to lumber under the burden of?

The really amusing thing about this is the hidden subsidy. People rave on about how wonderful it would be to rezone all of this land. The reason they think it is so good and the reason they put all these arguments about: it is going to be cheaper housing, affordable housing, blah, blah, blah, there is a good reason for that, it is because there is a hidden subsidy and the hidden subsidy is by the taxpayers of the future. So, the purchaser and the developer get to walk away knowing that somebody, five or 10 years down the track, is going to pay for what they have walked away with.

The Hon. R.B. Such: That's the Bob Day model.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes. That model is not an infinitely sustainable model, which is why there has to be an alignment between the land requirements, which at the moment are set at 15 years—we are at 18—and zonal infrastructure arrangements, which means that everybody knows who is paying for what and when. When you have the infrastructure in place, when you have those arrangements in place, fine, if the land is required to meet a minimum standard of rezoned land to be available then, sure, rezone, but at the moment I just want it on the record: 18 years worth of fringe land rezoned, six years worth ready to go right now, and the indicative requirement for that was 15 years in the plan.

So, when I read things in the paper like the idea from Light Regional Council, you know, just rezone and let the world take care of itself, surely everybody has seen enough of the consequence of that to say, 'We don't want this anymore,' because I promise the member for Bragg this: any planning minister who is foolish enough to ignore the lesson of history and go out there and rezone willy-nilly and let it rip is going to be condemned by future generations of South Australians for having been irresponsible with the Treasury of this state for decades to come—so, just a bit of a segue there.

This particular piece of legislation, as I said, should go off to Mr Hayes. I oppose it for that reason and I note, again, that the opposition opposed it elsewhere, have apparently told industry groups they now support it, and if it is the same as the last piece of legislation then I assume they will now support it again.

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (12:23): I rise to support the Development (Development Plan Amendments) (Notification) Amendment Bill. It is quite a strange day that I rise in this place to support the Greens twice in a row, so they are doing well. We heard the minister speak a lot about rezoning. Really, this bill has nothing to do with rezoning and whether some rezoning has been appropriate or not. What this bill is about is notifying people who are going to be affected whenever there is a change made to a development plan amendment report.

We also heard from the minister that the status quo has been held. I say the status quo has been held for far too long. At the moment the only obligations often are to put a notice in the *Government Gazette*. I do not think very many people in my electorate read the *Government Gazette*, so they have no idea what is going on sometimes. Previously as mayor I always made sure that our whole community was informed whenever any changes were to be made to planning rules within our council area. Often people would disagree with the proposed changes, but at least they knew that those changes were being debated, and I always made sure that everybody had the opportunity to have some input.

I chaired many meetings where people were quite up in arms, but at the end of the night, once they had a full understanding of what was proposed, they often agreed with those changes or they disagreed but felt that the matter had been dealt with in a proper manner and that they had had a chance to see what were the proposed changes, and they had the opportunity to make comment. Whenever changes are made, good leadership in councils and in government is all about informing the people of the changes you wish to make within their area. This bill goes a long way towards doing that and, whilst there may be an extra workload for some councils and for the government sometimes when it is making changes, I feel that that extra workload is well worth it to have a community that is well informed. I support this bill.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:27): I indicate that the opposition supports the bill. This bill was originally introduced by the Hon. Mark Parnell earlier this year. As has been indicated by other speakers, it proposes an amendment to the Development Act to require notice directly to parties affected by a proposed change to a development plan, either local government or ministerial. The position at the moment is that, although there is an obligation to give notice via the *Government Gazette*, the specific obligation to notify an owner/occupier of land directly affected or adjacent to that land is not required. This bill remedies that.

The bill also provides that any changes to the DPA would not be rendered invalid by reason of failure to notify a particular person. That is an important component of this, because the question of increased risk of legal challenge in the obligations to notify under 'reasonable steps' has been raised by one of the important stakeholders in this area, the UDIA, and we are mindful of that. As the preceding speaker indicated, this is a bill about giving people an opportunity to know something, whether they exercise any right to make a contribution, whether they make any submission or the like, is then a matter for them.

Interestingly, I received the Ambassador for Thailand and members of his staff this morning, and one of the first questions he asked me, when I brought him in to see this chamber, was whether we have a gazette published of the parliament. I explained that we did, that it was provided in hard copy still but was available online, was publicly accessible and it provides notices of the usual situations of ministers being appointed, going on leave, board appointments, any notices under our legislation required to be given public notification. We have anything from the registration of ear tags and cattle brands across to the disposal of land, acquisitions and the like. It is an important piece of information which is available online to the public and which probably is hardly ever read by members of the public.

That is the reality of the world: whilst governments and ministers are happy to say, 'Look, it's on the website, it's available online, you can access it, blah, blah, blah, www', etc., the reality is that if we all spent all the time reading all these things to try to identify what we should be keeping up with, we would never get a chance to live. I for one would like to actually live my life, not speed type it; nevertheless, the important thing is—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Not do what? You want to live it, not what?

Ms CHAPMAN: Speed type it. The important thing here is to understand that this is a bill about notice, and we think that it is reasonable. The original mover of the bill had identified the two circumstances of application of a heritage listing and also the change from residential to floodplain zoning, without people even having a clue that this was going on because they had not read the *Gazette* or, even if they had read the *Gazette*, they do not have any knowledge of it.

It is important that the government understands that it needs to provide for regulation on this and that, to supplement that, the questions about whether the form of direct notification is to be by unaddressed letter or council newsletter and the like are important things that could be considered under regulation, which I think would abate some of the reasonable first-response concerns raised as to the question of time, cost and administrative burden in providing for this initiative. So, we do support that.

I wish to just also refer to a matter which the Attorney raised in his contribution. He suggested that there had been the adequate provision of 18-year land supply as the reason why it was unnecessary to progress the Roseworthy structure plan. This is a matter which he has outlined as being clearly surplus to requirements of the government and unnecessary, given that, according to its own 30-year plan, it has plenty of housing stock available already that has been zoned, and a portion of that is already ready for immediate development.

If that is the case, if the government are of the view that, notwithstanding that there are areas available for consideration of applications in the 30-year plan, as at this point in November 2013, there is plenty of supply and they are ahead of time, indeed, in their land supply entitlement, then why have they not told anybody? Why have they not gone out and said, 'Look, we are telling the world; we are announcing to the world'?

Where is the minister being honest with the people of South Australia for those who might want to develop in a greenfield site, for example? Where is the honesty to the people of South Australia to say, 'We are just going to put a hold on everything. We are no longer participating in any kind of advance of structure plans or anything else that you have got pending'?

Where is the response to the letter that I wrote to the minister a couple of months ago, asking what is happening here, other than getting an acknowledgement? Why have I not got a response? Why is there not some respect for this parliament on behalf of the people of South Australia to give a response to say, 'We have decided, as a matter of policy, that we are ahead of schedule and we do not need any more. We are going to be honest with you and tell you that we are not going to be progressing any other applications'?

No, they are too gutless to do that. They would not ring up the UDIA or the Property Council or the Housing Industry Association, who they are proud to try to come out and quote today as the basis upon which they are opposing a particular piece of legislation. They are trying to condemn us for not following suit with various stakeholders. Yes, they are happy to do that, and yet they are too gutless to ring them up and say, 'It is the end of the line. There will be no further greenfield sites. We are above schedule. We do not need to do this.'

They come in here and start making these demands—how pathetic! I will tell you why: it is because we are just over 100 days from an election and the government does not want to come clean on this. It is absolutely disgraceful that they come in here and try to pretend that they give a toss about the future of South Australia's opportunities in this state, that they even give a care if our children are leaving here and there is about 5,000 a year net emigration out of this state into other states, and that they give a care about the debt and liability that they are leaving the future generations of this state. They do not give a toss.

They care about 14 jobs—theirs—and I cannot wait to the election to make sure that we do have some changes and some opportunities for South Australia and not have to listen to this drivel anymore, and then not have to listen to that nonsense of promises to care about the people of South Australia, when they are keeping secret what is clearly their plan; that is, there will be no further development in this state, and all you kids who want to have a future in this state may as well pack your bags now and go and get a job somewhere else.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:35): This bill, like the previous one, I believe is a reasonable, sensible measure. I was pleased to hear that the planning minister will refer it to Mr Hayes—I am sure he reads *Hansard* anyway—so that, even if it has a stormy response in this chamber, the principles outlined in this bill should and will get further consideration. The planning minister did not spend a lot of time talking about the notification aspect of the bill. This is really an extension of the democratic principle—that is, to inform people.

I think it is a fundamental principle to ensure that electors and residents are aware of what is happening, particularly changes in the law, whether it is planning law or whatever else it may be. Democracy is always more costly and it is always more time-consuming. If you want to get things done quickly, whether it be in planning or elsewhere, you go for the person with the small black moustache. That person can do things very quickly, but we do not want to live in that sort of society and we should not be subject to that sort of anti, non-democratic approach.

The planning minister mentioned some things about planning and I agree with him in many respects. I do not believe we should have more urban sprawl. I think we should be moving to—the term 'high rise' is probably inappropriate—three or four-storey options in appropriate locations along transport corridors, above shopping centres and so on, a bit like the Paris model. The critical thing is how you do it, not just what you do but how you do it so that you end up creating a city that is elevated in more ways than one.

This desire to keep expanding out, whether it is to Roseworthy or further, is not in the long-term interests of the people of Adelaide or this state as a whole. The cost of infrastructure, etc., is significant. The other thing—and we have seen too much of this already—is the impact on agricultural and horticultural land. In Adelaide we have built on some of the best horticultural land that exists in Australia, and we should not keep making those same mistakes in terms of agricultural or horticultural land. In terms of creating a city which is a community, I think there is merit in going up, as the planning minister said, rather than going out.

That approach will be tested by people like the incoming senator, Bob Day, who seems to have a view that you should be able to build whenever and wherever you like. I do not share that view. I think it is critical that the planning minister and the government make the correct decisions in relation to consolidating Adelaide and not having endless and, ultimately, very costly urban sprawl. Sure, you need to provide for and ensure that there is adequate open space if you are going to have people living in three or four-storey apartments, but that can and should be accommodated.

This issue is about the bill before us and, irrespective of its fate here today, it is an important issue that needs to be aired. There is a lot of concern in the community, as I said before, where people are concerned about lack of information and lack of awareness. The member for Bragg quite correctly points out that very few people read the *Government Gazette*. I do not think it is on the top sellers' list—it is certainly not on the top reading list. We know the argument that ignorance of the law is no defence, but the reality is that people do not get to know what is happening, so what is proposed in this bill I think is reasonable.

Sure, it will cost more and take longer, but, as I said at the start, that is what democracy is all about. They do take time and they cost more because you are letting the people have a say, and that is what democracy is about, to a large extent. I support this measure and I ask members in here to do likewise to help bring about some fundamental changes in respect of stakeholders being notified of changes in planning provisions.

The house divided on the second reading:

While the division was being held:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I understood it was always the practice of the house that a negative voice had to call the division. That is my understanding of the process.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Anyone can call for a division.

AYES (18)

Brock, G.G.	Chapman, V.A.	Evans, I.F.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Goldsworthy, M.R.	Griffiths, S.P.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	McFetridge, D.	Pederick, A.S.
Pegler, D.W.	Pisoni, D.G.	Redmond, I.M.
Sanderson, R.	Such, R.B. (teller)	Treloar, P.A.
Venning, I.H.	Whetstone, T.J.	Williams, M.R.

NOES (21)

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Breuer, L.R.
Caica, P.	Close, S.E.	Conlon, P.F.
Geraghty, R.K.	Hill, J.D.	Kenyon, T.R.
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	O'Brien, M.F.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Portolesi, G.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R. (teller)	Sibbons, A.J.
Snelling, J.J.	Thompson, M.G.	Vlahos, L.A.

PAIRS (6)

Marshall, S.S.	Weatherill, J.W.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Pengilly, M.	Fox, C.C.

Majority of 3 for the noes.

Second reading thus negated.

SUCCESSION DUTIES REPEAL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 September 2013.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (12:49): This bill is a minor tidy-up and finalisation of the long process of repealing succession duties, which were essentially repealed many years ago. This simply repeals the Succession Duties Act, which was amended in 1979 to exempt from succession duty the estates of persons who died after 1 January 1980. As it is now 2013, Mr Speaker, you can see the parliament has rushed into this decision, taking only 33 years to realise the act could be repealed. However, succession duty assessments and refunds continue to

be made in relation to those persons who died before that date, that is, 1 January 1980, as certain events trigger a liability or an entitlement under the act.

Although assessments and refunds are increasingly infrequent events, the technical knowledge necessary to assess succession duty liability and consider refund applications is difficult to sustain or justify. All other Australian jurisdictions have abolished comparable legislation on the basis that the employment of resources required to administer the legislation was not cost effective. The repeal of the act will remove any confusion as to whether there is an ongoing liability to pay succession duty.

The Succession Duties Repeal Bill 2013 gives effect to the abolition of succession duty from 1 July 2014, ending any liability from that date that has not been paid from and including 1 July 2014. The bill also extends any potential entitlement to a refund under the act that has not eventuated before 1 July 2014. The bill further extinguishes any entitlement to a refund that existed prior to 1 July 2014 but in respect of which applications for a refund have not been made on or before 31 December 2014. The way I understand it is that if they have applied for a refund before 31 December 2014 they will still get a refund. If they have not applied by that date, then there is no entitlement to a refund.

The opposition sent the bill to numerous industry groups inviting comment and received a response from the Law Society indicating that they support the bill. No other comments have been received by today's date. This is a bill that tidies up the repeal of the succession duties which started in the 1980s. It is now so administratively burdened compared to the number of issues it actually deals with that it is not worth maintaining the bill. It only deals with matters that arise for people who died more than 33 years ago, so the opposition supports this particular measure and has no questions for the minister.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the minister speaks he closes the debate.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (12:52): I have nothing to add other than to say that it has been 33 years, and I do not think anybody could accuse us of acting with undue haste. It is long overdue. All other states have adopted this practice or this legislation in relation to succession duties, so it is fairly straightforward.

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) (12:53): In the absence of any amendments or any discussion on the one clause, I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC CORPORATIONS (SUBSIDIARIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 September 2013.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (12:54): This bill deals with public corporations' subsidiaries and seeks to amend the Public Corporations Act 1993 in two ways. Firstly, the bill seeks to introduce a mechanism for an external, independent dispute resolution process. The bill will enable an amendment to the regulations to provide the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court to hear an appeal against a decision of the corporation.

Secondly, the bill seeks to limit the power and control of the parent corporation (the minister). It will amend the act to ensure that where a subsidiary makes a decision in the capacity of the trustee, the subsidiary is not bound to follow the direction of the parent corporation—in other words, the minister. It will take the power away from the minister and allow the subsidiary to exercise trustee functions independently. The opposition supports the bill and has no questions.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (12:55): Again, I thank the opposition. We have established a superannuation vehicle that sits outside the constitutionally protected framework under which we currently operate. It may be with the effluxion of time that more people join the Public Service or people who are currently members of the Public Service transfer across to the new scheme.

The new scheme probably has a major benefit in that upon retirement the pension is not taxable whereas at the moment, all of us, including those within the parliamentary scheme, in the constitutionally protected scheme, have our pensions taxed. My understanding is that, without speaking at length, due to the fact that we are setting up a non-constitutionally protected superannuation scheme that there is a requirement that certain things be done, one of which is that the dispute resolution power be withdrawn from me as the minister and conferred on the court, and there are a couple of others.

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) (12:57): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION (NOTIFICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 October 2013.)

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:59): I am happy to rise to speak on the Children's Protection (Notification) Amendment Bill but in doing so I identify that I am not lead speaker for the opposition on this matter. If the lead speaker were here right now, he would be saying the words that we are very happy to support this bill, as I do so now. A number of important measures have arisen out of the recommendations of the Debelle inquiry.

For the benefit of the house this bill, which amends the Children's Protection Act to enact those amendments, addresses recommendations 26 and 27 of Justice Debelle's report in relation to the Child Abuse Report Line. Recommendation 26 deals with section 11 of the Children's Protection Act to add that it should be a defence to a charge under subsection (1) to prove that the knowledge of the facts that gave rise to the suspicion was gained only from a police officer acting in the course of his duty.

What that means is that at the moment teachers, mandatory reporters, are under an obligation to report suspected child abuse cases, even if the knowledge of the case has only come to them from somebody who is also a mandatory reporter or a police officer as was highlighted in the case in the Debelle inquiry. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

LIQUOR LICENSING (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) (SUSPENDED SENTENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

NATIONAL GAS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (GAS TRADING EXCHANGES) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

WORKCOVER CORPORATION (GOVERNANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE (PRESIDING MEMBER) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

EVIDENCE (IDENTIFICATION EVIDENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier and the Minister for Health will not engage in self-congratulations.

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CIVIL AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ARREST PROCEDURES AND BAIL) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

GLENSIDE DOG PARK

Mr PISONI (Unley): Presented a petition signed by 698 residents of Burnside and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to proceed with changing the use of and/or selling the Burnside Council's Conyngham Street dog park at Glenside.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today students from Woodville High School, who are guests of the Premier, and four Bhutanese women from the migrant advisory council, who are guests of the member for Port Adelaide.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

ENVIRONMENT, WATER AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

287 Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (11 September 2012). With respect to 2012-13 Budget Paper 4, vol. 12—

What are the details of DENR capital works projections beyond the forward estimates?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport): The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation has received this advice:

The 2012-13 Budget Paper 4, vol. 2 includes a budget for the Department of Environment and Natural Resources annual program for 2012-13 of \$10.227 million. An estimate of capital works beyond the forward estimates period of 2015-16 is obtained by adjusting for projects finishing in 2015-16 and applying indexation of 2.5 per cent. This is known as the creation of 2016-17 forward estimates.

Since the publication of the 2012-13 Budget Papers, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources amalgamated with the Department for Water to form the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources. Other changes include application of a whole of government savings of 10 per cent of the Annual Programmes as part of the 2013-14 state budget process.

The revised capital annual program for the department for 2016-17 is \$14.088 million.

APY LANDS, CHILDREN'S HEALTH SERVICES

488 Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (4 December 2012). How many school-aged children living on the APY Lands, Yalata and Oak Valley in 2012 were—

- (a) assessed as having Otitis Media;
- (b) found to have one or more perforated eardrums; and
- (c) received surgical treatment to address one or more perforated eardrums?

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): A response to this Question on Notice about children in the APY lands was provided on 10 September, 2013, however, Part (b) of this response requires correction.

On 10 September 2013 the house was advised:

A study conducted by Flinders University in 2010-11 *An Evaluation of the benefits of swimming pools for the hearing and ear health of young Indigenous Australians. A whole of population study across multiple remote Indigenous Communities* found that, over six visits, an average of 285 children (82 per cent) had no perforated ear drums, 40 children (11 per cent) had one perforated ear drum, and 25 children (6.9 per cent) had two perforated ear drums.

I am now informed that this information, provided by SA Health, related only to 'wet' perforations and information about 'dry' perforations should also be considered to understand the frequency of ear drum perforation. A dry perforation is the presence of a perforation in the eardrum without any signs of discharge or fluid behind the eardrum. Some people also refer to this as inactive Chronic Suppurative Otitis Media.

I am informed by my department that the Flinders University study mentioned above found that over these six visits on average 82 per cent had no perforated wet ear drums, 11 per cent had one perforated wet ear drum, and 7 per cent had two perforated wet ear drums.

SA Health further advise that Professor Linnett Sanchez, one of the key authors of the above study, has confirmed that the combined wet and dry perforated ear drums in all Anangu communities which includes the APY land communities and Yalata and Oak Valley communities was found to be 36.1 per cent while many of the remaining 63.9 per cent of children had hearing which was not within normal limits due to middle ear infection (without perforation) or due to past history of infection.

SA Health is committed to improving the ear health of Aboriginal children. Closing the Gap funding has been used since 2011 to improve ear health services to remote Aboriginal communities, and to ensure improved access to ear, nose and throat medical specialists and audiologists. The service delivery model commenced with Country Health coordinating specialist visits, and since mid 2013, Nganampa Health Council has taken responsibility for coordinating visiting ear health specialist services with funding provided through Country Health.

COMMUNITY CONNECT

502 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol. 2 sub-program 6.1, p. 110: Community Connect—

1. Which non-government organisations received funding for rental subsidy support grants?
2. Which agencies received funding for the utilities literacy program and the emergency financial assistance program and how much did they receive for this financial year?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

1. Subsidies are being provided by the government to non-government organisations that were relocated from the Torrens building in 2008. However, these subsidies were not allocated as grants, or from a grants program, but were fixed term rental subsidies.

The non-government organisations that receive the fixed term rental subsidies are:

- Australian Association of Social Workers
- Create Foundation
- Global Education Centre (SA)
- Grandparents for Grandchildren
- Greek Welfare Centre
- Jewish Community Centre
- SA Council of Churches Inc.
- SA Lebanese Women's Association (SALWA)
- Shelter SA
- Spark Resource Centre Inc.

- United Nations Association (SA) Inc.
- Welfare Rights SA (WRCSA)
- Brain Injury Network of SA
- Muslim Women's Association of SA Inc.
- Volunteering SA/NT Inc.
- Youth Affairs Council of SA

2. The Utilities Literacy Program is in the final stages of a request for tender process. Allocation of funding to agencies will occur once the procurement process has been finalised.

In 2013-14, Emergency Financial Assistance Program funding has been provided to agencies until 31 December 2013. The funding allocation from 1 January 2014 is pending the outcome of the Family and Community Development Program tender process.

The agencies currently providing these services are:

- Anglican Community Care Inc.
- Anglicare SA
- Catholic Diocese of Pt Pirie Inc.
- Lutheran Church in Australia (SA District) Inc.
- UnitingCare Wesley Bowden Inc.
- UnitingCare Wesley Port Pirie Inc.
- SPARK Resource Centre Inc.
- The Hut Community Centre Inc.

STATE GOVERNMENT CONCESSIONS

503 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol. 1, sub-program 6.1 and 6.2, p. 110—

1. What funding was provided to non-government organisations to assist struggling families with their energy needs?

2. How much money is in the Emergency Electricity Payment Scheme, how is it used, and how is its effectiveness measured?

3. What is the amount of money, eligibility, effectiveness and all other relevant information in relation to the medical heating and cooling concessions?

4. How does the Centrepay scheme work, can deductions be made automatically from a citizen's federal Newstart or other Centrelink payments, and is the Centrepay scheme being used to deduct electricity or gas bills at the moment?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

1. \$780,000 has been invested in the Utilities Literacy Program, which provides support to those experiencing financial hardship associated with utilities related cost pressures. Additionally, funding of \$4.3 million over four years, from 2013-14, has been allocated to increase the number of state government funded financial counsellors based in community organisations to support more people to access the No Interest Loan Scheme (NILS). NILS provides small interest free loans to approved customers for the purchase of essential household items, such as energy efficient fridges, freezers and washing machines.

2. The Emergency Electricity Payment Scheme (EEPS) increased from \$200,000 to \$320,000 in the 2012-13 State Budget. In 2013-14, \$332,000 has been allocated to EEPS. EEPS provides assistance to households in a financial crisis who are unable to pay their electricity debt. A payment of up to \$400 once every three years is available to those who have been disconnected, or at risk of disconnection from their electricity supply. Payment is available for the

cost of reconnection and is available to pay a debt (including a final bill) at an applicant's previous address, provided the applicant has remained with the same retailer at their current address.

The effectiveness of the scheme is monitored by the number of people accessing the scheme and the payments provided resulting in people either being reconnected to their electricity supply or reducing the number of people risking disconnection.

3. The Medical Heating and Cooling Concession (MHCC) Scheme commenced on 1 January 2012 and has approved funding of \$1.8 million over four years. On 1 July 2012, the state government increased the MHCC from \$158 per year to \$165 per year.

In 2012-13, expenditure for the MHCC payments was \$441,329, comprising \$186,616 in first time payments (including backdated payments) and \$254,713 for quarterly payments from July 2012 to June 2013.

It is anticipated that by 30 June 2014, approximately 3,000 people in total will be receiving the MHCC. The 2013-14 budget allocated for the MHCC Scheme is \$346,000, including indexation.

The MHCC is an energy concession that is available to South Australians who are on a low income or pension and who have a qualifying medical condition, such as multiple sclerosis or Parkinson's disease. Medical evidence is required to certify that the applicant has been clinically assessed as requiring the use of heating or cooling in the home to prevent severe exacerbation of their condition.

The concession is available to eligible applicants, in addition to the current energy concession, to help with the higher costs of energy incurred because of the need to use cooling or heating in the home to regulate body temperature. It is also available to eligible parents or guardians of a child who has a qualifying medical condition. Where eligible, more than one person per household may receive the concession.

To be eligible for the MHCC, applicants must meet at least one primary and one secondary criterion. The qualifying primary medical conditions are Multiple Sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, Lymphoedema, Fibromyalgia, Tetraplegia, Post-Polio Syndrome/Poliomyelitis, Motor Neurone Disease, Systemic Lupus Erythematosus and Muscular Dystrophy. There is also a category of 'Other qualifying medical condition', which must be specified.

The effectiveness of the scheme is continually monitored and in September 2012, expert medical advice was obtained to assist in a review of the medical criteria for eligibility. The panel's recommendations, which increase the availability of the concession, have been implemented into the assessment.

4. Centrepay is a Commonwealth Government Scheme administered by Centrelink and, therefore, falls outside of any state government portfolio responsibilities.

The Department for Communities and Social Inclusion utilises approved Centrelink data to validate clients applying for concessions to determine their eligibility. Concessions for energy, once approved, are automatically applied to an eligible customer's electricity account.

Any Centrepay arrangement is between the customer and Centrelink.

FINANCIAL COUNSELLORS

504 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 6, p. 22—

How many financial counsellors will be appointed and where will they be stationed?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

The Department for Communities and Social Inclusion is in the process of seeking proposals from experienced, eligible and capable non-government organisations to provide financial counselling services.

Approximately 9 to 12 financial counsellors will be appointed with funding and it is anticipated that these positions will operate from various sites across South Australia.

A significant component of the service will be to provide financial counselling from hospitals, schools, courts and, other places or settings where communities are situated and are easily accessible by public transport, for example community centres, civic centres and libraries.

SA WATER CONCESSIONS

506 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 6, p. 22 (actual reference is on page 21)—

1. How many people will be eligible for the increased water concessions from 1 July 2013?
2. How many water concessions will be provided to owner-occupiers and tenants?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

In 2012-13, approximately 149,000 home owners and 32,300 tenants received the water concession. It is expected that similar numbers of water concession recipients will benefit from the increased concession amount in 2013-14.

DISABILITY SERVICES

538 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol.3, sub-program 1.1, p. 53: System Performance—

1. The Budget refers to a \$2.8 million expenditure reduction to the Department Communities and Social Inclusion for 2013-14 relating to the discharge of patients from hospital with a disability, how many Disability SA clients are in hospitals on a long term basis due to difficulties in obtaining appropriate accommodation and support?
2. How will the loss of funding under this sub-program impact those with a disability, will the alternative program be as effective and how will it differ?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

At 30 June 2013, there were 29 people with disability whose discharge from public hospitals was recorded as delayed whilst they waited for suitable accommodation or support to become available.

From 1 July 2013, the responsibility for administering this funding transferred from SA Health to Disability SA. There is no decrease in funding available to clients in 2013-14 compared to what was available in 2012-13.

There will be no change to the process for determining the discharge pathway for people with a disability from the acute sector. Clients discharge pathway will be continue to be determined jointly by SA Health and Disability SA.

The program will continue as normal.

DISABILITY SERVICES

541 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol.1, Program 4, p. 96: Disability SA—

1. How many new referrals have been referred to the accommodation placement panel in 2012 and 2013?
2. How many referrals have the accommodation placement panel assessed and denied in the past 12 months and how many has it accepted?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

During the 2012-13 financial year, 415 referrals were received and assessed by the Accommodation Placement Panel. None of these were rejected.

SOCIAL HOUSING

554 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol.1, p. 86—

Why has the net cost of services for the Social Housing program decreased from the 2012-13 budgeted amount of \$328.476 million to \$308.971 million?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

The reduction in the net cost of services from the 2012-13 Budget can primarily be explained by a reduction in land tax expenses, the transfer of asset strategy staff and related budget from the South Australian Housing Trust to Renewal SA, and the allocation of budget savings.

STATE BUDGET

555 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol.1, p. 93—

The financial commentary states that the \$7.9 million difference in net cost between the 2013-14 budget and the 2012-13 estimated result is primarily due to the allocation of budget savings, what are the details of these savings?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

The 2012-13 Budget included a savings measure to increase the existing efficiency dividend of 0.25 per cent of the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion's (DCSI) salaries and wages per annum to 1.0 per cent from 2013-14 onwards. The 2012-13 budget also included FTE reductions for DCSI increasing from 8.9 FTEs in 2013-14 to 29.7 FTEs in 2015-16.

In addition to these measures, the 2012-13 Mid Year Budget Review (MYBR) imposed a further efficiency dividend on DCSI of 1.0 per cent of the net cost of services budget, (excluding disability expenditure), in 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 (extended to 2016-17 in the 2013-14 Budget). The MYBR also included a savings measure relating to reducing labour contractors.

The savings in Program 3: Social Housing referred to on page 93 of the 2013-14 Agency Statements relate to Housing's share of these DCSI savings.

HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY

560 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol.1, p. 95—

1. Are women and young people, who are homeless and maybe couch surfing or staying with friends temporarily, included in the activity indicators and what about the homeless people in country areas?

2. In Budget Paper 4, vol. 1, page 94 it states that 19,200 people were assisted through Specialist Homelessness Services, but on page 95, Budget Paper 4, vol. 1, it states that the projection is 550—How many are actually homeless and why is there this discrepancy?

3. How many homeless people are there in Port Augusta, Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln and Ceduna?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

1. The activity indicator 'Number of "rough sleepers" in South Australia assisted through Specialist Homelessness Service' on page 95 of Budget Paper 4, vol. 1 includes people who are living in non-conventional accommodation. Non-conventional accommodation includes living on the streets, sleeping in parks, squatting or living in improvised dwellings.

Young people and women are included in this activity indicator if they are homeless in the sense of living in non-conventional accommodation. Couch surfing or staying with friends temporarily is not included in the definition of rough sleeping, therefore any young people or women in this situation are not captured by this indicator. Homelessness data is collected from agencies across all metropolitan and country areas in South Australia, and therefore results include people in country areas.

2. Clients assisted through Specialist Homelessness Services may present as either homeless or at risk of homelessness. Homelessness includes a wide variety of circumstances. Some homeless people are in non-conventional accommodation ('rough sleeping') whilst others are 'couch surfing' or in other vulnerable arrangements. The Budget Papers show 19,200 South Australian people sought assistance from Specialist Homelessness Services.

The data shown on page 95 of the Budget Papers is an activity indicator relating to rough sleepers. 'Rough sleepers' is one of two categories of homeless clients as defined by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

3. It is not possible to determine the exact number of homeless people within a local area at any one time. Therefore, whilst we do not have figures on the actual number of homeless people in Port Augusta, Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln and Ceduna, 194 clients were assisted by Specialist Homelessness Services in 2011-12 as follows:

- Port Augusta—70 clients
- Limestone Coast (includes Mount Gambier)—53 clients
- Port Lincoln—33 clients
- Ceduna—38 clients

COMMUNITY HOUSING

564 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol.1, p. 93—

1. Will the state government transfer additional assets to the non-government community housing sector over forward estimates and if so, what are the expected amounts?

2. Will the government be seeking permission from tenants to allow their personal details to be forwarded onto the relevant non-government organisation during the transition?

3. Will the tenants be required to sign new lease agreements with the relevant non-government organisation providing community housing and how will this impact on the tenants in relation to future rental agreements and rent increases?

4. What are the options for existing Housing SA tenants that do not want to transfer over to the community housing sector?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

1. The initial transfer of around 1,100 properties and tenancies will be managed by Community Housing Providers (CHPs) for an initial period of three years. Subject to satisfactory performance, the CHPs will be offered the opportunity to manage the properties for a further 20 years. It is intended that, subject to Cabinet approval, there will be further transfers of 4,000 public housing properties to the community housing sector.

2. The CHPs will be assuming tenancy management for transferring tenants. In accordance with the state government's information and privacy principles, Housing SA may exchange information that is deemed relevant to the management of the tenancies. The information and privacy principles 'require personal information handled by contracted service providers undertaking a service on behalf of government, to be treated the same way it would be if the agencies were delivering the service themselves'. It will be a requirement of the contract that CHPs comply with these principles.

Information to be exchanged may include:

- tenant and household names and dates of birth as these relate to calculation of rent;

- current income as this relates to calculation of rent;
- occupancy date;
- current arrears and repayment history;
- information relating to any disruptive behaviour management process and history; and
- special needs relating to either the household's application for housing (i.e. any specific grounds as to why they were housed) or special needs that have arisen since being housed, that have shaped the services provided by Housing SA or the way these services are provided.

This information will be provided to the appointed CHPs prior to the effective transfer date.

3. Housing SA is working through the detail of whether new tenancy agreements will need to be signed. If that is the case, the new agreements will preserve the conditions set out in the current agreement. Tenants will not be financially disadvantaged as a result of the transfers. If their household is eligible for Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA), the new rent charged will be higher; however rent will increase only by the amount of CRA for which the household is eligible. The household's 'after-rent income' will be the same as if the household had stayed with Housing SA. The community housing provider will maintain current rent increase increments that apply at the time of the transfer.

4. It is intended that all of the selected properties and tenancies will transfer. Housing SA has been working closely with transferring tenants since the announcement of the transfer areas. During the next 18 months, there will be a range of opportunities (e.g. forums, reference groups, and community events) for tenants, their support workers, agencies and other stakeholders to come together to share information and discuss any concerns they may have.

COMMUNITY HOUSING

565 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol.1, p. 93—

1. Will the government clearly identify whether housing provided is community housing provided by the non-government sector or Housing SA housing?

2. What is the current situation in relation to La Luna Housing Co-op and will the government intervene on behalf of residents, will the government be providing financial assistance to assist with potential legal costs and if so, how much will be budgeted?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

1. When the property and tenancy management of public housing properties identified through the Better Places, Stronger Communities program is transferred to community housing providers on 1 January 2015, the properties will be classified as community housing.

2. On 13 December 2012, Housing SA intervened in La Luna Housing Co-operative under the *South Australian Co-operative and Community Housing Act 1991*. La Luna Housing Co-operative was ordered to transfer five properties and tenants who were in dispute with the co-operative to another registered housing organisation. On 24 April 2013, La Luna Housing Co-operative successfully appealed Housing SA's intervention with the Public and Community Housing Appeal Panel.

Three of the tenants have found alternative housing outside of La Luna Housing Co-operative with the remaining two tenants having their membership revoked, with the decision to put them on a six month fixed term tenancy. It is understood both these tenants will be seeking support from the Tenancy and Information Services (TIAS) to appeal this decision with the Public and Community Housing Appeal Panel. There is no cost involved in engaging the support of TIAS, and there is no cost in appealing the decision of La Luna Housing Co-operative with the Public and Community Housing Appeal Panel.

HOUSING SA

566 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol.1, p. 93—

1. Has the government undertaken a cost benefit analysis to ascertain the financial impact on local government rate revenue as a result of the ownership of 5,000 SA Housing houses being transferred to non-government organisations?

2. Which councils have met with the government regarding this issue, what concerns did they raise and what dates did they meet with the Minister for Social Housing?

3. Has the government overcome issues such as rate rebates and ascertained the effects of this policy?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

1. Yes.

2. On 11 July 2013, I met with the City of Marion and the City of Playford to discuss the transfer of stock to the community housing sector and the impact on rate revenue. Housing SA staff have also held discussions with local government, including the City of Marion and City of Playford councils.

3. Housing SA is having ongoing discussions with local government in relation to the rate rebate and transfer of stock management to the community housing sector.

HOUSING SA

567 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol.1, p. 93—

1. Will local councils have to increase their rates to offset the financial impact of a 75 per cent rate reduction on homes owned by the non-government sector?

2. What is the current status in relation to 191 Regent Street and the Regent Street south units as far as the transfer of SA Housing stock to Renewal SA, when will this program be finalised, how many residences and how many tenants will be affected?

3. Has Housing SA changed their plans to decommission any of these properties previously considered and transferred ownership to non-government organisations for the purposes of housing refugees, mental health accommodation or Department of Corrections accommodation?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

1. It is up to individual councils to determine the level of their rates.

2. Five proponents were selected from the 16 that submitted proposals for Stage 1 of the Inner City Expression of Interest. They have been invited to submit detailed proposals for the Box Factory complex in Stage 2.

Stage 2 is now underway, with final proposals due in September 2013. Renewal SA anticipates evaluating the Stage 2 proposals received by October 2013, with a recommendation to the government by December 2013. Housing SA can advise that 50 residences and 49 tenants will be affected as part of Stage 2.

3. The expression of interest has sought the interest of community housing providers in partnership with private sector housing providers. Subject to the proposals received, it is anticipated that community housing providers will be a provider of social housing at the Box Factory complex as an outcome of the renewal project.

HOUSING TRUST

626 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15 October 2013). In reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol. 1, p. 93—What is the explanation for Note (b) to the program summary which states 'that the 2013-14 Budget does not include a reduction of \$79 million in the SAHT grant following the partial write-off of SAHT's debt with the Treasurer'?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

The benefit arising from the write-off of the South Australian Housing Trust's (SAHT) debt, less \$50 million for new projects, has been returned to the state government via reductions to the SAHT's land tax reimbursement grant. This will occur over the four-year period 2013-14 to 2016-17, with an annual reduction of \$79 million in the grant amount that would otherwise be payable.

The SAHT receives its land tax reimbursement grant from the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (DCSI), which in turn receives it as an appropriation from the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) before paying it to the SAHT.

At the time the 2013-14 Budget Papers were finalised, the reduction in the SAHT's land tax reimbursement grant had not been made in the agency budget numbers, due to the approval of this arrangement late in the budget process.

Note (b) essentially advises of this issue, by stating that the published figure still includes a \$79 million reduction that, at the time, was yet to occur.

The SAHT and DCSI budgets have since been updated by the DTF to include all adjustments arising from the debt relief arrangements.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SPORTS INSTITUTE

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (5 July 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport): The seven sports which were transitioned out of the South Australian Sports Institute (SASI) had their previous level of direct program funding of \$263,000 maintained for the 2011-12 financial year, principally through StEP grants. StEP grants provided \$206,000 with the balance \$57,000 coming from the Office for Recreation and Sport budget.

The allocation per sport was as follows:

Sport	Allocation
Football—Men	\$55,000
Football—Women	\$55,000
Basketball	\$29,000
Baseball	\$49,000
Aerial—MAG	\$35,000
Sailing	\$20,000
Tennis	\$20,000
Total	\$263,000

SPORTS FUNDING

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (5 July 2011) (Estimate Committee B).

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport): This project was an initiative of the Physical Activity Branch within the Office for Recreation and Sport (ORS). It involved a partnership between the ORS and the Community and Neighbourhood House Association (CANH) to establish *be active* branded physical activity projects at participating centres and houses.

CANH is the peak body for 90 community centres and neighbourhood houses in South Australia.

First negotiated in 2007, the project enabled CAHN to provide small amounts of seed funding to local houses for physical activity projects across its network in metropolitan and regional areas.

Seed funding was provided for three years, ceasing in 2010-11. ORS funding priority is to fund sport and recreation organisations rather than CAHN activities. However eligible projects can still be considered under ORS funding programs.

The funding has not been redirected, as it was used to meet savings targets for the ORS.

CONCESSIONS AND SENIORS INFORMATION SYSTEM

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (25 July 2013).

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

I own the intellectual property for the Concessions and Seniors Information System Program (CASIS).

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

In reply to the **Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport)** (12 September 2013).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised of the following:

The Hon. Iain Evans is referred to the 2013-14 Budget Statement (Budget Paper 3) page 30, Table 2.10: General government sector employment numbers which shows a reduction of 4,882 FTEs across the forward estimates from 30 June 2013 to 30 June 2017.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Auditor-General's Department, Operations of—Annual Report 2012-13
State of the Sector Report—Annual Report 2012-13

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

South Australian Parliamentary Superannuation Scheme—Annual Report 2012-13
Treasury and Finance, Department of—Annual Report 2012-13

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

State Records Act 1997, Administration of—Annual Report 2012-13

By the Minister for Business Services and Consumers (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Liquor Licensing—

Dry Areas—

Adelaide—New Year's Eve 2013

Cadell—New Year's Eve 2013

Glenelg—Seacliff—New Year's Eve 2013

Kimba—New Year's Eve 2013

Strathalbyn—2013 Christmas Party

Various Councils—New Year's Eve 2013

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. M.F. O'Brien)—

Police Superannuation Board—Annual Report 2012-13
State Procurement Board—Annual Report 2012-13

By the Minister for Correctional Services (Hon. M.F. O'Brien)—

Correctional Services, Department for—Annual Report 2012-13

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

Fisheries Council of South Australia—Annual Report 2012-13

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Primary Industry Funding Schemes—Sheep Industry Fund—Application of Fund

By the Minister for Small Business (Hon. T.R. Kenyon)—

Small Business Commissioner—Annual Report 2012-13

By the Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts (Hon. C.C. Fox)—

Carclew Youth Arts—Annual Report 2012-13

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:04): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The current uncertainty surrounding the future of the car industry in South Australia is the most pressing economic issue facing our state. Last sitting week I was joined by members from across the chamber on the steps of Parliament House to launch the government's More Than Cars campaign. This campaign is a community push to raise awareness of the importance of securing the future of the nation's car industry.

In under two weeks, more than 2,700 people have signed up to the More Than Cars website to show their support for national investment in our local car industry. We have been to workplaces, in the Rundle Mall and at shopping centres, encouraging South Australians to show their support. I have also briefed local car components suppliers on the progress of the campaign and received their support.

Since the last sitting week, ACIL Allen Consulting group has released a report which found that the closure of the car industry would wipe \$7.3 billion from Australia's gross domestic product by 2018. The report also states that the economies of Adelaide and Melbourne would face a reduction in their gross regional product of up to 1.4 per cent and it is likely that gross regional product will be lower than current levels until the end of 2031.

The report estimates that Melbourne would lose 33,000 jobs by 2018, in addition to around 6,600 jobs lost in Adelaide. Even when these jobs return, by the second half of the 2020s, they would be jobs with lower real wages. The ACIL Allen report echoes the local work done by Barry Burgan and John Spoehr that found that up to 13,000 jobs might be lost from South Australia if the industry closed.

This is a problem of a national scale. It needs a national solution. On Friday, I have been invited to Victoria to address the national conference of automotive component makers from across the country and seek their support for our campaign. This will be the first part of rolling out the More Than Cars campaign across the country to build a national consensus in favour of investment in the car industry.

Before I meet with them, I want to be able to present the bipartisan support of everyone in this place for national investment in the car industry. That is why this Thursday, the government will be moving a motion which will make crystal clear this house's support for national investment in the car industry and the urgency of resolving this issue in the interests of all South Australians.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

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

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (14:11): I bring up the 73rd report of the committee, entitled Urban Density.

Report received and ordered to be published.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:11): I bring up the 87th report of the committee, entitled Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Act 2002 Report July 2012-June 2013.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 89th report of the committee, entitled Prescribed Burning—Fire Management in the Mount Lofty Ranges Fact Finding Visit 7 June 2013.

Report received and ordered to be published.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:14): I bring up the report of the committee, being the annual report for 2012-13.

Report received and ordered to be published.

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE

The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (14:15): I bring up the report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into the Stolen Generations Reparations Tribunal Bill 2010.

Report received.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:16): I bring up the report of the committee into issues relating to surveillance devices.

Report received.

QUESTION TIME

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house what action has been taken in relation to a northern suburbs out-of-school-hours care worker who is alleged to have behaved inappropriately with children and who has reportedly been stood down by the department?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:17): I can advise that, in relation to the circumstance the leader is referring to, the person has been dismissed from one position, stood down from another and then resigned.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Supplementary, sir. Can the minister confirm the report was first made about this alleged offender in April of this year?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:18): The advice that I have was that information came to the principal on 30 August this year. I am happy to take that question on notice and go back and check, but the information I have is that concerns were expressed to the principal and within days the person was stood down.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): Further supplementary. Can the minister advise what action was taken by the government from the time of the initial report?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:18): The person was stood down. There were concerns in relation to the out-of-school-hours care. The person was dismissed from out-of-school-hours care. A police investigation ensued and is ongoing.

The SPEAKER: A third supplementary?

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): A final one, sir, I am sure. Can the minister advise when the Child Abuse Report Line was first informed about this incident and what action was taken subsequent to that?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:19): I would imagine the principal made a report. I am not sure about that, but I am happy to take that on notice and come back to the house.

EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister confirm that South Australia has more staff within the education department's health and safety unit compared to, say, its Victorian equivalent and, in addition, can the minister provide some comparative information on how the department is tracking in relation to the number of mental stress claims lodged?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:19): I thank the member for Florey for this question and commend her on how she always seeks accurate information before releasing facts to the public. On Monday, a media release from the Marshall Liberal opposition made a number of assertions about stress claims in the education department. It claimed Victoria's health and safety unit has five times less staff than DECD.

That is correct. DECD's health and safety unit employs 29 injury management staff. This is higher than the Victorian equivalent because Victoria outsources this service. We employ more staff and, as a self-insurer, all claims are managed in-house. The member for Unley's media release states that, since 2010, there were 3,284 separate claims with 52 per cent for mental stress.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: In actual fact, there were 544 fewer claims than were stated in this media release, and the collective cost for stress claims was \$10.3 million less. The member for Unley asserted that after 12 years of Labor we have fallen behind on this front. Let me outline some comparisons. In 2011-12 there were 173 mental stress claims. This compares to 244 in 2002-03—40 per cent more mental stress claims in 2002-03. If we remove the number of non-teaching staff from the 174 claims, it leaves us with 112 teachers. Back in 2002-03, the after-effects from eight years of Liberal mismanagement saw 171 claims made by teachers. This is 53 per cent higher.

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education will be seated.

Mr PISONI: It is clearly debate as to the previous government's type of management and handling of a particular department. It is clearly debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: It is within the scope of the question, and it is germane.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir. This is 53 per cent higher. So, to borrow the words from the Liberal media release, 'It's a staggering statistic.' The frequency rate within the department as reported in the annual report for new psychological injuries is also in decline. The opposition release states that after 12 years of Labor we have fallen well behind. If they think the 2002 retention rate of 69.5 per cent is an improvement on today's figures of 89 per cent, then I would say the Liberal priorities are in the wrong place.

Let's not forget the 45 schools closed outright by the Liberals when they were last in office. Perhaps the member for Adelaide would not object if the Liberals closed Sturt Street Community School for a second time. If staff aren't already distressed by his \$76,000 worth of FOI requests, the thought of having to answer to someone who can utter these untruths is enough to put any decent person in stress.

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport rose, but I waited for him to make an utterance.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I said 'Point of order' twice, sir.

The SPEAKER: I am sorry; I didn't hear you.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Is the minister finished, otherwise a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Is the minister finished?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Yes.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister is finished and I call the member for Unley to order. Does the member for MacKillop have a supplementary?

Mr WILLIAMS: No, sir, I am seeking a point of clarification from your ruling of a moment ago. I believe you said that the answer was not debate because it was within the scope of the question. Does that mean that if somebody asks a question which invites debate, it is therefore parliamentary or not unruly for them to debate the answer? If that's the case, sir, I don't know why we have standing orders at all.

The SPEAKER: Thank you for that hypothetical observation.

Mr PISONI: Supplementary, sir, or are you still dealing with the point of order?

The SPEAKER: The question asked for a comparison, and a comparison was received. Supplementary from the member for Unley.

EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:24): In her answer, the minister referred to a WorkCover record. Can the minister advise when was the last time the Department for Education passed its WorkCover audit?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:24): The member for Unley has gone through these questions time and time again. What we know is that we can't trust any of the figures he puts out anytime in any of his media releases.

Mr PISONI: Point of order: I refer you to 127.

The SPEAKER: Personal reflections on members: well, if that kind of thing is to be ruled out as a personal reflection, there isn't much that we could say about one another in debate and in question time.

Mr Pisoni: But it's a lie.

The SPEAKER: I'm sorry?

Mr Pisoni: It's not a personal reflection: it's an untruth, isn't it?

The SPEAKER: Did I hear the member for Unley just say that the minister's answer was a lie?

Mr PISONI: I said it was an untruth, sir.

The SPEAKER: No, I think you said it was a lie, and you will withdraw that.

Mr PISONI: I withdraw, sir.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The leader.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. As paragraph 536 of the Debelle report indicates that parents should be told if there is a possibility that children are at risk, does the government intend to notify parents of the allegations against the northern suburbs out-of-school-hours care worker?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:26): Mr Debelle also makes it very clear that you have to be very cautious about releasing information whilst investigations are ongoing, when you are in a situation where no charges or arrests have been made, and I understand that is the case currently. So, police are conducting an investigation and no charges or arrests have been laid in relation to this person and any allegations made about him. We are seeing, over recent days, where media outlets are choosing to name particular schools and visit particular schools before an investigation is complete, and we have been in the situation where, without naming a particular person, we have to put letters out to parents to allay their fears and assure them that proper processes are underway.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Supplementary, sir?

The SPEAKER: I'll hear it.

Mr MARSHALL: I am just trying to seek some clarification with that answer, relative to an earlier answer. The minister previously indicated that this person had been stood down from one position and dismissed from another. How can it be the circumstances that the government would dismiss somebody from a role when there hasn't been the conclusion of the investigation, there haven't been charges laid and there hasn't been a conviction?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:28): I understand it was the governing council that dismissed this person. It wasn't the government: it was the governing council of the OSHC service. The person then resigned from his position with the education department, so he is no longer an employee, but he is under investigation.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house whether there is any urgency to secure national investment for Australia's car industry?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:28): I note that a number of members on the other side laughed at the asking of that question, though one of the things that I did say at the outset of my ministerial statement is that this is the most crucial economic issue facing the state. I don't think it's actually—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I don't think that it is a laughing matter. As outlined before, the car industry underpins tens of thousands of jobs here in South Australia and is worth billions of dollars in our gross domestic product. We know that the previous Labor government committed to more than \$1 billion in funding to the car industry than is currently on offer by the Coalition government. They did not cut \$500 million from the first stage of the Automotive Transformation Scheme, and they committed an additional \$500 million to the next stage of the Automotive Transformation Scheme. The then government also committed to ongoing support into the 2020s and that this would be secured by legislation. So that is what we were facing. We know that that was enough funding to secure Holden's future and, indeed, the industry's future.

It is worth reflecting, I think, on the \$500 million cut. For a party that is often heard to complain about sovereign risk issues—that is, changing the goalposts underneath companies after they have made their investment decisions—what would be a more significant sovereign risk issue than a group of companies having made their investment decisions to then have the underpinning funding arrangements taken from them after they have already made those commitments? It rather puts taxation change regimes into the shade. It is a spectacular act of sovereign risk, and it has been noticed by the large multinational companies that are making these investment decisions.

Then we have the federal Coalition government referring the issue of the car industry funding off to the Productivity Commission. Referring the issue off to the Productivity Commission is supported by the Leader of the Opposition. Referring it off to the Productivity Commission involves delay, a delay that the Leader of the Opposition is happy to underwrite. It also involves giving to an unelected body the decision-making process over the future of our car industry.

Anybody with a moment's reflection would know that the very economists who are actually involved in the Productivity Commission are the same economists who have set their face against subsidies. They do not like subsidies, so if you send a question of whether there should be subsidy to a body that does not like subsidies you're going to get a particular result. For the Leader of the Opposition to cooperate in that and, indeed, support that, is an extraordinary proposition—an extraordinary proposition.

Holden does need an answer now. The South Australian economy cannot afford further delay now. We cannot afford to stand still here in South Australia now waiting for some unelected body to get back to a government we know is deeply divided about its commitment to the future of

the car industry. But what we could at least get here in South Australia is the Leader of the Opposition standing up for South Australia—the Leader of the Opposition standing up for South Australia—the Leader of the Opposition standing with us; but instead the Leader of the Opposition stands for nothing. He does not stand up for South Australia, and that is what we need at this juncture.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier's time has expired.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Would you like a question?

Mr MARSHALL: Yes, please, sir.

The SPEAKER: Then it would be a good idea to stop interjecting so I can call you. The leader.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister confirm that up to five primary school students are currently being interviewed and counselled as alleged victims of the northern suburbs school out-of-school-hours care worker?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:33): This is a police investigation and I am not going into details around the police investigation.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

HEALTH AND HOSPITAL CARE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Can the minister please update the house on the state Labor government's transformation of health and hospital care in South Australia?

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) (14:34): The government has caring about health and hospital care for all South Australians at its core. The government has made health a priority from its first day in office and continues to make it a priority every day to better serve South Australia. We are modernising every metropolitan public hospital in Adelaide and we have rebuilt our major country hospitals. We are giving people better care—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We are giving people better care in modern facilities closer to where they live. Since 2002, we have committed to over \$3 billion in these improvements, in addition, of course, to \$2.1 billion for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. The government has put more nurses, more midwives, more doctors and more allied health professionals into our hospitals than ever before and we are investing in Australia's best ambulance service with the best qualified paramedics in the nation. That means more attention for our sick kids, more elective surgery performed, faster visits to our EDs and better response times in emergencies.

Since reliable data was available in 2004, we have improved ED waiting times by 41 per cent. We are very proud of those achievements, but we are not going to rest on those achievements. We do this because it is in our DNA, and we believe that South Australian families deserve the best hospitals in Australia, and that is what we are delivering. We are building Australia's best and most advanced public hospital—the new Royal Adelaide Hospital—and we are immensely proud of that investment.

Along with Australia's most advanced public hospital, the state will have the biggest health and biomedical research precinct in the Southern Hemisphere, and that is an investment that will

bring new jobs and industries and new cures for diseases right here in South Australia. What do those across the chamber think about better hospitals and better health care? They oppose it—every step of the way those across the chamber oppose providing better health care for South Australians.

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A point of order from the member for Heysen.

Mrs REDMOND: Surely the minister has now strayed into debate in discussing what 'those across the chamber' might think about any topic.

The SPEAKER: The minister is, of course, not responsible for the opposition's policy on health care, and within those constraints I invite the Minister for Health to continue.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Just the other week the Premier announced a bold plan to build a new world-class Women's and Children's Hospital co-located with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: This will bring better care for our mothers, children and babies. It will mean that no longer will a mum have to leave her baby to go to an adult hospital if complications arise. It will mean that they will have the best possible care right there on one site for generations to come. The AMA supports it, the nurses federation supports it, the ambos support it—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —and consumers and carers support it. Healthcare professionals have told us that this is the right thing to do and in the right time frame. We will involve them at every step of the way to make sure we get it right.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: And what do our opponents say? Well, they are not really sure. They will have a look at it sometime down the track—

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Yes, the Minister for Health is defying my ruling. I call him to order.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I make the point that it is a piece of information that the shadow minister for health—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I did not withdraw the minister's leave to answer. I asked him to obey my ruling and now I am sitting here waiting to see if he will, and we haven't found out yet. So the deputy leader's point of order is premature.

Ms Chapman: I haven't raised a point of order yet.

The SPEAKER: Then why are you rising in your place?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Of the Women's and Children's Hospital, the shadow minister for health said it 'should be a goal'. Well, this government has more than goals. In contrast, we have clear achievements and clear plans for health care for future generations of families. It is fortunate that we do because certain others have no plan other than to oppose. The shadow minister for health, in the other place, thinks he can coast along, tweeting late at night about budget figures and staffers' salaries and great big conspiracies—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir—

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —about what I or the Minister for Transport might be up to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley, a point of order.

Mr PISONI: The minister is straying into debate and—

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think he is, I think you're right, member for Unley, and we shall hear no more from the Minister for Health—at least for a while.

Dr McFETRIDGE: A supplementary question, sir.

The SPEAKER: A supplementary question, member for Morphett.

HEALTH AND HOSPITAL CARE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:39): Can the minister tell the house how many new beds will be provided in the new Women's and Children's Hospital and who provided the \$600 million costs for this hospital?

The SPEAKER: Well, this merely encourages him. Minister for Health.

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) (14:39): There is a significant increase: 800 beds for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. That is a significant—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Women's and Children's Hospital; at the moment we would expect the new Women's and Children's Hospital would have the same number of beds and the same scope of services as the existing Women's and Children's Hospital does.

The SPEAKER: The member for Goyder is a rabble-rouser today and I warn him for the first time. I also call the member for Kavel to order. The member for Morphett, a further supplementary.

HEALTH AND HOSPITAL CARE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:40): The second part of that supplementary was: who provided the \$600 million cost for the hospital?

The SPEAKER: It pains me to call him but, Minister for Health.

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) (14:40): The \$600 million is advice from my department. We've always said, from the very beginning, that that is an indicative figure. Of course, the project is 10 years out. There is a considerable amount of work that needs to be done, but we have been clear about that from the outset. I am happy for the opposition to question me all day long about the Women's and Children's Hospital. Let's make it quite clear: the opposition does not want a new Women's and Children's Hospital. The opposition does not care about rebuilding health in this state. Everything that this government does to rebuild health infrastructure—

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order from the member for Heysen.

Mrs REDMOND: Not only is the minister debating the issue, he is defying your previous rulings on this point.

The SPEAKER: Yes, and I call him to order, and I warn the Minister for Health for the first time. Member for Ramsay.

RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. What is the South Australian government policy on urban rail infrastructure and what external factors have impacted on its implementation?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order. Surely the Labor member of parliament knows their own policy. She is asking: what is the Labor policy? She is a member of caucus; surely that is known to the caucus.

The SPEAKER: No, it is not publicly available.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Surely it is known to the caucus.

The SPEAKER: No; the Minister for Transport is about to reveal the policy to us and, no doubt, pour oil on troubled waters. The 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) (14:42): Sir, I come in peace. Not only do these infrastructure projects create jobs, they also create faster and more efficient public transport. It is important to note that the opposition was deriding this question when I started. Our investment recognises, across the rail networks, an investment in the future.

We know rail investment is intrinsically linked to investments in our communities and is at the centre of our unprecedented infrastructure spend. We recognise that it is a key element in building a stronger South Australia. These investments and projects will ensure the state remains one of the best places in the world to live, work and do business. Whether it is electrifying or revitalising our urban rail network, or grade separations to improve efficiency in our freight lines, this government is directing money towards modernising our rail networks.

The newly elected federal government has made its position clear: it will not fund urban rail. This government, however, believes there is a crucial role for the commonwealth to play in supporting urban rail projects. This Labor government remains committed to investing in vital public infrastructure. However, there are some in our community who say that investing in infrastructure is a false economy. Under this government, our transport infrastructure is not an afterthought: it is a strategic platform, an economic driver; that is why we will not fade quietly into the night and let people like the commonwealth rip investments away from South Australia.

This government's position is clear: the cancelling of the Tonsley public transport project was wrong. We do not support the commonwealth ripping that money out. The Labor government's position is clear on the cancellation of electrification to Salisbury: we do not support it. We do not support it because it puts a handbrake on our economy. We do not support it because either tenderers had bids in, in good faith, or contractors had boots on the ground.

Ripping away this project not only sees hardworking South Australians sacked for no good reason, but also creates sovereign risk in our community. Our position is clear. The federal government's position is clear. There is only one position that is not clear, and that is that of the opposition. No-one knows if they support the cuts or not. Is it because, perhaps, the Leader of the Opposition just simply agrees with everything Tony Abbott does?

The SPEAKER: A point of order from the member for Heysen, who is not herself particularly orderly today.

Mrs REDMOND: No, sir, and you have already warned me about that, but this is a legitimate point of order because the minister is debating.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to what the minister has to say.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This government will stand up for South Australia. We don't lack the courage to tell Canberra when we think that they are wrong. We have a vision to build a stronger South Australia. During the last federal campaign, Senator Xenophon was fond of quoting New York City mayor Ed Koch. He said, 'If you agree with me on nine out of 12 issues, then vote for me; if you agree with me on 12 out of 12 issues, see a psychiatrist.' The Leader of the Opposition agrees with Tony Abbott all the time.

The SPEAKER: A supplementary.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): To the Minister for Transport, if I may, as a supplementary: has the estimated cost of the electrification of the Gawler line blown out since it was announced as Labor Party policy in the 2010 election?

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): Since 2010?

The SPEAKER: Yes; has it blown out since 2010? The Minister for Transport.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No. What has happened is that the commonwealth government had a policy at the last federal election. They detailed in their public statements on the Thursday before the campaign what projects they would cease funding. They mentioned Tonsley in their plans. They did not mention that they would be stopping the funding of the electrification of Gawler. Then, after the government released its ITLUS plan—its transport and land use plan—we announced electrifying to Salisbury. That money has been removed by the commonwealth. So, if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants to call her colleagues in Canberra and ask them to reinstate the funding, then we can deliver the project as planned.

The SPEAKER: A second supplementary, member for Bragg.

RAIL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Why then did the government cancel the Gawler electrification project last year, before the federal announcement this year?

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): At the last state budget, we announced that we would continue electrification to Dry Creek. When tenders—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the second and final time. The Minister for Transport.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We announced in the last state budget that we would electrify to Dry Creek. We put out tenders and market soundings. We received tenders back. Those bids came in exceptionally under our budget, and we were able to increase our destination to Salisbury. We were able to go further, make our dollar drive further. Unfortunately, the commonwealth government broke the hearts of everyone in the north by ripping out the money, and the only person who is silent on that is the Leader of the Opposition, because you support Tony Abbott all the time.

The SPEAKER: Leader, would you like a question?

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): Yes, thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Now that the alleged offender at the northern suburbs out-of-school-hours care program has been stood down, have other school sectors been advised of the nature of these allegations, as required by the government's MOU with all school sectors?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:48): My understanding is that that has occurred.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. When did the minister become aware of allegations that a northern suburbs out-of-school-hours care worker inappropriately touched students?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:48): I was in a discussion with the department about this issue briefly late last week. I am happy to go back and check the date of any files coming through to my office, but the best of my recollection was it was late last week.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): For clarification, are you indicating to the house that, despite this allegation being raised with your department in August, nobody sought to advise you until last week?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:49): Allegations were made, as I outlined earlier. The situation came to the attention of the principal. A critical incident report was lodged. A

CARL notification was lodged. Information escalated, and a police investigation ensued. To the best of my recollection, it was last week that I was briefed on this but, as I said, I am happy to check the files.

The SPEAKER: Does the leader have another question in this line?

Mr MARSHALL: No.

The SPEAKER: No, okay. Member for Ashford.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM AWARDS

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:50): My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister inform the house about the South Australian Tourism Awards on Friday night?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:50): It was a fantastic night on Friday night at the Convention Centre, where we had 670 people from the tourism industry around South Australia gather to honour the top people in the industry. We had 29 winners in the top level, across 29 categories. Jeff Ellison from SeaLink was given the award for the most outstanding performance by an individual in the tourism sector, a well-deserved honour. Jeff is a former member of the South Australian Tourism Commission board and he has done a lot with SeaLink over the years to build it from a company that was based here in South Australia to one that now operates in other states and territories of Australia and was recently floated as well on the stock exchange.

Four of the state's best tourism businesses were inducted into the Hall of Fame. The Hilton Hotel business section was in the Hall of Fame, and I pass on my congratulations to Peer Norsell and his team. Tour Barossa won the best tour and transport operator category. I know the member for Schubert is a big fan of the way they go about their business, taking people around the beautiful Barossa Valley. There was lots of talk on the night, too, about the wonderful Barossa Valley ad that of course was named the best ad in the world in Cannes recently. So, there is plenty happening in South Australian tourism.

Narnu Farm won the best standard accommodation. They were winners at the national level this year, down in Hobart in February, where South Australia for the first time picked up 10 gongs. Narnu Farm was elevated to the Hall of Fame, as were Emaroo Cottages at Port Hughes. They do a fantastic job there, and they are also building a new property just up at Paringa. They keep sending me fantastic SMS updates as the building is emerging. It is looking fantastic, with really good accommodation. Again, Emaroo Cottages at Port Hughes won a national gong this year.

Congratulations to all those winners at the South Australian awards. Tourism is a \$5 billion industry for South Australia. We want to grow that to \$8 billion, and we will do it by all working together, the government sector and the private sector. As I mentioned on the night, we now have 83 per cent more international airline seats coming into South Australia than we did just two years ago, when the member for Cheltenham became Premier. We just want to make sure that we fill those seats. We want to work with the hotel industry to make sure we fill the beds.

There was a great deal of optimism in the room on Friday night as the tourism industry came together to celebrate with each other and to applaud the outstanding performances of individuals and businesses in the industry. People are looking forward to a very bright future in tourism on the back of some investments made by the government and also some investments the private sector has made in the knowledge that there is confidence in the industry.

TOURISM CAMPAIGN

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): I have a supplementary question to the Minister for Tourism. Following the \$6 million Barossa tourism campaign to which he referred as being commended, will the minister confirm that the government is planning a similar campaign for Greater Adelaide, to be launched before the next election?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:53): Absolutely—and we are very proud of the work we have done on this. We have been out there doing the research interstate about what people think of Adelaide, in Brisbane, in Sydney and in Melbourne, to get their ideas of what image we should send into their states. On the back of the success of the \$6 million ad for Kangaroo Island, then the world-beating \$6 million ad for the Barossa, we are going to concentrate on Adelaide as a vibrant city, and we will be

spending around the \$6 million mark on that as well. It is very important that we tell the story of Adelaide. It is a much different place from when you guys were last in government, when it was considered a rust bucket state. We have turned—

The SPEAKER: The minister will not refer to Her Majesty's opposition as 'you guys'.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: My apologies, Mr Speaker. There are people who may not have been to Adelaide since we came into government, and we need to tell the story of South Australia and that Adelaide is a very different city from what it was back in 2001.

So, the ad that we are doing will be all about our vibrant laneways that the Deputy Premier has created; it will be about the Adelaide Oval, where the government has invested over half a billion dollars to bring people from around Australia here to watch AFL football. We already know—I have told the house before—that all 18 clubs are going to be bringing people here, and bringing millions of dollars into our state on the back of that investment.

We are going to capture all those images. It will not just be the CBD; it will be Greater Adelaide, so expect to see McLaren Vale in there; expect to see the Adelaide Hills in there. They are out at the moment, working on the concepts. The same people who were responsible for the Barossa ad and for the Kangaroo Island ad are preparing the Adelaide ad. I know there were some detractors when we came out with those ads; we will probably expect a little bit of negative feedback around the new Adelaide ad when we launch it around Tour Down Under time.

The Tour Down Under is a very important time for Adelaide. Adelaide and South Australia are on the Australian map: people are reading about it on the front page and back page of newspapers, and they are seeing it on their TV screens. So, to intersperse the coverage of this wonderful international cycling race with some fantastic imagery around Adelaide I think is a winner, and I think any person who knows their marketing would think it was great timing.

The SPEAKER: Further supplementary, member for Bragg.

TOURISM CAMPAIGN

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): I have a further supplementary, sir, to the Minister for Tourism: minister, what will be the cost of this campaign, and will you be bringing forward—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: No, he said 'similar'—and will you be bringing the money to pay for this campaign forward from the post-election budget next year to pay for it?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Manufacturing will not interject with the answer unless he is answering it himself, and accordingly is called to order. The Minister for Tourism.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:56): I did give the answer: it is \$6 million that we are spending on the ad, or thereabouts, but you allocate some money to actually make the ad and then more money to buy the slots. So, some of the money will be brought forward; some of the money will come from the existing budget, but what is important is that we have that ad going to air during the Tour Down Under, during WOMAD, during the Clipsal, during the Festival and during the Fringe. We could wait until July and August, but the time when most people around this country are concentrating on what is happening in Adelaide is actually January through to April, and that is the right time to actually have that ad out there.

TOURISM CAMPAIGN

The SPEAKER: A supplementary from the member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:57): Thank you, sir. Can I ask the minister, given his last two answers, can he assure the house that the money used to 'buy the slots', to use his description, will be spent interstate and won't be spent here in Adelaide trying to attract people who already live here to Adelaide?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:57): I think everyone who lives in South Australia would have seen the Kangaroo Island ad and the Barossa ad go to air.

Mrs Redmond: So that's a no.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: When you are doing a marketing campaign—and this is the marketing people that tell us this—

Mrs Redmond: So that's a no; this is marketing for the election!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —that you do a story—

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: When you run a marketing campaign, you do it interstate and you also do it locally, so you have the people of this state being aware of what is going to air interstate, but also the best sales people we have got are the people who live here in South Australia. When the Liberal Party was last in government, we had two premiers in a row who talked this state down—they were all about 'Kick a Vic', and they were all about 'They stole our Grand Prix'. We are about actually giving people confidence about our state to celebrate what we have here in our state, and we will be doing that through marketing. The timing of it—we would be doing it whether it was this year, last year, or the year before, because it is the right time to do the—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Why didn't you do it last year, or the year before, or the year before?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Because last year was Kangaroo Island, this year was the Barossa—

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport is called to order!

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

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

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The member for Davenport may not realise, but the Adelaide Oval will be open for the Ashes in a couple of weeks, and it will be finished in time for AFL football in March; why would we do it two years ago?

Ms CHAPMAN: My final supplementary, sir—

The SPEAKER: Well, that would be a fourth supplementary, and that would be stretching a friendship. The member for Little Para.

Ms Chapman: Are we no longer friends?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Little Para.

SUPER TYPHOON HAIYAN

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the house about South Australia's contribution to the National Medical Assistance Team deployed to the Philippines following Super Typhoon Haiyan?

The SPEAKER: I call the Minister for Health and warn him that he is on one warning.

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) (14:59): Thank you, sir, but I do rise on a very serious issue. On 8 November Typhoon Haiyan struck the Philippines causing significant numbers of casualties and widespread damage in parts of Leyte and Samar Island. We have been shocked and saddened by the loss of life and the scale of destruction caused by Typhoon Haiyan.

In response to the urgent need for medical support in the affected areas, SA Health is contributing four employees to join the Australian Medical Assistance Team. The deployment will be coordinated by the commonwealth-funded National Critical Care and Trauma Response Centre based in Darwin, and the team will take medical equipment and supplies with the capacity to treat up to 4,000 patients over a two-week period in a temporary 60-bed hospital.

At this stage the national team will have a primary focus on emergency and acute trauma surgical care. The four SA Health employees include two paramedics from the Ambulance Service, a general practitioner with extensive overseas experience and an emergency medicine consultant. The current deployment is expected to be for a 14-day period, but as the situation is unlikely to be resolved quickly, it can be anticipated that further deployments may follow.

SA Health has a database of trained and immunised volunteers ready to deploy at any time. SA Health had, in fact, conducted training in the week prior to this deployment as part of its usual preparedness response. South Australia has a strong history of deploying staff to major disasters in the Asia Pacific over the last 10 years. I commend the outstanding efforts of our volunteers and the extraordinary contribution they make to support people in our region in this terrible disaster. On behalf of the government and the house, I wish those volunteers a safe return and a good deployment.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. In February last year, why did the head of schools inform the student wrongly accused of accessing pornography that the teacher at the centre of that incident had been referred to the Teachers Registration Board when the minister's office told media last week that no such referral had been made?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:01): I have had a look at the email that was sent by the head of the office of education, and it does not say that at all—surprise, surprise. What I can tell the house is that things are referred to the Teachers Registration Board in certain circumstances. I think that is similar to the wording in the particular email that the member for Unley is referring to, and there are legislative constraints around what is referred and what is investigated by the Teachers Registration Board.

Mr PISONI: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:02): When did the minister become aware of correspondence between the head of schools and the wrongly accused student confirming that the teacher had been referred to the Teachers Registration Board?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:03): As I said, that is not what—

Mr Pisoni: Well, read it.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, you need to read it.

Mr PISONI: Read it. Read it into the *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: No. The minister will not conduct banter across the chamber, and I warn her for the first time.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Sir, is answering the question banter?

The SPEAKER: No, your answers are supposed to be through the Chair and you were referring to 'you', when clearly you did not mean me.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: In this particular instance, I restate that there was no criminal offending. I have read the email and it refers to certain circumstances in which matters are referred to the Teachers Registration Board. It did not say in this matter it was. Whether the wording of the email can be questioned or not, there are circumstances in which things are referred to the Teachers Registration Board. Generally that is around deregistering a teacher because of some sort of criminal act, and that was not the case in this circumstance.

The SPEAKER: A second supplementary.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:04): Thank you, sir. What confidence can parents have that their children are in the care of teachers who do not pose a risk if the department does not make the Teachers Registration Board aware of such matters?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:04): This was a disciplinary matter. This was about someone blaming someone else for accessing inappropriate material on a computer in a school. It was dealt with as part of a disciplinary process. It wasn't about dismissal.

MOUNT BARKER STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Can the minister inform the house about the new accommodation for the SES Mount Barker Unit that was officially opened on Saturday 10 November?

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): I thank the member for Mitchell for this question. As members of the house are probably aware, the population of Mount Gambier has increased by about 30 per cent over the past—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Sorry, Mount Barker. I am glad we got that one sorted out—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes, I could have got myself into trouble on that one. I notice that Don lifted his eyebrows. Mount Barker has become increasingly urbanised and additional growth is projected. The government recognises that services need to keep pace with population growth and that's especially the case with emergency services, when people's lives are potentially at stake. On Sunday, it was my pleasure to officially open the new accommodation for the local SES unit in Mount Barker, and I was joined by Mark Goldsworthy, the member for Kavel, Ann Ferguson—

The SPEAKER: Refer to the member for Kavel, not by his Christian and surname.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Sorry, the member for Kavel, Ann Ferguson, the Mayor of the District Council of Mount Barker, and Chris Beattie, Chief Officer of the SES. It is not surprising that the opening of the SES facility attracted the attendance of the local CFS and police. Across the state, the SES, CFS, police and the MFS work closely together to support the community, particularly during their hour of need. This is definitely the case in Mount Barker and the surrounding regions, and it was great to see them all together on Saturday afternoon.

The purchase of the site and subsequent refurbishment cost government approximately \$1 million and, after speaking with SES staff and volunteers and viewing the new facilities with the member for Kavel first hand, I could see that this was money well spent. I was particularly impressed to see the training space available to the unit which will allow them to practise and further develop their important skills and expertise, ready to respond when needed.

Once again, noting the growth in the region, the new facility provides a strong platform moving forward for the local SES to support the community. The major storms which make the news are only a fraction of the work the 1,700 SES volunteers across South Australia do from day to day. The Mount Barker unit is particularly active, with its 29 volunteers responding to over 250 calls for assistance last financial year.

I think that that is a significant commitment for 29 individuals to be making to their community, and I think we all have to be very much aware that this cuts into their personal time. It is a significant commitment that both they and their employers make to keeping the community safe.

Three weeks ago I travelled to the South-East to meet with emergency services personnel, including SES (that's why I referred to Mount Gambier) in Mount Gambier, Millicent and Kingston. The trip was a valuable chance to meet with volunteers and get a close look at the issues they face. The people I met were, without exception, dedicated and passionate. I know the SES volunteers in Mount Barker and across the state are exactly the same.

I would also like to congratulate the Tea Tree Gully SES unit, the reigning national champions, for finishing third in this year's National Disaster Rescue Competition which was recently held in Victoria. The winning team came from new South Wales. More than 100 volunteers representing seven teams across seven states and territories took part in the competition, and well done to the Tea Tree Gully SES unit. Finally, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. The member for Waite.

HONEYMOON MINE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Can he advise the house if the Honeymoon mine is to be mothballed?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:09): Yes, it is a sad day when any mine is put into care and maintenance. On 11 November, the government was formally notified that Honeymoon was being put into care and maintenance.

The reasons cited by the company include the current low global uranium spot prices, ongoing technical challenges impacting on the quality and quantities of uranium production, and the subsequent operating cost. It's fair to say that the global uranium market sees significant stresses on current operators. Spot uranium sank to \$US34.75 a pound recently—a long way from the record \$US136 a pound in 2007.

The government recognises the cyclical nature of the sector and continues to promote and foster investment across a range of commodities to ride the resources wave. I endorse the comments of the SACOME chief executive Mr Jason Kuchel, who says that this is what occurs in the industry. There is no reason to suggest that, if prices do improve, the mine will not be taken out of care and maintenance and operation put back into place. He also says, and I quote:

If the mine is put into care and maintenance it doesn't mean it is dead, never to be resurrected.

The resources remain in the ground to be developed as global markets shift. I'll also note that, recently, in terms of the state's performance, we were once again rated number one by the Minerals Council of Australia, in terms of their scorecard for mining and approvals processes, and that the Minerals Council's latest assessment retains—

The SPEAKER: Yes, that's very interesting, minister, and now can we move on to another question.

HONEYMOON MINE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:11): Supplementary, sir: given the minister's answer, what will be the impact in job losses and investment from the mothballing of the Honeymoon mine, and what are the key time lines?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:11): We are still awaiting information from the company. We have been in discussions with them. I am very keen to see the workforce maintained to a relatively high level while it's put on care and maintenance, but we will be in those discussions with the company, and when I have an answer I will report back to the house.

HONEYMOON MINE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:12): Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: A third supplementary.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Again, to the Minister for Energy, given his answers, will the Four Mile mine adjacent to Honeymoon be proceeding? Is the government aware of any other imminent mine closures?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:12): I wouldn't say it's adjacent. It's a fair distance but, I suppose, if it's in the same state, it could be adjacent. I have received no information from the company saying that they will not proceed. When Honeymoon's operators contacted us, they were talking about putting it into care and maintenance. I have not had that discussion with anyone from Four Mile.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: And in relation to—

The SPEAKER: Three supplementaries is, I think—

HONEYMOON MINE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:13): I did ask the minister whether he was aware of any other imminent mine closures and mothballings around the state.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:13): No, but I will check and make sure my advice is accurate.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE

The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister advise the house about the establishment of a bid fund for the Adelaide Convention Centre?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:13): I was delighted to join with the Premier today to announce a \$2 million bid fund for conventions to South Australia. We are spending as a government \$350 million doing up the Convention Centre next door. The western end of the Convention Centre is well underway and, when that's finished, we will be knocking down the very original part of the Convention Centre and replacing it with a room which, for plenary functions, can seat up to 3,500 people, so it is a very important piece of infrastructure for the South Australian tourism industry.

We already have \$160 million worth of forward bookings for the next three years, and that could well grow to \$200 million. We are just about to lock in about \$40 million worth of business, but I don't want to count the chickens until we've actually got them. The bid fund—with \$1 million next financial year and \$1 million the year after that—will help us be agile out there in the ever more competitive convention market. There are people right throughout the world who are all looking to host bid conventions.

Adelaide was the first capital city in Australia to have a convention centre, and we want to make sure that we maintain our spot as one of the leading convention cities in the world. We are facing increasing competition from other parts of Australia, and we need to be in the marketplace with the agility to be able to match and better offers that may be made by Sydney, Brisbane, Melbourne and other cities that are in that competition. This is something that we have worked very hard on with the private sector.

Just a few months ago, I sat down with all the leading major hotel owners and operators in Adelaide, along with AHA. We worked long and hard and in good faith to reach the decision today where we were able to announce this bid fund. I thank those hoteliers and the AHA for their kind words of support and congratulations to the government today on bringing this fund about. It is going to be a game changer; it is going to make sure that we get even more conventions here.

We want to thank the private sector for their ongoing investment in this state that follows on from the big capital spend we are doing as a government. The Premier and I made the announcement at the Ibis Hotel, which is rising out of Grenfell Street. They are putting on two new storeys every 18 days. We were up on level—

Ms Bedford: Will it eventually stop?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: They will eventually stop. We were on level 11 today. It was great to be on a construction site with 90 to 100 workers building South Australia. It will be a 17-storey building, and they expect it to be open in April or May next year. It is one of three new hotels—we have also got the Quest Apartments on King William Street and the Mayfair on King William Street—three brand-new hotels that will be opened between now and May next year that will deliver more than 600 rooms to South Australia. Again, it is great to see the confidence that the private sector has in South Australia, in our state, and in the future for the tourism sector. We want to grow it from a \$5 billion a year industry into a \$8 billion a year industry by 2020.

HOUSING INDEMNITY INSURANCE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Business Services and Consumers. As insurance companies won't issue housing indemnity insurance to subcontractors, what action is the government proposing to stop local councils approving building applications for owner-builders subject to the subcontractors providing housing indemnity insurance which they can't access?

Mr Marshall: 'I'll take that on notice.'

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:18): Yes, Mr Speaker, I am happy to take this on notice. The reason I was conversing with some of my colleagues is that there was an issue some six months ago, or thereabouts, where my ministerial colleague the Minister for Finance was involved in resolving an issue in this space around indemnity insurance. I was of the understanding that that had, for the time being, resolved the problem in the market. Now, if—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay, okay! If it is the case that there is some new and different issue in the market, then I would be very happy to receive any information about it from the member for Davenport. I am sure that between myself and the Minister for Finance we will be able to assist the honourable member with that problem.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:18): We seem to have a contest going on over here for who is either going to be the leader or the deputy leader of the Labor Party. We have the Three Stooges—Larry, Moe and Curly Joe, in the form of the current Deputy Premier, the member for West Torrens and the member for Playford—all trying to compete for either the spoils of victory or the spoils of defeat. We are not quite sure what it is going to be. I am not sure if it has been a terribly good week for the member for West Torrens. I am not sure how his cab is ranking up at the moment because there has been quite a bit of bad news in his portfolio areas and quite a few silly comments from him in his portfolio areas.

Sadly, Mr Speaker, we have the news today regarding Honeymoon. It is indicative of the problem facing the mining industry at the moment Honeymoon has closed; prior to that, the Angas zinc mine, near Strath, and Centrex Metals have taken a backward step with its WISCO fusion iron ore project. We had the scrapping of the \$1 billion Arafura rare earth processing plant, 61 jobs lost at OZ Minerals at Prominent Hill and of course Olympic Dam. That was at a time when the member for West Torrens—who is in this competition to see whether he can be the leader of the Labor Party or the deputy leader of the Labor Party, depending on how things pan out in March—made a very wise decision to get into the mining budget during the recent state budget.

He ripped \$6.9 million out of that mining budget, including very significant cuts to the PACE scheme, and we have seen quite a disinvestment from mining exploration as a consequence. Knotted with that is the government's grab for cash through royalties measures that were introduced into the parliament some time ago to strip well over \$30 million out of the industry at this very difficult time. So, I do not know if the member for West Torrens is really making the right calls here.

But it does not stop there for the member for West Torrens because he has made some real purlers in recent weeks. Apparently, he now wants to go out and renationalise ETSA and spend \$7 billion reacquiring the state's electricity assets. It is a really curious position for the member for West Torrens to take; I know he railed against privatisation right back in the 1990s, but I notice he has been strangely silent on the question of what he would do about it ever since. He now thinks that going out and spending \$7 billion renationalising ETSA is a really good thing to do. Somehow or other he is trying to twist the argument.

Because the opposition has said that we need to get about the business of reforming the regulatory regime, he is suddenly trying to twist that into some sort of a bizarre set of circumstances that only he understands. In fact, what he revealed in the *Sunday Mail* is that he does not understand the need for national regulatory reform. He does not understand that to get meaningful regulatory reform he will have to line up with former prime minister Kevin Rudd, former prime minister Julia Gillard, and the former Labor government's energy white paper, where the minister said that Queensland and New South Wales need to divest themselves of their government-owned assets.

Of course, the Productivity Commission and every other respected commentator in the country all argue that regulatory reform will not really be possible until Queensland and New South Wales divest themselves of their assets. The minister said to the house on 30 October that the Queensland cabinet has resisted regulatory reform, and he said, 'Why? They own their assets. Regulated decisions that increase their profitability hurt their treasury.' He has acknowledged himself that this is what is needed, but he has not taken the steps through SCER to make it a reality.

What the minister needs to do is more to help the mining industry. What the minister needs to do is to do more about regulatory reform to get our power prices down because they have gone up 133 per cent. Unless he can get some better results, I am afraid with the Three Stooges over here, Larry, Moe and Curly Joe—the member for Enfield, the member for West Torrens and the member for Playford—he will lose this contest about who is going to be either the leader or the

deputy leader of the Labor Party, whatever may come in March. He will really have to lift his game. Based on this report card, I think it will be a distant third.

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite will withdraw the unparliamentary imputation that any member of this chamber is a stooge, let alone three of them.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Sir, I could not possibly presume that there would be three stooges on the government's side of the house. If your view is that that is unparliamentary, I am happy to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: And is the third Curly or Shemp?

Ms Bedford: There were lots of thirds.

The SPEAKER: Were there?

Ms Bedford: Yes, more than one.

SEAVIEW HIGH SCHOOL

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:24): I rise today to speak about an event I was recently proud to attend as the member for Mitchell. Seaview High School's 2013 graduation and awards ceremony was a powerful reminder to me about the immense promise and potential of our young people. It was also a reminder that our young people show more than promise and potential: they are already making valuable contributions to our society across a range of areas, including volunteering and community service, sport and the arts.

The event, which was held at the Capri Cinema, was a wonderful opportunity to showcase the achievements of the graduates and included slide shows, music, dance, speeches and the presentation of subject prizes and special awards.

Graduating students Caitie Cain, Blake Derer and Dessy Georgescu hosted the evening, while old scholars Isabella and Phoebe Shaw were among the guest speakers. Student Samuel Jamieson delivered the valedictory speech, reflecting on his time at Seaview in a highly entertaining way. There were award winners in 22 subject categories: Chao-Wen Liu, Nikki Parker, Lincoln Brown, Oliver Godfeldt-Smith, Serena Condo, Kane Thompson, Patrick Buksinski, Tori Herbener-Bemold, Luke Schwarz, Tiah Underwood, Jamie Wickstein and Jack Storey each won an award for one subject, while Sonia Caruso, Suphaneela Sivakumaran and Dessy Georgescu each won awards for two subjects.

Saxon Nelson-Milton topped four award categories and, not surprisingly, won the special award for academic excellence. A special mention must also go to graduate Blake Derer, who won three of the six special awards presented at the graduation ceremony: the Long Tan, Caltex All-Rounder and student leadership awards. The other special award winners were Georgina Lanyon, who took out the sports category, and Saori Iizuka, who won the international student award.

However, the graduation ceremony was a celebration not just for the award winners or the graduates, but for the whole school. The success of Seaview High School highlights the importance of government providing quality public education for our children. Michele Spencer, the assistant director from the office of education, who attended the night, summed it up well when she said:

The graduation ceremony was a public demonstration of the quality programs, dedicated staff and leadership that go together to create a good school.

Indeed, I would like to congratulate principal Penny Tranter, now in her third year at Seaview High School, who has fostered a real sense of community at the school. Penny has been unafraid to set the standards bar high for her students and staff and has seen the whole school community benefit from the pride taken in its performance, whether it be in academics, sports, the arts, or just representing the school outside its Seacombe Road campus.

Seaview High School's motto is, 'Live to achieve', and this has clearly been taken seriously by many of the fine young people moving on from its ranks in 2013. For the 80 young people who graduate from Seaview High School and the thousands of youth who finish their time at other schools across South Australia this year this is such an exciting time, whether they go onto further education at university, TAFE, take a gap year or pursue employment opportunities.

Finishing secondary school is a huge milestone. It is one of the many great steps we take in our lifetimes. No matter where life takes us, we always remember our high school days,

admittedly some more fondly than others. But for all of us there were lessons learned, friendships made and experience gained, all important as we make our way in the wider world. As we do this, we would all do well to ponder the character traits listed on the Seaview High School website: empathy, respect, resilience and integrity. Good luck to all our high school graduates.

AGRICULTURE SECTOR

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (15:28): I would like to start with a quote from my maiden speech in this house, given on 8 August 1990:

My 20 year involvement with the Agricultural Bureau of South Australia has been of great value to me. I pay the highest tribute to the bureau, which has been Australia's most successful farmer education body. I also pay tribute to all those in the bureau and the Department of Agriculture whose input is appreciated by all in rural industry. I also offer my continued support to the United Farmers and Stockowners and offer my ear to South Terrace at any time.

There have been a lot of changes to farmer representation since I gave that speech almost 24 years ago. The Agricultural Bureau movement is still strong and I was honoured to be presented with my 50-year service badge last year. But I was absolutely disgusted that the Labor government withdrew the meagre funding to the Advisory Board of Agriculture, especially as the bureau celebrates 125 years this year—a fantastic record. I am very pleased that a Marshall Liberal government will reinstate \$100,000 per year to the ABA. I wish it well in the future, and my membership will be ongoing.

During my early days here I enjoyed great cooperation with the UF&S, which later became the South Australian Farmers Federation (SAFF). Mr Dean Bolto would regularly come into this place and discuss with me and other MPs—and some of them were members of SAFF—all issues and pending legislation, generally having good liaison.

Along came the issue of deregulation: abolition of the single desk and, in relation to the South Australian parliament, deregulation of the Barley Bill. What happened is quite regrettable and no-one won out of it. Yes, the final result may have been inevitable, but the way it was done caused maximum damage to farmer representation here in South Australia. More work should have been done on giving the farmers a direct say—take them with you on a big change like this.

I will not repeat what I have said before in this place, but we saw SAFF, which was a great organisation, very sadly disintegrate. Ten years ago it was functioning extremely well, fulfilling its role and the farmers were generally happy, and most were members. After the abolition of the single desk they resigned in droves and that was the end of SAFF.

We must move on and that is why, in one of my last speeches to this house, I want to finish on a positive note. We now have a new body with a totally new structure: Primary Producers South Australia, under former premier Rob Kerin, overseeing six commodity groups. One of those is Grain Producers SA, which represents grain growers. They now have one delegate who sits on the PPSA board, and it is off to a good start.

The problem is that we have several other groups—two national bodies seeking farmer involvement and membership—and many farmers are confused. We want one body, not a fragmented approach. Also, the subsequent sale of AusBulk to ABB Grain, then to Viterra and then again to Glencore has now put our almost monopoly business into the hands of a large multinational with control of our ports, which is a concern.

To make farmers even more edgy is the big issue of today: whether Australia's largest grain authority, Grain Corp, should be sold to a huge multinational, US grain giant Archer Daniels Midland. This is a real headache for the federal government and also for the farmers. Today or tomorrow we will see the tabling of the report of the Select Committee on Sustainable Farming Practices, and I commend it to you. Some of the evidence shows quite clearly that farmers want to have closer liaison with law makers, their MPs. Check the evidence of Brendan Smart on page 19, because he says it well.

We really do need to have an effective, all-encompassing agri-political farm body, and I believe that it has to be PPSA and its affiliated groups. In retirement, I will be doing all I can to help get farmers back into the fold, especially the younger ones who seem to not be out there getting involved, including my own son. They seem to be doing their own thing. Older, long-time farmer activists like me need to encourage them, and we need to move on or move over to give them a go.

At this time, the harvest is proceeding very well here in South Australia. We are faring better than most other states, particularly Queensland and northern New South Wales, which have had bad droughts. We have suffered storms, with wind damage, especially with our barley and our beans. We have no canola. It would be nice if we had some GM canola. To the Chairman of PPSA, Rob Kerin, and also the Grain Producers South Australia Chairman, Garry Hansen, and CEO, Darren Arney, my very best wishes. If ever we need to get it right, it is now.

ELECTRICITY ASSETS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:33): The Liberal Party has released its policy for empowering the consumer. On the weekend, the *Sunday Mail* ran an article where I comment on the dot point that the Leader of the Opposition put in his policy, which states, 'Changes to state regulatory arrangements and network business ownership.' That regulatory reform has come out of a policy from the Productivity Commission to encourage states that own their assets to break up their ownership. I see the Leader of the Opposition nodding, saying that he understands that.

South Australia has no power to compel New South Wales and Queensland to sell their assets. That Productivity Commission recommendation is speaking directly to those jurisdictions. The shadow energy minister just came into the parliament now and said that I wanted to nationalise ETSA. It is a bizarre, weird claim, based on absolutely no evidence or facts. I can only think that he is making a desperate attempt to undo this very large mistake indeed.

The idea is that this state government, or a future state government, would change state regulatory arrangements and network business ownership for assets that are already privatised. That means that a future Marshall government will use its regulatory powers to forcibly get privately owned institutions to have their ownership broken up. There are only two ways to do that; that is to compulsorily acquire those assets and then sell them, or to force them by legislation to be broken up. Either way, it would expose the state to massive risk.

I am not the one who has cut and pasted this from the Productivity Commission and made it my own; it is the opposition. You would expect this sort of mistake from a first-term rookie and people with only 3½ years' experience, but it would not be so funny if the Liberal Party of South Australia did not want to make him the next premier of South Australia. The reality is this: when you cut and paste Productivity Commission recommendations and put them in your policy documents as gospel, saying that you will change state regulatory arrangements and network business ownership, what you are saying to people who have invested money in this state is that their investment is not safe, that their investment will be broken up.

Quite frankly, if this was the type of mistake that I had made as a minister, I would be resigning today. This is not only plagiarism, it is plagiarism talking about the wrong state, which is even worse. Again, for whatever reasons, the opposition is maintaining this position. I think it is now incumbent upon the opposition to explain what changes to state regulatory arrangements and network business ownership mean, because the way the standing committee of the energy and resources minister works is that I cannot compel two sovereign states like Queensland and New South Wales to sell their assets. I cannot do that at all, and no state regulatory powers that I have here will facilitate that.

I am not sure what it is the member for Waite has done in his sloppy and lazy policy formulation, but it needs to be changed and changed quickly. I have to say that if you are going to just cut and paste policy Productivity Commission recommendations and put them into your policy and say that you have come up with them, you had better reference that and say they are from the Productivity Commission. If you are talking about a benefit for South Australian consumers by New South Wales and Queensland selling their assets, then say that.

It is not hard to say that a future Marshall government will encourage other states to privatise their assets or benefits for South Australian consumers if that is what they believe, but do not put in your policy that you will change state regulatory arrangements and network business ownership. I can tell you what this means for SA Power Networks and ElectraNet: it means it will force them to sell their assets. When the assets were privatised, the business was already broken up, and they are intending to do it again.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:38): On 1 November I was very pleased to be joined by nearly 250 people from the local community in Morialta, in particular, at a fundraising quiz night that I organised for the Eastern Adelaide Domestic Violence Service. I just want to speak briefly about the work that the service does and thank the groups and the businesses which assisted in making that event an outstanding success. For the record, the event raised about \$5,000 (I think just some \$20 or \$30 under \$5000), which will support the programs of the Eastern Adelaide Domestic Violence Service.

The wonderful staff there do a great job. They provide an accommodation service and run a number of tremendous programs, particularly for women and their families who have been betrayed—I think that is the best way to describe it—by the person who is supposed to love them the most in the home environment. Domestic violence is a very significant issue, as I think most members would be aware.

In 2010-11—and I am afraid I do not have more recent figures—1,754 people were arrested in South Australia for domestic violence-related assaults. This figure has historically been increasing. Fifty-eight per cent of sexual assaults, I am led to believe, are committed by someone known to the victim; of course, we would all be aware that most assaults against women where the victim knows the offender go unreported. This is a very significant problem, and we are lucky, I think, in the eastern suburbs to have a tremendous service that engages with the community and provides shelter and support for these families.

The service also does some terrific work in building resilience in the families, and in programs that give extra skills to these families to encourage them to have more robust mechanisms to support the work of the family going forward. It is important that, when we have a cycle of violence, we do everything we can to break it.

In increasing the awareness in our community, one of the things that this event did was to give an opportunity for local businesses and community groups to become more aware of the service, and also to offer their support. I have a local martial arts instructor who was aware that such a service existed but had not really engaged with it before, and who is now meeting with the service in my office in the next fortnight to talk about how they might be able to offer self-defence courses for the service using a program that he has run previously in a different state. That is something that I know the service is interested in pursuing.

Groups such as the Athelstone Kiwanis; the Teringie Residents Association; the Zonta Club of Adelaide; the Lions Club of Rostrevor; the Campbelltown Rotary Club; the Morialta Rotary Club; the Liberal Women's Council of South Australia; the Campbelltown Historical Society; the local Greens candidate for Morialta (Scott Andrews); the Liberal candidates for Torrens, Hartley and Cheltenham (Michael Manetta, Vincent Tarzia and Jack Batty); and a range of other people were very helpful in organising tables and encouraging people to come along.

The quizmaster was Georgina McGuinness, who did a tremendous job on the night, and I want to acknowledge the work done by Maria Hagias, who is Executive Director of the Central Domestic Violence Service, and Alison Meneaud and Kathy Lilis from the Eastern Adelaide Domestic Violence Service, in promoting it and helping it to be successful. I would also like to thank my staff, and in particular Scott Kennedy and the other people who helped in organising the night, including Priya Pavri, Helen Dwyer, Jenny Richardson, Raelene Zanetti and Samantha Mitchell. I will not list the local businesses; there were around 35 who made donations that made it work. I just want to record for the *Hansard* Maria Hagias's letter in relation to the people who put this together:

Dear John,

I just wanted to write to you and your staff to thank you for the efforts and commitment in organising such a successful fundraiser. The service was overwhelmed by the kindness, showed by you, your staff, all who donated their time and goods and the wonderful people that attended.

It is absolutely amazing to see what can happen when communities come together, we are very lucky to have local members who are so committed to the issues that affect our community.

The money will be used to run a number of group programs that will support women to rebuild their lives and fully participate in community as they deserve.

Your ongoing support is so valued and appreciated and we look forward to working with you to address violence against women.

Cheers and please pass on my many thanks to your wonderful staff as well...

In particular, on the issue of staff, I want to identify that my staff volunteered their time outside of work hours, as well as some time in work hours, for this community event, because it is an important cause, as demonstrated by the fact that nearly 250 people came along on the same night and at the same time as there were 10,000 people down the road celebrating the Moonlight Markets at Thorndon Park. I think that was a tremendous identification of the support for this service in our community.

Time expired.

ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER WAR MEMORIAL

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:43): On Sunday afternoon, I was very privileged to attend an important event, which was the dedication of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island War Memorial at Torrens Parade Ground. The time that is available does not allow me to in any way do justice to the significance of this occasion, but I want to digress to say that it reminded me very much of the first time that I attended an important event which was presided over by two women: the then governor Dame Roma Mitchell and the then chancellor of Flinders University Sister Deirdre Jordan. I was in my 40s and it was the first time I had had this experience.

It seemed to me that many Aboriginal people present on Sunday would have had a similar experience—that it was the first time so many Aboriginal people had been the leaders in a ceremony of such importance as to be presided over by her Excellency the Governor-General.

The MC was David Rathman AM. The Catafalque party consisted of Indigenous members of our armed services. The chaplain was Chaplain Grant, an Indigenous ex-serviceperson. The Chair of the committee that organised the war memorial was Marj Tripp. The Deputy Chair was Frank Lampard OAM and the ode was read by Frank Clarke—another Indigenous ex-servicemen. The best way to give some idea of the significance of this event is to read from the speech delivered by Frank Lampard on behalf of Marj Tripp who was the Chair of the War Memorial Committee:

Today is a special day for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community. Moreover it is a special day for all veterans, nay, for every Australian. Today we come together for the first time to remember in a significant and tangible way, the service rendered to our nation by all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men and women. This beautiful and culturally sensitive memorial that Her Excellency [dedicated] will stand for years to come as proof of the 'Love of Country' so readily demonstrated by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples of Australia. It has taken an awfully long time to get a memorial of our own.

I guess I could ask why. After all, 'remembrance', particularly of those who have served our nation in time of war, is in the DNA of most Australians. As Professor Ken Inglis says in his authoritative tome on War Memorials in Australia entitled *Sacred Places*, we are particularly good at remembering. He tells us that our memorials remember those who served in all sorts of categories—we have remembered 'employees of organisations, and worshippers in settings of work or leisure'.

I will skip now to his comment that:

...within the environs of this Parade Ground there are 39 memorials to all manner of men and women who served in peace and war. Indeed not far from here there is a memorial to 'war horses' and at Goolwa, only an hour or so drive away, a lovely memorial to 'war dogs'. Why then, as Inglis says, are '...Memorials to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander participation in Australia's wars few, modest and late'.

The answer to this query is not as divisive as it may first appear. It is due in part to the fact that at the commencement of World War I Aborigines and Torres Strait Islander were denied citizenship and unable to leave Australia without the government's approval. They rarely declared their racial identity when signing up. The Defence Act of 1909 prevented most of those who were not of 'substantially European descent' from even enlisting! But enlist they did, in every conflict in which Australia has fought.

They often took on another cultural identity to hide their Aboriginality just so they could serve. We know now that from the Boer War to Afghanistan, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men and women have served with distinction. They have been decorated for gallantry, taken Prisoners of War, and been wounded or killed in action. Some lie forever in foreign lands far from their 'country'.

With no record kept of Aboriginal soldiers it was hard for even the most compassionate nation to track down their service. Eventually the link became too remote and I quote here from the National Commission on the Commemoration of the ANZAC Centenary which says that the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community had come to view ANZAC as 'a party which they had not been invited to!'

That lack of recognition ended on Sunday.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION (NOTIFICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:49): It is good to be able to resume, as I left off my contribution on this matter just before the lunch break. From recollection, I believe I was just explaining the outline of what the bill does.

The advice provided by Justice Debelle in his report was, of course, in relation to the Child Abuse Report Line—that where the person who is mandatory reporter becomes aware of the circumstances that would require them to mandatorily report as a result of being notified by someone who was also a mandatory reporter or who has already made a report, or by a police officer, then it is in fact an unnecessary burden on the system and an unnecessary requirement of that person, that mandatory reporter, to make the report.

This is an important reform not just because of the situation identified in the Debelle report, that a similar situation would relieve the requirement of the principal, as it was in that case, to make a report, but because the Child Abuse Report Line is significantly burdened by an extraordinary number of calls. This is having an effect, in my view—from the discussions I have had with people who are mandatory reporters, and I think it is in the Debelle report as well—on the way in which people are making reports.

When there is at peak times a 45-minute wait to get through to make the report, that is a significant burden on somebody in their day when they have limited time for recess or lunch—if they cannot get through, they have to make the call again after school—and those peak times, significantly, have created a problem in this area. However, while school is on, I heard suggestions in estimates that the waiting time can be very short. The overall picture, though, is that over the last five years the waiting times, and the average waiting times and the average peak waiting times, have extended and extended.

In other speeches in this house, I have spoken about the evidence provided by the government that points to that extension. One would hope that if four or five mandatory reporters become aware of the same incident that needs to be reported, this legislation will mean that they do not all have to make the report, and that, in addition to the other measures the government is undertaking, should hopefully assist in making the Child Abuse Report Line more functional.

I hope that the minister will take the opportunity in her second reading response to perhaps update the house on how those other measures are going because improvements to the CARL mean that people can leave a message and then be called back automatically at a time when the line is free. With the eCARL system (the electronic CARL), we are told that thousands of regular mandatory regular reporters will be trained in the system so that they can make an electronic internet notification, rather than have to call the report line. In estimates this year, the minister provided advice that that would all be in place by the end of this year.

I have not checked with the shadow minister recently as to whether he has received any advice on how this improvement is going, but I can tell the house that the advice the minister gave me this year was almost exactly the same word for word as the advice the previous minister gave in estimates last year—and last year it was due by the end of last year. This year, we were advised that these improvements were due by the end of this year, so I hope that the minister will take that opportunity to advise us on that eCARL improvement.

Reports of child abuse are a very serious matter, and it is important that the systems in place are able to adequately consider the matter being reported and then deal with it appropriately. When so many reports are coming in, it sometimes seems as though there is a triage taking place, where some of the reports do not get the attention that they potentially deserve, and then there are awful unintended consequences of that work that can take place.

We wholeheartedly support this legislation, and I think it will make a contribution. It came out of the Debelle report and, of course, the circumstances around that have been gone over at some length, and we are still trying to get to the bottom of some of the matters in relation to that. However, on the matter of the legislation at hand, I am pleased to be supporting this bill.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:54): I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. As my colleague the member for Morialta has already indicated, we are supporting the bill but take note, of course, that it is the lowest hanging fruit available to the minister when it comes to parliamentary or legislative reform of the 43 recommendations Mr Debelle put forward in chapter 16 of his report on his royal commission into just what happened at that western suburbs

school, starting from December 2010 through to when parents were eventually told because a brave mother came forward and told her story and enabled the opposition to ask questions in the parliament.

Of course, we recall that at that time the then education minister (the member for Hartley) was adamant that police had told the department that parents were not told because it would frustrate the police investigation. That, of course, has been proven wrong in Mr DeBelle's inquiry, yet I have not seen the minister come in to correct the record since the findings of the DeBelle inquiry were tabled in the parliament.

I will take this opportunity to recognise the work that SAASSO (South Australian Association of State School Organisations) has done. SAASSO is an organisation we supported last time we were in office because we have a strong belief that parents play an important role in their children's education. SAASSO is a parent body that represents those very governing councils that sit in all our schools here in South Australia. The role, of course, of those governing councils is to assist in the governance of the school, and they work very closely with school principals.

I have to congratulate them on a couple of the articles they wrote for their monthly magazine, the *School Post*. I refer to the article written by Danyse Soester in the term 2, 2013 edition, where she was able to put a time line together as to what had actually happened. For those who have not been involved in this sorry saga at the intimate level at which members of parliament have been involved and the department has been involved, it does simplify the case. I will read it into *Hansard* for others, who may not have access to the magazine, to be able to refer to. It has an introduction, which says:

In October 2012 the media carried a story that parents of a western suburbs school had reported that a paedophile had been running their school's OSHC [that is, out of school hours care] and had raped a young girl in 2010 and that it had been kept secret from the school parent community.

In the weeks and months that followed, SAASSO witnessed an outpouring of anger from parents, unprecedented in the last decade.

In response to all those questions and how, when and why, here is the timeline, so far.

It starts on 30 October:

...Minister Grace Portolesi confirms the crime and tells parliament it was kept from parents on advice from police.

SAPOL denies Portolesi's claim. Police say they told the school's principal to consult with the education department to decide how to advise the school community.

On 31 October:

Ms. Portolesi denies misleading parliament. Portolesi states she had no knowledge of any other cases where parents weren't told. Also states that department policy does not require parents be told.

Ms. Portolesi admits that she knew of rape in March 2012.

It's revealed that following parent complaints, the State Ombudsman is investigating the case.

Premier Weatherill says parents should be told of any allegations.

Then it refers to 1 November 2012:

Parents reveal they were told the OSHC Director had 'quit because of ill-health'.

Professor Freda Briggs reveals the school's Governing Council had approached her a year earlier because they were unhappy parents hadn't been told. 'They claimed that an administrator from the department had banned them from telling other parents....'

Ms. Portolesi says she doesn't know if the department pressured the school to keep the abuse secret.

I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

(Continued from 31 October 2013.)

The CHAIR: We have the Minister for Transport Services, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts. If I could remind members, when they ask their questions, to refer to the page number in the Auditor-General's Report. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Ms CHAPMAN: I refer to the Report of the Auditor-General for the year ending 30 June 2013, Part B, Agency Audit Reports, Volume 4, and I start at pages 1150 to 1152. The subject matter, for the benefit of the minister in the planning, transport and infrastructure portfolio, is bus contract payments. Minister, in April this year you announced that some routes would be transferred from Transfield to Torrens Transit. At the time, minister, you stated that changes would cost approximately \$2 million per year through increased payments to Torrens Transit. When the state budget was published in June the cost per year of the changes had increased to \$8 million. At budget estimates later that month I asked you some questions and you said:

The cost is—as I said at the time—\$2 million and it remains \$2 million at this time for those particular eight routes. As I understand it, the rest of the moneys to which you are referring are not actually moneys that have been spent. These are contingency moneys that are there. You seem to be implying that somehow I said we were going to spend X amount and in fact we are going to spend Y amount. That is just not the case.

Well, minister, you have had an opportunity to read now what the Auditor-General has said, and clearly there have been changes that were implemented prior to answering that question. My question to you, minister, is: at the time that you as minister claimed that the rest of the \$8 million was a contingency had those changes already been agreed that would result in the expenditure beyond \$2 million?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Thank you, member for Bragg. The contract variations that specifically related to the transfer of routes as approved by cabinet have not been exceeded. The contract variations provided for in the May 2013 service changes included the increased cost of moving routes from Light-City buses to Torrens Transit, as approved by cabinet on 22 April 2013, as well as the cost for regular service alterations that had previously been funded within the PTSD budget. As a consequence, there is no requirement to provide further advice to cabinet.

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, that might be the case, minister, but my question was about this. As is clearly now identified, the contractor performance standards for those new routes had changed, effective from 9 May 2013 as you point out, and had been signed two months later under the contracts to do it, but at the time of estimates you knew what they were. It is confirmed now by the time line that there were other routes that had been identified for the purposes of that extra expenditure, which was later then disclosed as \$8 million. There was no such thing as a contingency.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: The funding that we have released specifically related to the routes that transferred from Transfield to Torrens Transit on 12 May. The net costs of those transfers was approximately \$2 million, as advised at the time. I reiterate that the contract variations provided for in the May 2013 service changes included the increased cost of moving routes from Light-City Buses to Torrens Transit as approved by cabinet on 22 April 2013, as well as the cost for regular service alterations that had previously been funded for in the PTSD budget.

Ms CHAPMAN: Has all of the \$8 million been spent?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: No.

Ms CHAPMAN: How much is left?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: The answer there is approximately \$6 million, but I can get a more specific answer back to you.

Ms CHAPMAN: The author goes on to say at page 1151 that 'the total value of the contract variations...with the bus contractors was significantly higher' than the budget that was advised. You have referred to that in your earlier prepared statement. My question is: who approved the total increased payments to the contractors?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: The changes were approved by cabinet.

Ms CHAPMAN: Why was cabinet then not advised of the correct increased cost?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: I do apologise. Could you reiterate that question? I think I may have misunderstood you.

Ms CHAPMAN: The Auditor-General tells us that the value of the contract variations with the bus contractors was significantly higher than cabinet was advised—you have referred to that—and my question is: why was cabinet not advised of the correct increased cost in the first place?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Cabinet was advised, as I said previously, of the anticipated cost of \$2 million. However, negotiations are still ongoing to ensure that the services provided for the north-south corridor meet our community's expectations and, indeed, those of the department.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, the Auditor-General is wrong, is that right, in his statement in his report that cabinet was not advised of the accuracy of the increase of the expenditure, that the bus contractors were significantly higher than what cabinet was advised?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: I think this goes back to the first answer that I gave you, which was that the contract variations that specifically related to the routes as approved by cabinet were not exceeded, and that is my and the department's response to that point that was made by the Auditor-General.

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, if that was, at the time, the information you had and you conveyed that to them and that was all that you had. Now that, in fact, it has been disclosed, the total increased cost of the changes and what they are, have you advised the cabinet of what that is and what is the total increased cost?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: At this point we have negotiated \$2 million, as I initially stated. There has been no exceeding of those particular moneys, as I stated before, and the negotiations are ongoing, as I stated before. I am not quite sure what you are implying there, but that is the case and I have actually said that once or twice already.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, we have a situation, minister, where you say \$2 million is the total amount, that there has not been any exceeding of that, you still have \$6 million in the bank, therefore there is nothing else to tell the cabinet. That is your position, and anything in the Auditor-General's Report does not undermine that. So, my next question then is: did the changes (this is the changes to the routes) result in an increased payment to Transfield for the routes which they continue to operate?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Sorry; could you ask the question again?

Ms CHAPMAN: Did the changes that you made under the new contracts result in increased payments to Transfield for the routes which they continue to operate? I will make it simple: when you changed the routes you gave some of the routes to a different operator and you let Transfield keep some of the ones that they had. My question is: are you paying any more to Transfield to do those routes that they are continuing to do?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: As I said previously, we are still in negotiations and that answer does not change.

Ms CHAPMAN: You may be in negotiations—I am not quite sure what for—but the routes have changed. You have told us the routes have changed. There are some routes that are continuing to operate with Transfield, and that has been going on now since May 2013. I assume they are being paid.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: For the routes that they are continuing to operate, are they being paid more and, if so, how much?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: I am advised that some additional payments have been made of approximately \$236,000 per month. That is inclusive of all of those routes. That is not per route. That is an interim payment, which is subject to those particular routes meeting their benchmarks.

Ms CHAPMAN: To conclude on that matter then, minister, what is being continued to be negotiated?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: I am advised that what is under negotiation includes timetabling, the repositioning and layover time for the buses that service the remaining routes.

Ms CHAPMAN: The Auditor-General confirms on page 1151 that cabinet had approved the contract variation. We understand that that has now happened and, as you have explained, that is operating under the new regime. However, regarding this approval by cabinet, he specifically states:

...however the total value of the variations agreed and executed with the contractors was significantly higher than the value approved by Cabinet.

Can you explain to the committee why that is the case when you keep telling us, as you have before now, that there appears to be no substance in that? The Auditor-General is very specific in saying that cabinet had not been told the whole truth. I would like some assurance, and I am sure other members of the committee would, that cabinet now knows all of it, knows the full extent, given that even if there was no change in the monetary amount later, they had granted approval on information that was inaccurate.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: So what is your actual question?

Ms CHAPMAN: My question is, I think that some assurance has to be given to the committee—and I ask you to do this—that this accurate information, on which the cabinet had relied to make its earlier decision, has been remedied, that is that real information, that is the significantly higher than the value approved by cabinet, has been disclosed to cabinet and that they are now fully aware of what the full amount is.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: As I advised previously, the contract variations that specifically related to the transfer of routes as approved by cabinet have not been exceeded, and the cabinet was advised of the correct sum of money. I see that you have asked this question a number of times now and I do not think I can make the answer any clearer for you.

Ms CHAPMAN: Can you explain to the committee what you think the Auditor-General then means by saying—he is reporting to us as a parliament and this committee in particular—that that information was not accurate in what was given to the cabinet? If that is not the case, then I would ask you to confirm that the Auditor-General has got it completely wrong. You could say, 'No, that is not right; in fact the position was absolute that the total value of the variations that was agreed and executed was exactly as I gave to cabinet.' If that is the case, then let us hear it. If it is not, then I would just like to know when you told cabinet or when you ensured that the department provide that information to cabinet.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: I think you have suddenly included another question into your initial question related to the responsibility of the Auditor-General's comments. I am not responsible for the Auditor-General's comments. I am advised by the department that we did not exceed that particular sum. I am responsible for what I say and for what the department says, but I am not responsible for what the Auditor-General says.

Ms CHAPMAN: So let us go back to page 1150, which shows that the contract variations were not signed at the time that the routes were transferred between the contractors. In fact, there is a two-month delay. Obviously, the Auditor-General was sufficiently concerned about that to note it. Indeed, you might remember that when you took over the responsibility as Minister for Transport Services contracts had been signed several months before you took over, and under your watch contracts were initiated and started without even the KPIs being in place. This is not something new. I would like you to explain to the committee how it is that in these multi-million dollar contracts you can start operating, changing the rules and operating under the new rules without even having the contract signed?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: First of all, I would like to correct you on one particular matter. The contracts were initiated and started some two or three weeks before I was made the Minister for Transport Services. I am just correcting you on that particular timetable.

Ms CHAPMAN: Did Patrick Conlon sign them?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: I am not Patrick Conlon.

Ms CHAPMAN: No, exactly. That is why I let you off the hook on signing it.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Where possible, the Public Transport Services Division endeavours to ensure that any scheduled contract variations are executed prior to a service change taking effect. In this instance, the required variation to kilometres and hours had been verified by PTSD and accepted in principle by the contractor to enable service changes to commence as scheduled. Formal acceptance was not provided by the contractor responsible for delivery until such time as they were able to confirm through actual operation.

Ms CHAPMAN: That all sounds beautiful, minister. In an ideal world, we would all like to make sure that things are done, that every effort is made, and that contracts are signed, and so on, but that did not happen. You can espouse to the committee what you think is the ideal world, and I would agree with you, but in this instance it did not happen that way.

Two months—two months! What explanation can you give to the committee to explain why it took two months to sign this contract after the negotiations, after the in-principle agreement—two months after they had even started operating under the new regime—before you even signed the contract to undertake the new terms?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Member for Bragg, can I just confirm whether you are talking about the service changes in May 2012 or the introduction of the initial contracts in October 2011?

Ms CHAPMAN: I am talking about the changes this year.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Are you talking about 2013?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, 2013. At the bottom of page 1150, you will see there that the Auditor-General obviously makes comment about this.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Yes, absolutely.

Ms CHAPMAN: Two months after.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Thank you, member for Bragg, and thank you for that clarification. We were ready to sign on that particular occasion. The contractors wanted to run the service to actually see what was going to happen, which I think was quite reasonable, given the state that they had taken over those timetables, those contracts, in. They wanted to actually know what the reality would be in their running of those services.

Ms CHAPMAN: We have a situation, minister—

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Sorry, may I just say that previously you referred to that all being in a perfect world. These are not 'perfect world' determinations; this is actually what occurred.

Ms CHAPMAN: I know it is not perfect, that is for sure. What has happened is that you have changed the routes, for reasons which are now well known. You have allowed Transfield to continue some routes; you have transferred some of those that Transfield had across to Torrens. You have them all running around under the new routes. You are paying Transfield more money (in fact, \$236,000 a month, I think you told us) for their existing routes—more than what you were paying them before—and yet no-one had even signed up.

Minister, as a committee, we receive this information from the Auditor-General on the basis that there are multimillions of dollars spent by governments every year. You are responsible for multimillion-dollar contracts, and we have buses running around by providers which you have determined should not be able to continue even some of the routes they had under a contract; you are paying them more, and you do not even have them signed up.

So, can you explain to the committee why it took another two months even to sign up, apart from checking that they could actually drive their bus from one section to another, which you say was necessary to do to show that they could do it, or some such other KPI?

The Hon. C.C. FOX: There are a number of points made in there that are just not questions, so I am not going to comment on your, I guess, debate. One thing I would point out is this: the choices of routes that were taken away initially from Transfield were taken away on the basis of their running of that particular route. That did not mean that the other ones they were running were running unsuccessfully. In fact, in their north-east routes, they had had significant improvements, but there were some routes on the north-south corridor that were not running well.

It was not an overall decision. It was not saying, 'This company lock, stock and barrel is no good.' It was a decision that said, 'You have consistently, over 18 months, not managed well on certain routes.' However, on the north-east routes, they had actually been improving quite significantly, so I would like to make that clear. In relation to your other points, is there one specific question that you are asking?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes; I am happy to make it clear. Now that you have excluded that there is any contingency requirement to test them—because you have already acknowledged that, in your assessment, they were doing the other routes quite okay, so you are able to continue to contract them to continue do that at an increased price—why was it necessary to delay even a day after they had commenced the routes? You had already made this assessment. They were doing a good job on those. You had agreed in principle. Why wouldn't you sign up the documents and not leave the exposure and criticism ultimately by the Auditor-General, let alone the exposure of the taxpayer, in these circumstances?

The CHAIR: You can answer this; this is the last question.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIR: Your time is up.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: But I can answer this question?

The CHAIR: You can answer this question.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Thank you. The routes that you are discussing were transferred from Transfield to Torrens; that is correct, isn't it? You are talking about the routes that were transferred from Transfield to Torrens?

Ms Chapman: No—the others.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: As I just said, member for Bragg, the routes in question were transferred from Transfield to Torrens. Torrens were not prepared to sign up to those contracts until they had actually had an opportunity to run the conditions and to see how it would run for them. It is probably worth making the point that they have since signed those contracts.

The CHAIR: That concludes the time for the Minister for Transport Services and Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts. I thank the minister, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the committee. We now go to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers. I remind members to reference the Auditor-General's Report when they ask their questions.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, Part B, Volume 1, page 260. Can the minister tell the house what performance management principles have been undertaken to ensure that NGO performance management is consistent across the department? On page 260 it says final reporting and formal approval of the risk-based approach to performance management is not finalised yet and the project is expected to be completed and reported to management for approval in December this year.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I thank the member for his question. I can advise, as the member said, that the Auditor-General has previously reported that the extent and evidence of non-government organisation performance management has varied across the department and that we have been required to look at performance management principles. I can advise the committee that progress has been made in the design and implementation of a risk-based approach to performance management. For example, the Homelessness Strategy Unit piloted the use of this approach and supporting tools during 2012-13. That trial is continuing and will progress in 2013-14.

The first phase of that project was completed in January 2013. The department's risk management and internal audit branches have been involved in the development of the project to ensure that it is aligned with the department's risk management policy. Importantly, this project is now part of the department's regional service integration program as part of the funding of sector engagement projects. The findings of the current trial will be consolidated into a report which will go to my executive team later this year. I will be happy to provide further information when it becomes available.

Dr McFETRIDGE: So, that is on target for approval in December?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: As far as I am advised.

Dr McFETRIDGE: In the same reference, Auditor-General's Report, Part B, Volume 1, page 260, what work has currently been planned by the department in relation to individualised funding for Disability Care Australia? In the third dot point on page 260, it says:

the Department has considered the impacts individualised funding and Disability Care Australia will have and further work...

Can the minister tell us what the impacts are and how he is going to mitigate those impacts?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The answer to that question is that it is in relation to costing factors. We are in a competitive market so we will have to compete with all the other providers of disability services in the market with individualised funding. The department relies on a range of indicators, communications and workflows to ensure that the agreed services are provided to clients. We need a better system to ensure that we are able to cost the services that we provide more accurately, because that is what we will be seeking in reimbursement from the commonwealth through that program.

During this period we have had discussions with our clients to work out the best way to assess the service that they have been receiving because, as you can imagine, previously it has been block grant funding and, therefore, they have not paid much attention to what they are getting, and how many hours, etc., and we now have to do that. Because of the number of transactions involved, we have provided a sample test which was introduced in the previous financial year, and this involves obtaining time summaries from service providers and ensuring they agree with the charged hours and the provider invoice or activity statement.

Sampling is based on a random selection and weighted towards those providers holding a large proportion of the overall contract base. I can further advise that the sampling has been successful in terms of reinforcing with providers that these independent checks do take place and that all the evidence provided by suppliers has reinforced the department's view that the providers are properly organising their workers to attend and deliver the actual services.

Based on the findings for 2012-13, the department will consider other methods of sampling, including clients with high cost volume contracts. Individual contracts with families and carers provide opportunities to help target where the sampling of payments may take place. I can also advise that the continuing implementation of the department's request contract reconciliation system provides great opportunities to flag possible concerns that staff may have about service delivery, including client complaints.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I assume from that answer, minister, that you are continuing down the path of Disability SA being a service provider, unlike New South Wales.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That is correct, and that is the same answer I gave to you during estimates. We are a firm believer in that, and there are a number of reasons why we do that. As long as our costing is fair, it should not be a problem, but there are a number of cases where, if we were not there in the marketplace, there would be clients who would actually receive no services.

One reason is the lack of any other provider in the area and, secondly, we actually provide some competition, so our service maintains the standards of the other people we compete with as well. So, there are very good reasons why we are in the marketplace, and we will continue to do so under this government.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Can the minister tell the committee in what areas not provided by NGOs will Disability SA have to provide the services?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I will not provide an explicit example but, in a general sense, there are some regional areas that are not serviced by a number of providers, just because of a lack of staff and an ability to actually attract people to those areas. So, regional areas will probably be the worst hit, but also, for those types of services that require a high level of care, the actual cost involved is quite high and the service providers cannot provide them at those costs. The reality is, by having a supplier like Disability SA across the sector, we can do some cross-subsidies, and those services will be provided.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you. We will go to page 261. Why did the Auditor-General require another review and specific costing models for grants, subsidies and client payment issues raised with the department? I think, in those dot points at the top of page 261, he is talking about the following matters needing improved controls.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: If I am reading your question correctly, member for Morphett, my understanding is that it deals with the issue of making sure that our provider panel is actually reviewed on a regular basis and making sure that they meet the criteria to be an approved disability service provider. As you are aware, we actually provide services from the list of pre-accredited—for want of a better word—provider panels. My understanding is that the concerns he has raised are to make sure that the service providers on that panel are reviewed regularly to make sure they meet the standards and the criteria required to be on the panel.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you, minister. On that same page:

Audit recommended that the Department continue to improve procedures to ensure a consistent structured approach to recording, analysing and communicating client feedback.

I think you have just said something about that, but can you just give the committee details of what the department is considering when they say that:

- the Department will consider methods of sampling transactions including clients with high cost/volume contracts for further testing.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: There are two aspects to that. As you can imagine, in the audit process, you do not actually check every transaction. The idea is you make a risk assessment. As I mentioned, the department will consider other methods to ensure that we look at those clients with high cost/volume contracts, because there is a high risk involved there and, secondly, we are going to increase the amount of feedback we get directly from the clients as well—they are the two things we are doing.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On that same reference, minister, the department states at dot point 3:

...the Department will investigate opportunities to enhance recording capabilities to help capture events or communications that increase the risk that services were not provided.

What is the incidence of services not being provided and have clients paid for services?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am advised that that may be the case in some situations, because we do rely on advice and information given by the clients. There may be situations where the client is not clear on exactly what service they are receiving or how it should be received. As I said, we are going to improve that area of client feedback, particularly in the area of non-generic service delivery, so that they have an appreciation of what they should be receiving and that they receive it.

Dr McFETRIDGE: So there is no real method? Perhaps you could tell the committee if there is a method in place where service providers are being audited and crosschecked—it may not be by intent, but it may have been overlooked, but some services may not be delivered that were supposed to be delivered—so that we are getting value for money and clients are getting the services they need.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: All I can add is that we are going to increase the level of sampling obviously to reduce the risk of that not occurring. Secondly, we going to improve the quality of the feedback we get from clients. There is not much more that I can add to that because of the tens of thousands, literally, of transactions. All you can do to ensure that people get what we are paying for on their behalf is sampling. Sampling is important because if a service provider knows there is a high chance they are going to be audited or checked there will be less likelihood that the service will not be provided; but on the point you have made, it may not be deliberate but purely inadvertent. A reasonable sample will also pick that up.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you, minister. I would be very surprised if any of the providers that we have met in our time would be doing anything deliberately mischievous. I think they are the highest quality in South Australia; we are very lucky. I refer to page 263 in the same volume—Part B, Volume 1—concessions of CASIS. 'It is a matter of concern that the system is not yet operational', the Auditor-General states on page 263. Actual expenditure to 30 June 2013 was \$3.71 million, and I think the initial cost was something like \$600,000, and there is a further \$780,000 required. Can you tell the committee where we are at, where we are going, how much more it is going to cost, and why it has cost so much?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Thank you for the question. Like yourself, it is one of those projects I have been keeping my eye on to make sure that it does deliver. I am confident that, once completed, the system will provide value for money for taxpayers; but not only that, it will also provide value for money for the people who receive concessions. You have to remember that we provide about 200,000 concessions a year, and one of our aims is to make sure that those people who are eligible receive the concession and those who are not do not.

I am advised that the figure you have stipulated is correct, and we anticipate that will be the last payment for this project. To the other part of the question, we have probably now reached at least 95 per cent of reconciliation of matching the data. We are confident that some of the figures being bandied around in a certain publication about the overpayments is incorrect, based on figures we have actually matched and those which are not matched.

The only unmatched ones, I am advised, are the ones that deal with energy retailers, and that is a bit complicated. We have a number of situations where people have been granted concession prior to getting approval from us. We are going through that process to match that data at the moment. In fact, the letters have recently gone out and we anticipate that that should be finalised as previously indicated to the house.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Are you trying to claw back any overpayments and would you like to put on the record how much has been overpaid?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: As previously advised to your colleague in this place on a number of occasions, no, I cannot give an exact figure. But given that we have matched the data for 95 per cent of our client base, even if the 5 per cent is completely wrong it is nowhere near that figure which has been bandied around. Rather than mislead you, once I get that figure and once we have finished that 5 per cent and we have run the system, I would be happy to advise the house of the actual figure. It is nowhere near the \$50 million, \$60 million, or \$200 million figures which have been growing in a particular publication.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Did you say there are about 200,000 concessions this year. So 5 per cent would be 10,000 concessions that are out there to be questioned, to be recovered and investigated. What is the value of those?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: With 200,000 concessions you have to remember that some people might be eligible for multiple concessions; somebody might be eligible for a council concession, an energy concession, a water concession—a whole range of concessions. In fact there are fewer individuals than that 10 per cent. In some cases you are quite right—one person may only receive one concession, but in most of our examples that I am aware of it is unusual not to have multiple concessions. If somebody is on the pension there are a whole range of concessions that they are entitled to. I am still confident to advise the house that the figures being bandied about are not correct.

Dr McFETRIDGE: It would be nice to know what the correct figure is, but that is obviously unknown as yet.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: As soon as I know I will let you know.

Dr McFETRIDGE: What steps are being taken, then, to recover that from both the energy providers and in some cases individual clients who have perhaps mistakenly—I will not say fraudulently—claimed the concessions?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Certainly there is no evidence to suggest that there has been any fraudulence. Some of the problems that have arisen for example include someone being recorded as Bob Smith on one system and another retailer might record the person as Robert Smith. They are the same person and eligible for concessions. So we need to make sure that matches up. You may think that that person may not be eligible, but until we have made a match we do not know that.

What I can say is that we cannot write off any debt; we need the Treasurer's permission to do that. What we would do is make a judgment as to the cost involved in recovery. That is one thing. Secondly, in the case of energy retailers where they have provided a concession before approval, that is something which we need to look at, because they do not have the prior approval to provide the concession.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Just to finish up on this one for now, minister, last year's report mentioned the proposed operation of CASIS, and it has been mentioned in a number of audits. There have been ministers before you so I am not blaming you, but how did we get to this situation where it has gone from \$600,000 to a bit over \$4.5 million?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: It is like most IT projects where you start off with an idea and as you get into it you think, 'We could add this little bit to it; we can do this as well; and the system can do that bit.' So the actual scope of the project has increased. I am not suggesting that there have not been some cost increases as well, but the scope of it has increased.

As the government introduces new concessions—rather than be a separate system—we have decided to bring those concessions in sometime. For example, I think the energy and heating concessions started since this project commenced, as did the medical helium one, for example. So there are a number of concessions, and the idea of this system is to make sure that if any concessions are introduced they can be tapped into the new system. It is not desirable that it has taken this long, I accept that, but I am confident that by developing it in the way that we have we can have a flexible system which will cope with any new concessions which may come on the scene by a future government.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I was not going to go there. Through you, Mr Chairman, page 264, same reference, the Auditor is there looking at payments to energy retailers that have been undertaken.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Say that again, sorry?

Dr McFETRIDGE: Page 264. We are looking at payments to energy retailers that have been withheld. Has the government withheld any payments to energy retailers and if so how much? What further action is the government considering against energy retailers to ensure that reconciliation files are provided within the correct time frame?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: As I mentioned in my earlier answer, one of the problems which we encountered is that some energy retailers have provided the client with a concession prior to getting approval from us as to the provider's concession. So, until we can match up that that person is eligible and verify that that person is eligible, those concessions are withheld until that occurs. All we are doing there is making sure that we are safeguarding taxpayers' money and that only people who are eligible get the concession. I think that sometimes retailers might be quite active in the marketplace in trying to get new clients, so we have to make sure that we do not hand out money to people who are not eligible.

Dr McFETRIDGE: So, you are not actually having to hold back hundreds of thousands of dollars from energy retailers?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am advised not. There are amounts we have withheld but not the sort of figures you have just suggested. I can get that for you.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Moving on to page 265 of the same volume, Client trust funds, 'The major issues arising from the audit included', and there are a number of dot points there. Has the department or the minister been able to address the issues arising from the audit and can you tell the committee exactly what you have done? Perhaps there is an example in dot point 1:

instances were identified where payments requested by NGOs were not authorised by Department staff. Audit recommended that all payments for client trusts should be appropriately authorised and arrangements between NGOs and client trusts clarified.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I thank the member for Morphett for his question. As the member has indicated, the Auditor-General has identified a number of areas where client trust payment processes, security and segregation of duties could be improved, and that is acknowledged. What I can advise is that, from 1 October 2013, payments from client trust accounts have been approved by the department's officers with the appropriate level of authority. Secondly, client trust accounts payable officers have been advised to only process forms approved by the department's officers, and that the client trust request form has been amended to facilitate this change and procedures have been updated accordingly. All affected non-government organisations have been advised of the changes in procedures.

Protecting access to client network drives and/or files: the department will review the client trust payment process to determine if increased security can be put in place. This includes ways to restrict access and file passwords to provide additional safeguards over and above the management controls and reconciliations currently in place. Segregating duties and updating policies: the department has advised that it has reviewed the segregation of duties and has updated procedures to address issues raised by the Auditor-General. The department also plans to restrict administrator access to only two senior officers. This will be done in conjunction with the upgrade of the client trust accounting system.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On that same issue, same page, same reference, dot point 5:

the Department will review access to EFT and client files to determine if additional security measures can be implemented.

I know you mentioned something about it there before, but who has been accessing the electronic fund transfers and client files and why has that been allowed to develop, because, as the Auditor said before, there are major issues arising from Audit?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am advised that it has not been accessed, but the Auditor-General raised it as an issue of potential risk and, therefore, we have acted to close that risk off.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I refer to page 285, same reference. Note 2.10 states:

During 2012-13 the Department was required to transfer \$14.3 million for concessions which is an administered item.

How much of the money transferred as part of these concession payments was to ineligible customers and paid to energy retailers? We are back with cases for a minute.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Is this another way of asking what we have actually paid people who may be ineligible for payments? If that is the case, my answer has to be the same as earlier. I think the question is the same but asked differently.

Dr McFETRIDGE: The same but different. Thank you, minister. I refer to Auditor-General's Report Part B, Volume 5, page 1572. It states:

- sales of Trust properties were undertaken by Renewal SA without reference to a current market valuation, as required by the Trust's house and vacant land sales guidelines

What was the difference between the real value and the sales price of properties that were sold before the response was put in place? I note the response under the first dot point.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: As I said, sales processes are set based on independent market valuation. The Housing SA policy requires a valuation not to be less than 120 days old. Renewal SA is responsible for managing the sale of a number of properties on behalf of Housing SA. Of all the sales, six were identified by the Auditor-General where Renewal SA was found to have used market valuations which were greater than 120 days. In fact, the valuations used ranged from 122 days to 231 days.

In the case we have been in for the last financial year—a falling market—this means an older valuation is actually higher than the one set more recently and, therefore, results in higher sales being achieved. That said, that practice has ceased. I do not know the figure, but it is not a case of losing money.

Dr McFETRIDGE: So, minister, you can assure the committee that all transactions undertaken by Renewal SA now will be trying to obtain the best market price?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I missed that comment. In relation to the question, yes, that practice has ceased. Given that the policy is to have valuations of six months and under, that is designed to get the best possible valuation to approximate the market value at the time. That is correct.

The CHAIR: That concludes the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth and Minister for Volunteers. I thank the minister, the shadow minister, the committee and also the minister's advisers. We now go to the Minister for Tourism and Minister for Recreation and Sport.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will be questioning the minister with respect to some tourism matters, particularly. I am referring to the Auditor-General's Annual Report to 30 June 2013, Part B: Agency Audit Reports, Volume 5 in particular, and firstly on the South Australian Visitor and Travel Centre which is highlighted—that is the most positive way I can describe it—in the report by the Auditor-General on the procurement and contract management of this centre.

Having found some fundamental errors in the process, I note that at page 1809, at paragraph 23(a), it appears that there is a continuation of the lease for the current visitor information premises. My question is: notwithstanding the now exposed tawdry circumstances surrounding the lack of completion even of forms for conflict of interest, can the minister confirm whether the government has renewed the lease on the current visitor information centre premises; if so, what is the duration and the total cost of the renewal lease? Paragraph 23(a) gives it for all the properties.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Sorry, what page was it?

Ms CHAPMAN: Page 1809 in the financials gives a summary of all the contractual commitments. I think the explanatory note talks about a number of different leases and warehouses, but I am asking specifically for the amount of the cost for the visitor information centre premises.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The lease on the current visitor information centre on North Terrace goes through to 30 June next year.

Ms CHAPMAN: What is the annual rent for this financial year?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The figure is around \$50,000. I do not have the exact figure, but I am happy to bring that back for you.

Ms CHAPMAN: At this point, has the government provided any renewal of lease or introduced any new lease to any other premises? It has not extended the current lease. Has it secured any other premises to apply from 1 July?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No, we have not at this stage.

Ms CHAPMAN: I refer to paragraph 5 on page 1804. This is employee benefits and expenses. My question is, is the South Australian Tourism Commission paying Mr Rik Morris; if so, how much is Mr Morris being paid?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: We are not paying for Rik Morris out of the South Australian Tourism Commission at the moment. He is on secondment with the Premier's office and would be paid out of that budget line.

Ms CHAPMAN: When is he due to return to your department?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: He is with the Premier's office until the election next March.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am still at page 1804, which relates to advertising and promotion. Today, minister, you actually told us in question time that the Barossa advertising campaign was some \$6 million, and indeed you have a new Adelaide campaign of \$6 million scheduled to be undertaken, to be screened next year. We have heard some of that information during the course of question time. As I understand it, the \$6 million is to cover both advertising in South Australia and interstate. Can you give us a breakdown of the amount of money that is to be spent in the advertising campaign for interstate coverage?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: We are examining the Auditor-General's Report, so the facts of how much we would spend interstate and intrastate in an advertising campaign where the ad has not yet been made is irrelevant in these circumstances.

Ms CHAPMAN: For the purposes of your advertising campaign in this financial year, has there been any disclosure to the Auditor-General of your intention to bring forward moneys budgeted for the 2014-15 financial year to prepare for a budget for that campaign in this financial year? Have you had any correspondence with the Auditor-General about that proposal?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No; Mr Chair, this has nothing to do with this Auditor-General's Report.

The CHAIR: No, I do not think it does either.

Ms CHAPMAN: Did you use any money for the Barossa campaign—

The CHAIR: Which page number are we up to?

Ms CHAPMAN: We are talking about the advertising and promotion campaign, which is—

The CHAIR: Right; on 1804, still?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes. This is the \$6 million Barossa campaign of which the minister gave us details during question time, so I will not need to repeat those, but was any money spent from this financial year for that campaign?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The Auditor-General's Report would be dealing with the previous year where the ad was around Kangaroo Island, and where the expenditure was around the same (around \$6 million). It is not something that has been brought into question by the Auditor-General, so if you want to continue along these lines, probably the best place is in question time tomorrow.

Ms CHAPMAN: I might write him a letter. My question then is: of that campaign, there was some money spent in the 2012-13 year, I take it. Of what is disclosed here, some of that was spent on the Barossa campaign; is that correct?

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: I have just asked a simple question: of all these expenses here—these millions of dollars—was any of this money spent on the \$6 million Barossa campaign?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: There would have been some of the amount.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIR: You have to sit down now.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: What happens is: when you do an advertising campaign, you go out and you do some research. You find out what it is the market is looking for, and then you do some scoping work where you actually work out what it is that you want this ad to present to the market where you are taking it. So, some money gets spent on that sort of research work. Then, you get into giving an advertising company and a director the brief, and then you get into doing a storyboard about what the ad is going to look like.

You then go out and look for the actors that are going to be in the ad, then you have to look for locations for the shooting of the ad. You have to hire the cinematographers and the sound recorders; so, yes, there is some money expended there. Then, you have to pay for the production of the ad, and post-production expenses are quite high when you are going for a really high-quality ad like the Kangaroo Island ad or the Barossa ad.

Given that we launched the Barossa ad in June 2013, there would have been some money spent on the expenditure, but where the really big spend comes is in buying the TV slots across Australia to put that ad to air. So, part of the \$6 million is to design, develop and produce the ad, and then the rest of the money is spent in buying the TV slots to actually put that ad to air and in cinemas as well.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you for that explanation. My question is and was: did you use any of the money from this current year's budget to fund that? I think you have explained that you prepared it with all of those steps up to June and that it may well be that there is some money spent then for the actual advertising and promotion of it in the advertising bite that was purchased in this financial year. Let me ask you the reverse: how much of the \$6 million of the Barossa fund was spent in the 2012-13 year, which is in this lot?

The CHAIR: I must remind the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that there is no specific reference to what you are asking. I know you are using that general catchall of advertising and promotion, but there is no specific reference to the Barossa campaign.

Ms CHAPMAN: Exactly. It just says all of their campaigns—that's why I am asking for a breakdown.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: The Auditor-General's got no concern with it.

Ms CHAPMAN: So what? Wake up, Patrick, or go back to work across the road, or do something useful but don't interrupt.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Do you have any other thing to offer? Anything at all?

Ms CHAPMAN: Stop interrupting.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: How is your property on Kangaroo Island—

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Chairman, just throw him out, will you?

The CHAIR: Order! I'm not going to throw anyone out. I will just ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to be specific to the Auditor-General's comments.

Ms CHAPMAN: Correct, and the minister has actually given a very detailed answer under paragraph 6, which is advertising and promotion of all the different things that are made up. He has told us today that he spent \$6 million on the Barossa campaign, which is in each of those categories, and I am simply asking him: how much of that was spent on the Barossa campaign?

The CHAIR: And I am simply saying that the Auditor-General has not made any reference to it.

Ms CHAPMAN: He has mentioned the total amount spent by the government.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order. Can I ask whether the member is disputing your ruling, because if she is, she should know enough about the standing orders to do it in the proper way.

The CHAIR: I will ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to move on.

Ms CHAPMAN: At paragraph 10, page 1805, you will see sponsorship revenue, minister. Can you explain the reduction that was received in the 2013 year?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: It is a fairly small reduction, and it could be around the timing of when sponsorship money comes in. It could be different one year to the next year.

Ms CHAPMAN: At paragraph 25 on page 1810 is the reference to each of the board members and what they are now receiving. Could you provide a breakdown of the amount paid to each of the board members? It is under paragraph 25—the particulars of the money are on the second page of that. The names are on one page and the numbers are on the next page, down the bottom.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Can you just ask the question again?

Ms CHAPMAN: On page 1810 is the reference to the amount in brackets for eight of the members there in 2013 and then one, so quite likely the one is the chairman or someone who is being paid more anyway. I would like to know how much he or she is being paid, and then all the remaining board members who are enumerated on the page before: I am assuming that they are all receiving a similar amount, but that may not be the case.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The chair does get paid more than the other committee members, but all these figures are in the annual report.

Ms CHAPMAN: Similarly, sir, with respect, the amount that is paid within the bracket is in the annual report. What is here now is the bracket, and what I am asking for is the breakdown of how much the chairman is being paid. I see what the bracket is. It is somewhere between \$20,000 and \$29,999.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, he's right. If you have not got it, I am happy for you to take it on notice, but I would like some answers.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I will bring you back the answer but I am sure it is on the record in the *Government Gazette* or somewhere.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have been through the government boards, minister, which identifies as at 30 June, and that identifies some payments, but I do not know whether that is the full payments that are within here or not, so that is what I am asking. The next matter is in relation to Mr David O'Loughlin, whom I note, at least in the public arena, is leaving the department as of March next year.

The CHAIR: Which page number is this?

Ms CHAPMAN: This is in relation to salaries.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Someone who is leaving next year; in a couple of years you could ask about that.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, I think this is last year.

Ms CHAPMAN: I think there are two other senior executives who have left in the last two years, some of which is covered during the course of the period under audit, which is the 2013 year.

The CHAIR: Which page number is it please?

Ms CHAPMAN: I will just find it for you.

The CHAIR: It is not unbelievable; it is the correct protocol to reference the Auditor-General's—

Ms CHAPMAN: I understand that, and I think, Mr Chairman, you will agree that I have identified each paragraph. I gave you the paragraph for employee benefit expenses before and I will just find it again. 'Interpretation and analysis of the financial report, Highlights of the financial report' page 1788, for example, 'Employee benefit expenses'. How much paid out in the financial year that we are subject to, was monies paid to senior executive employees who have left in the subject year? I am only aware of a Mr Tommy Pavic and Mr Ian Darbyshire but they may not have been in that financial year. I am asking for any payments made out for these two.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: We had a few people resign. That is what happens in the workforce and we don't actually hold people as captives. People are allowed to move on to different places. They would have been paid the entitlements that they are entitled to.

Ms CHAPMAN: How much of the \$10.4 million in the 2013 year was paid to any of these two or any other executives who have left the department in that financial year? It is pretty simple.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Their salary arrangements are private.

Ms CHAPMAN: I missed that, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIR: Can you repeat that please?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Their salary arrangements are private.

Ms CHAPMAN: You're joking. You're saying to this committee that the salary payments of executives of the department are private and that you are not going to disclose this to this committee?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: Are you serious, minister? Are you absolutely serious? The chief executives, all of these executives—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: You didn't ask about the chief executives; you asked about any staff.

The CHAIR: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: Are you absolutely serious?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: You can yell at me all you like, I am serious.

Ms CHAPMAN: So you are not going to tell the committee how much you have paid out to these people in that financial year, if any?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I will stand up and answer the question when you sit down. That is how it works here. It is down, up, down, up.

Ms CHAPMAN: You're still sitting on your backside.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Because you didn't sit down. You should know the rules after eight years.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Remuneration of these employees is a private matter; however, the band of the salary that they are paid is reported.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it in the report?

The CHAIR: Is reported.

Ms CHAPMAN: I see—where?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: It is published in the annual report. See, you haven't sat down again.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Why don't you ask a question about the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, it's in the annual report.

The CHAIR: Deputy Leader of the Opposition, any more questions? We are now changing over to rec and sport. The member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: I refer the minister to pages 1164 through to 1166 where the Auditor-General is quite scathing on the process of procurement of the State Aquatic Centre. Amongst other things, I note that the Auditor-General had this to say:

The Department sought and received Cabinet approval to fundamentally change the procurement and project delivery approach which transferred the risks from the PPP proponents to the State. The significance of this risk transfer was not adequately analysed in the Cabinet submissions.

Can the minister explain to the committee why the government proceeded with a PPP—which I have always understood was about protecting the taxpayer from risks—when, under the process they went through, they apparently transferred the risk back to the taxpayer?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Why did the cabinet make a submission—is that what you are asking? Why did the cabinet make a submission?

Mr WILLIAMS: I'm asking this bloke.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The procurement process was not run by the Office for Recreation and Sport: it was run by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Mr Williams: You are left with all the inherent problems.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Is that a supplementary?

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes. The Auditor-General goes on to say:

The Department's management of the remediation works and oversight of the operations of the [State Aquatic Centre] by the Office of Recreation and Sport, which is now a part of the Department, will be the focus of ongoing audit review.

So, the Office of Recreation and Sport is left to pick up the pieces and the problems caused by the sloppy procurement process by whoever was responsible.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I think you are looking towards future reviews. We are actually looking at this year's Auditor-General's Report, and the Office of Recreation and Sport came up with a clean bill of health in the Auditor-General's Report. I must say the aquatic centre, when it comes to delivering for the recreation and sport sector here in South Australia, is doing a great job. I will also add that it is doing a great job for the tourism sector, as we host national and international competitions down there.

The CHAIR: Hold on. Point of order?

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes, point of order, sir. I just heard you telling one of my colleagues earlier that this was about the Auditor-General's Report. The Auditor-General has been very, very scathing of this project.

The CHAIR: Tell me what your point of order is.

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister is not answering the question and he is not talking about what the Auditor-General talked about. He is talking about some other sort of outcome which has got nothing to do with what the Auditor-General said.

The CHAIR: There is no point of order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Just to continue my remarks, it is an outstanding facility.

Mr Williams: That has got nothing to do with the Auditor-General's Report.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: But neither has what might be in a future Auditor-General's Report. We are actually looking at this year's Auditor-General's Report.

Mr Williams: Absolutely; that's what I'm—

The CHAIR: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The point is you were saying that, in future reports, they will be taking a close look at it.

Mr Williams: He has already taken a close look at it in this report—

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr Williams: —and it is now your responsibility.

The CHAIR: Order! Minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I would really appreciate it if you stopped the member for MacKillop's continual interruptions. I am being very polite and listening to his questions. I just think, if he could just afford the same courtesy to me on this side, that would be a good thing. What I am saying—

Mr Williams: If you could address the matters—

The CHAIR: Order! The minister is on his feet and has the call.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —is the Auditor-General has given the Office for Recreation and Sport a clean bill of health.

Ms CHAPMAN: Minister, in this year's budget, your department has the management of the aquatic centre, and you have appointed the YMCA as the operators of that. Last year—that is, in the 2011-12 year—there was a very significant contribution to supplement the income. That was explained by the previous minister as being necessary to get it on track, get it started. This year's budget disclosed that \$2.462 million was paid by your department towards the operating cost; that was less than the previous year, I might say.

If it is going so well, why is it necessary for your department to continue to subsidise the operational cost each year? If it is significantly improved and you are able to tell us that you have not made any provision for the 2013-14 year by way of any subsidy, I would be pleased to hear it. There is nothing illegal about these multimillion-dollar subsidies for the operational costs, by your department, but you are telling the committee that this is working very well, etc.

The CHAIR: Is this the same reference number, the Auditor-General reference number?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes; he is managing it.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: There is a subsidy paid by the government to the YMCA so that it can be accessible to all members of the community. If you did this on a purely commercial basis, the cost would be much higher, but we want people to be able to use the pool. As things settle down and management works on different things, we expect that subsidy will reduce.

Some of the benefits that come from this pool include health benefits to local people with diabetes, psychological benefits for people with problems, and there is a local Vietnam vets group that uses the pool for all sorts of reasons we do not necessarily associate with a swimming pool and people just doing laps for training or kids going down slides. The pool is a wonderful asset for South Australia, and a subsidy is paid so that all the community can benefit from it.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am simply asking how much it is. No-one is disputing, minister, that this is a magnificent piece of infrastructure—so is the Burnside swimming pool, but you do not subsidise that. I make the point, though, that here we are talking about the Aquatic Centre for which you have ongoing management, and you are subsidising it. I think there is also a half a million dollars a year that you contribute for maintenance. If it is going so well and you say notwithstanding that we still have to keep subsidising it, how much are you continuing to subsidise it for this year, if that is the case, and do you anticipate that will continue?

We ended up in court—people had not been paid, so people went broke—and all sorts of other things. The sad thing about that legacy is that there were good expectations of patronage for this facility and that within two years of its operation it was going to be a viable entity in its own right. That has not happened. I am not saying that it is a bad facility; I just make the point that we are still paying for it, as taxpayers, at the rate of millions of dollars a year.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I do not think there is anything in the Auditor-General's Report that says it was going to be a viable entity within two years.

Mr WILLIAMS: Minister, I draw your attention to page 1233 and specifically to the receipts into the Sport and Recreation Fund for the financial year 2012. It says here that the receipts were \$2.042 million. Can you explain that number, given that the law stipulates that \$3.5 million per year should be paid into that fund?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Is it the recreation and sport fund or the Sport and Recreation Fund?

Mr WILLIAMS: The Sport and Recreation Fund.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thank you for clarifying that. The sum of \$3.5 million is expended from that fund every year.

Mr WILLIAMS: No, it seems from that figure that only \$2.042 million was paid into the fund from the gambling taxes. Under the law, \$3.5 million per year should be paid in. It looks like the fund is being short-changed to the tune of almost \$1.5 million in that financial year. Is there some explanation for that?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I can give an explanation for that. This one reflects the fact that the Office for Recreation and Sport was only in the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure for seven months of the 12-month period, having moved over from another department.

The CHAIR: I would like to thank the minister, the shadow minister, the committee and also the advisers. The committee has further considered the Auditor-General's Report 2012-13 and completed its examination of ministers on matters contained therein.

ELECTORAL (LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VOTING REFORM) 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) (17:36): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Today, I will introduce a bill to amend the Electoral Act 1985 in order to address the very legitimate concerns about gaming and preference harvesting behaviour seen around the country during the recent Senate election. Independent commentators have expressed alarm at the prospect of this behaviour continuing to occur. The bill that I will introduce proposes modest changes designed to ameliorate the problem, but the bill is not a comprehensive solution in and of itself.

There has recently been some discussion about the introduction of a form of optional preferential voting. This discussion has apparently foundered on the inability of the Electoral Commission to be practically capable of implementing any such reform in time for the 2014 election.

There is an uncomfortable collision between a system that embraces both proportional representation on the one hand and exhaustive preferential voting on the other. The tension between these has now been fully realised by individuals and groups who seek to manipulate the outcome of elections by, in effect, gaming the system. There is an alternative that has not been adequately considered thus far, that being the Saint-Laguë system of vote counting utilised by many European countries. Such a system would effectively eliminate exhaustive preferential voting and reverse the count process from being bottom up to top down.

In such a system, preference harvesting would be impossible. Parties and groups would need to secure substantial public support in their own right. They would not be able to rely on complex backroom deals and mathematical algorithms to manipulate the voting system. I have prepared a draft bill which I am advised would deliver such a system in time for the 2014 election. The counting of such a ballot would be child's play and present no challenge whatsoever to the Electoral Commission.

I seek leave to table this draft bill today in the hope that agreement can be secured between the houses for this draft bill in its entirety to be included amongst such amendments as may be made in the Legislative Council. I also point out that should this draft bill be adopted by the Legislative Council a number of the measures in the bill introduced today would be rendered irrelevant.

I again make it plain that I welcome discussion with all parties and members about this important issue over the week ahead in the sincere hope that we can firmly address this problem in a long-term fashion. I am convinced that this solution, if adopted, would produce a simple, fair, logical and game-proof method of electing members of the Legislative Council. I urge the Legislative Council to give this draft bill its urgent and favourable consideration.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (17:41): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable the introduction forthwith and passage of a bill through all stages without delay.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

ELECTORAL (LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VOTING) 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) (17:42): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1985. 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) (17:43): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Following the results of the 2013 federal election, there have been widespread calls to reform the way preferences act in proportional representation voting systems throughout Australia. These have been generated by preference-harvesting behaviour, which has seen some candidates elected to the Senate with significantly fewer primary votes than other, ultimately, unelected candidates. Gaming of this system has resulted in there being a degree of a lucky dip in becoming an upper house member. I believe that these outcomes are undemocratic. This capacity to manipulate the system needs to be addressed. Can I say also that I would urge the Leader of the Opposition to have a good look at the ministerial statement I have just given and the tabled document, because that might be of interest as well.

This bill makes some minor changes to the act. They are not a complete solution to the problem. I encourage discussions between the houses to see if the bill can be improved. There is a belief that, given sufficient time, the solution may well rest with some variation of optional preferential voting or other reform of the preferential voting system. Given the time in the current electoral cycle, we are not likely to be in a position to progress a wholesale reform of this nature, though the government is not closing the door. I repeat: we are not closing the door. In particular, we would be very happy in having a chat about Saint-Laguë.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We will come back to it. Anyway, we are definitely not closing the door; it is quite open and hospitable if you want to walk through it. There remains a need at least to take targeted measures that will reduce the capacity of non-registered groups and candidates to harvest preferences. This bill achieves this by increasing the nomination requirements so that a single candidate finds it harder. The bill requires a single candidate for the House of Assembly to obtain the support and signature of 20 electors and a candidate for the Legislative Council 100 electors, as opposed to the current requirement of two. This will encourage quality candidates who have reasonable support and backing within the community, we hope.

Further, only political parties and groups may lodge a voting ticket and hence obtain an 'above the line' voting ticket square. However, if candidates group together, they must have the supporting signatures of different electors. If two or more candidates have the same signatures, that signature will not be counted for the purposes of making the nomination.

As a consequence, electors will have to provide a preference for every candidate below the line on the ballot paper should they wish to vote for an ungrouped independent candidate or a group whose candidates did not provide supporting signatures of at least 200 different electors upon making nomination. Further, the bill will also reduce the number of descriptive words that may be provided adjacent to a candidate or group name on the Legislative Council ballot paper from five or less to two words. Finally, the ballot paper will be required to list candidates and groups in an order beginning with registered political party groups, Independent groups and then, lastly, Independent candidates.

I advise that I also propose to increase by regulation the nomination fee for single candidates from \$450 to \$2,000. We believe that, in the available time frame, this minimalist approach taken in this bill will address the problem to some degree, but will not be the ultimate solution. I repeat: we will be open to discussion upon this bill between the houses. I commend the bill, and hopefully some very good amendments similar to the ministerial statement, to the house.

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (17:48): I rise to speak on the Electoral (Legislative Council Voting) Amendment Bill 2013. I thank the Attorney-General for bringing this bill to the parliament. I indicate that we will be supporting this bill through the house.

We, like the government, believe that reform is due. It is interesting to note that the Attorney-General describes his own bill as a 'minimalist approach' and that it is not to be taken as the ultimate solution, and we agree with that. However, we do commend the Attorney-General for bringing this, because there is no doubt that some reform is needed.

We do reserve our right between the houses to consider any suggestions for amendment from the government, or perhaps from ourselves, that we will consider in due course, but I think both the government and the opposition are in agreement that there is some opportunity to reform the Legislative Council voting system. We look forward to continuing discussions over the coming weeks.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:49): I rise to speak on the Electoral (Legislative Council Voting) Amendment Bill 2013. As our leader has outlined, this is a bill which the opposition favours in its thrust and as an attempt to reform some of the ills which were exposed particularly at the 2013 election. Can I say generally that it never ceases to amaze me that we have to have very clear laws to protect all of us in ensuring that we have a democratically elected government at all the levels which operate and which give us the freedoms and secure the freedoms that we have, so it is important that we get it right.

The stakes are high. The opportunity for certain persons to be able to aggregate and form governments is a very high prize. It is a very high level of responsibility, so we do need to ensure that two things happen. One is that as best as possible we do elect responsible people to undertake the role as members of parliament and, if they have the privilege of office, as a member of a government. The second is that as best as possible we ensure that those who are elected reflect a process which enables men and women over the age of 18 years to have their voice heard and to have a selection which at the end gives them a team of people as representatives that is fair in that assessment.

What becomes clear is that, probably because the stakes are so high, each election there is usually some exposure of a weakness. Sometimes it is just something at a machinery level; sometimes it is much more penetrating in its application. What happened at the 2013 federal election clearly raised some concerns. Some who had nominated for parliament relatively easily were able to secure a very, very low primary vote, even far less than 1 per cent, and still achieve a seat in the parliament. Of course, many people were left shell shocked as to how that could occur.

The classic example in that election was the election of Mr Ricky Muir, who is the Australian Motoring Enthusiast Party representative. Mr Muir received a primary vote of 0.51 per cent, and through preferences with other micro parties was able to achieve a quota of 14.28 per cent. To do this, Mr Muir received preferences from the following 25 parties, nine of which polled higher than he did. I will list them quickly: the WikiLeaks Party, Rise Up Australia Party, Palmer United Party, Australian Sex Party, Shooters and Fishers Party, Democratic Labor Party, Animal Justice Party, Help End Marijuana Prohibition Party, Katter's Australian Party, Australian Fishing and Lifestyle Party, Australian Independents, Senator Online, No Carbon Tax Climate Sceptics, Bullet Train for Australia, Drug Law Reform Australia, Stable Population Party, Building Australia Party, Australian Voice Party, Bank Reform Party, Stop CSG, Citizens Electoral Council, Socialist Equality Party, and two other Independent groupings.

I have to confess I did not read avidly the published policies of each of these parties. I am not quite sure what the difference is between the Australian Fishing and Lifestyle Party and the Shooters and Fishers Party. Perhaps they have some overlapping policies. In any event, there is no question that people have the opportunity to stand, but to then climb on the back of other candidates, including those who get a greater first preference poll than you do and actually end up in the parliament, does obviously expose a weakness in the system we have.

Other examples include the situation in Western Australia for the election of Mr Wayne Dropulich of the Australian Sports Party. He received a primary vote of just 0.23%. He had half the score of Mr Ricky Muir in a percentage of 1 per cent. Clearly, Western Australia is in some other difficulty at the moment as far as their electoral commission goes, because they seem to have lost a whole lot of votes. Whatever happens there, again it still exposed a problem that we have.

Essentially, the capacity for people to game (as they describe this harvesting of votes) has been exposed. Some would argue, 'Well, they are the rules; that's what applies.' The parties that missed out on the opportunity of having a member of the parliament, like here in South Australia—the Australian Labor Party lost their sitting member, Senator Don Farrell, and he will have to retire in June next year if he does not get someone else tapped on the shoulder to go willingly.

I think it is fair to acknowledge that the major parties had probably dropped the ball; they had not actually been keeping alert as to how mischievous some could be to be able to work a system in such a manner. So, this is no reflection on those who are members of organised political parties, but the reality is that I think we should have been more alert to this. The fact that those who are nominating only hoping to get a few hundred votes, be able to survive that process and then be able to have a paid agent—a negotiator—to then secure the opportunity for the preferences to flow and the aggregate to be acquired, I think is some reflection on those of us who are members of major political parties.

Nevertheless, it is important to recognise the public disquiet in some quarters and outrage in others that people should be able to acquire that. I did note, with interest, the Hon. Nick Xenophon has had a bit to say on this matter as well; he has represented the cause of no poker machines and has had a career here in South Australia and then in the Senate. Again, issues have been raised by people across the spectrum as to the concerns raised.

The Attorney has outlined the specific provisions of this bill; each aspect has some merit. I thank him for identifying the proposed prescribed nomination fee at \$2,000; it was a matter I would have otherwise canvassed in committee. We think that the general objectives which will provide that: only registered political parties and groups of two or more Independents can have above-the-line voting square; candidates fielded by political parties need to find 100 electors to nominate a candidate (however, these may be the same 100 nominators for all candidates in their group); the single Independent candidate who wants a below-the-line listing will need to find 100 electors to nominate them—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry to interrupt; I just need to get a minister to extend beyond 6pm and then I will come straight back to you.

[Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. A. Piccolo]

Ms CHAPMAN: —and that if a group of two or more Independents wants a voting ticket square above the line then they must find 100 electors per candidate to nominate them who have not nominated any other candidate; that the Independent candidates may only use two words to describe themselves on the ballot paper in addition to the word 'Independent'; and finally, that the registered political parties would appear on the ballot paper before Independent groups.

The discussions, at the invitation of the Attorney, will continue. We are pleased to have the invitation to do that. I am sure that other interested parties and stakeholders will also wish to present their position to the government, and we will be happy to discuss those matters with them.

Can I leave with one other matter which is not specifically covered by the bill, but which I think is more a machinery matter that comes out of these elections. I do not know about you, Mr Deputy Speaker, but I had difficulty fitting the ballot paper for the Senate into the polling booth. Laid out flat, it sort of went up each side about half a foot, or 15 or 20 centimetres. I am told that we were lucky in South Australia, and that if you were in New South Wales, it was up over the edge of the wall and dripping over the top, it was so long. This is a practical thing. If we do achieve these reforms, that will have some effect, I am hoping, on the redesign of the ballot paper.

Some of that might be avoided, but if it is not, then I think the Electoral Commission needs to be on notice that we need either a wider facility to be able to examine the ballot paper for the purposes of voting or a redesigned system so that at least it can fit in the polling booth when we go to vote. I just ask that the Electoral Commissioner take that on notice. It is not a matter that requires legislation. I just indicate that I wish to briefly go into committee.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (18:00): Can I thank the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for their contributions. This is one of those happy moments where the parliament is all of a single mind, really, about trying to address what I think 90 per cent of citizens in South Australia would agree is a genuine problem. The constructive attitude that has been brought to that actually does demonstrate that the parliament is capable of doing good things when people of goodwill actually focus on the same problem.

I just close by repeating that, on behalf of the government, I am very happy to have conversations with the Leader of the Opposition and the deputy leader and other people who might

be wishing to talk about any detail in this bill that we are now about to vote on but I would also invite them to please turn their minds to the implications of the bill that I tabled. Consider over the next week whether or not you can see your way clear to giving support to that, because I guarantee you that there is a big difference between dealing with the problem at its roots and merely addressing symptoms of the problem.

To some degree, the bill we are putting through today does address the symptoms. It does offer tweaking of the current system but, as I said in my second reading remarks, it is not a fundamental solution to the problem. It will ameliorate elements of the problem, but I cannot stand here and say that I can guarantee that the bill I introduced that is before the parliament presently is going to solve all our problems. It will make some of those problems more difficult for people to create, but it does not actually stop them creating problems, if they are prepared to be intrepid enough to spend \$2,000 and get 200 signatures and so on.

It creates a number of hurdles, yes, but does it actually address the root and branch problem? Not really. The root and branch problem is the unhappy interaction between an exhaustive preferential system and proportional representation. Anyway, I have probably said enough about all of that. Again, I thank both the other speakers.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1.

Ms CHAPMAN: This relates to the question of consultation with the Electoral Commissioner on these reforms. Attorney, could you just confirm that that has occurred, and that it is achievable that the reforms be applied for the forthcoming election?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I invite the deputy leader just to put all her questions on the *Notice Paper* and I undertake to get back to her between the houses on all of them.

Ms CHAPMAN: The first question was about the consultation with the Electoral Commissioner. If it could be confirmed between the houses in a letter, or however you wish, that she is able to undertake the necessary reforms in the event that the bill goes through in its current form, that would be excellent. I have asked the question on clause 1 and the minister has nodded; he can get the answer to us in between the houses.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 8 passed.

Clause 9.

Ms CHAPMAN: Section 139(2) of the Electoral Act currently allows for regulations to fix fines of up to \$750 for the contravention of a regulation. The bill proposes to increase this to \$5,000. My questions are:

1. How many fines are currently prescribed by regulation under this power? If there are none, why is it necessary for this fine-making capacity to be increased from \$750 to \$5,000?

2. Why are the regulation-making powers being made more specific than under the current section 139 of the act? Is it anticipated that this will provide any further regulation-making power than what is currently available?

3. What matters are intended to be included in subsection (2)(e) of proposed section 139, and what would the commissioner's discretion relate to?

I ask, in the spirit of this debate and of some workable dialogue and cooperation, that the Attorney takes those questions on notice and provides us with answers to the same, which will allow the expeditious conclusion of this debate today.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (18:07): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

COMMUNITY HOUSING PROVIDERS (NATIONAL LAW) (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) 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. Schedule 3, Clause 5, page 40, lines 20 to 24—Delete paragraph (c) and substitute:

- (c) without limiting paragraph (b), accommodation provided by a community housing provider registered under the *Community Housing Providers National Law* that is incorporated on a not-for-profit basis for the benefit of the public, other than accommodation provided by such a body—
 - (i) that has as a principal object of the body the provision of housing for members of the body; or
 - (ii) that is excluded from the ambit of this paragraph by the Minister by notice published in the Gazette;

No. 2. Schedule 3, Clause 5, page 40, lines 26 to 29—Delete subsection (1a) and substitute:

- (1a) For the purposes of paragraph (c) of the definition of *supported accommodation* in subsection (1)—
 - (a) a body will not be regarded as incorporated on a not-for-profit basis—
 - (i) if a principal or subsidiary object of the body is—
 - (A) to secure a pecuniary profit for the members of the body or any of them; or
 - (B) to engage in trade or commerce; or
 - (ii) if the constitution or rules of the body provide that the surplus assets of the body on a winding-up are to be distributed to its members or to another body that does not have identical or similar aims or objects; and
 - (b) the Minister may, by notice in the Gazette, vary or revoke a notice that has been previously published in the Gazette under that paragraph.

No. 3. Schedule 3, Clause 16, page 47, after line 1—Insert:

- (8) A transitioning housing association will (while its registration under the SACCH Act continues) be taken to continue to be within the ambit of paragraph (c) of the definition of *supported accommodation* under section 4 of the *Local Government Act 1999* despite the substitution of that paragraph by an amendment made by this Act.

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (RESTRICTED BIRTHING PRACTICES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION (NOTIFICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr PISONI (Unley) (18:09): Just picking up from where I was before the Auditor-General's Report, I was reading from the SAASSO (South Australian Association of State School Organisations) Sex Abuse Timeline that was put together by Danyse Soester. It goes on to say, for 2 November:

Parents formally told about sexual assault in their school. Former justice Bruce DeBelle appointed to investigate.

Weatherill says, 'all critical incidents are always notified to the Minister', but not this one.

Education department says it did notify Minister's office in December, 2010—Deputy Chief Executive Jan Andrews emailed Mr. Weatherill's Chief of Staff, Simon Blewett and advisor Jadyne Harvey.

On 3 November:

Jay Weatherill defends Mr Blewett's decision not to tell him about the rape. He claims 'an impossible standard' for minister's office to check all advice from agencies.

Weatherill says counselling is now available to school.

Scouts SA confirms they knew of paedophile's conviction earlier in the year.

On 5 November:

Opposition does not accept Jay Weatherill was not told about the sexual assault in 2010.

Jay Weatherill says that OSHC staff [that is, the out of school hours care staff] are employed by Governing Councils—

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order: I fail to see how an article printed in a magazine is relevant to legislation that is before us today.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the point of order is correct. I find it hard to relate this to the bill. The member knows that he has to speak to the bill before us.

Mr PISONI: I am speaking to the bill, and the bill came about because of the actions I am referring to in this report.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think you are drawing a very long bow.

Mr PISONI: Well, if you want to shut me up about it, that is up to you. It continues:

Jay Weatherill says that OSHC—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I do. I have asked, as a result of the point of order, for you to move on and to speak about the bill, please.

Mr PISONI: I am speaking about the bill, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think you are.

Mr PISONI: I am speaking about the bill. If you read the minister's second reading speech, she said it came about because of recommendations from the Debelle inquiry, and the Debelle inquiry was a direct result of questions that were asked in this house on 30 October 2010. What I am reading into *Hansard* is a time line of other events that have occurred since that raising of the issue in the parliament and other related issues, including the Debelle inquiry. I have mentioned Mr Debelle in this material right now.

The minister might not want to hear this, but this is what has happened. This is history; this is why we are here today, and people reading this *Hansard* in 50 years' time will want to know why it was that there were changes to the Child Protection Act that reduced the obligation of mandatory notification. I am making sure that they can understand it by giving those who are reading this *Hansard* the ability to understand the whole history of where we are today and why we are where we are today, that is, beginning to implement the recommendations of the Debelle inquiry that were a direct result of the rape of a 7 year old in a western suburbs school where parents were not told.

This chronology is a good explanation of what happened, why parents were not told, why the department was so wrong, and why the government was so wrong in not telling parents. This chronology goes on to explain to the reader that, first of all, minister Portolesi said that police said that parents were not to be told. We have since found out that that was incorrect. This chronology goes on to explain that the Premier at the time said that staff at OSHC were the responsibility of governing councils and not the responsibility of the department, whereas minister Portolesi went on to say—

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order: is the member for Unley reading from an article or is he providing a chronology of events? My perspective is that there is no relevance in relation to reading an article from a magazine in relation to this particular legislation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have already ruled in favour of the point of order. I would ask the shadow minister to move on and make sure that he is speaking about the bill.

Mr PISONI: Are you ruling, sir, that people cannot use written notes?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What I am ruling is that you have got to speak to the bill. I am certainly not saying you cannot use written notes, but what I am saying is you have got to speak to the bill.

Mr PISONI: There are reasons why this bill is here, sir, and I am explaining why that bill is here.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: That is fine, but do not read someone else's article.

Mr PISONI: If the minister refers to *Hansard* she will see that I am merely referring to the article after your objections because I am a cooperative person, unlike you, minister.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Let's not slang across the chamber.

Mr PISONI: The chronology goes on to explain that the governing council said that it was misled about its rights and obligations by the education department, and that was that it was not allowed to tell the parents. The chronology also goes on to say that the Premier was wrong when he claimed that it was a decision of the governing council that parents would not be told that their children were in the care of a paedophile rapist. That is what the Premier said and this article goes on to say that the Premier was also wrong in making that claim.

We are here today making changes to the Children's Protection Act through amendments, and the amendments were recommended among 43 recommendations by Mr Debelle. They were recommended at No. 27 and No. 28 of Mr Debelle's recommendations. The challenge for the minister in her reply, of course, is to update the house as to where the department is going or how the progress is on the 43 other recommendations that Mr Debelle has made, in particular, the recommendations that refer to governing councils.

I know that at recommendation 23, Mr Debelle recommended that provisions be made to establish a fund from which governing councils can draw funding to enable a governing council to obtain independent legal advice when that governing council is in dispute with the department and that the decision—whether it is necessary or appropriate for governing council to obtain funding—be made by the person who holds the office of Crown Solicitor.

I raise that in particular because at the moment we know that Rose Park Primary School is in the courts with the education department trying to determine just whose responsibility it is to employ out-of-school hours care staff; whether it is the responsibility of the Department of Education or whether, as claimed by the Premier and by the department, the responsibility lies with the governing council.

The extraordinary event that happened last week at that hearing, of course, was that the Crown Solicitor's office was more interested in technical legalities or technical get out of gaol free cards, if you like, on making this decision, calling for the matter to be dismissed and that the governing council pay all costs. I would argue that that is not in the spirit of the recommendations that Mr Debelle made, particularly those recommendations concerning governing council.

In concluding, of course the opposition supports the amendments that present themselves here today. We know that it was the opposition's relentless campaign of holding this government accountable for its poor performance on child protection, for the poor performance of the education department and not only the way that it reports and handles child protection issues in schools but also the failure—from the dozens of examples that have come to the media and the opposition—and lack of support and lack of empathy for the victims and their families that have brought this issue into the public domain since it was first raised in 30 October 2012.

There is no doubt that for many of those people who came forward (many of these situations where historical, of course; they happened two or three years earlier) it was the interest from the community, the response from the community, that gave those people the courage to come forward and to take the department on, to take the bureaucracy on, to take on the bullying that they had experienced, and the lack of support that they experienced. As family members and community members they simply wanted nothing more than a safe environment for their children.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (18:21): I rise also to talk to the Children's Protection (Notification) Amendment Bill. This bill is to amend the Children Protection Act 1993 to enact the recommended legislative amendments which were set out in the Royal Commission 2012-2013 Report of Independent Education Inquiry prepared by the Hon. Bruce Debelle AO QC. I note that the amendments proposed in this bill address recommendations 26 and

27 of Justice Debelle's report and will enhance the current mandatory notification provisions in section 11 of the Children's Protection Act 1993.

I will not repeat too much of the relevant history of how we got to this stage, but it has been a terrible sequence of events that has got us to this stage. It is a department cloaked in secrecy, with ministers who will not reveal what is going on with our children at school. As a father of two young children—one in year 4 and one in year 7—the protection of children and how they are treated at school means a lot to me. It is not just my kids but all the children who attend our schools throughout the state. I am quoting directly from the Debelle Independent Education Inquiry from the section about law reform—recommendation 26. It is recommended that:

...section 11 of the Children's Protection Act 1993 be amended by adding a new subsection 4(a) to read as follows:

It shall be an defence to a charge under subsection (1) to prove that the knowledge of the facts that gave rise to the suspicion was gained only from a police officer acting in the course of his duty.

Paragraph 674, in relation to this recommendation, states:

These considerations draw attention to the question whether section 11 of the Children's Protection Act should be amended. The consequences for a teacher who fails to make the mandatory notification are serious. The teacher will be liable to a fine of \$10,000. Teachers should not be subject to the risk of a substantial penalty if they fail to make a mandatory notification in circumstances where they are doing no more than passing on to CARL what police already know. There are sound reasons why it is desirable to amend section 11 to relieve a person from the duty to notify CARL where that person learns of allegations of abuse or neglect from police in the course of a police investigation and that person knows that police have already notified CARL or that the alleged offender has been arrested and charged. Such an amendment would have the consequence that police would remain subject to the existing obligation to notify CARL.

This is still quoting from the commissioner:

I recommend, therefore, that section 11 be amended by adding a new subsection 4(a) to read as follows:

It shall be a defence to a charge under subsection (1) to prove that the knowledge of facts that gave rise to the suspicion was gained only from a police officer acting in the course of his duty.

The obligation upon police to notify CARL should continue to exist.

Still quoting from the Debelle report, recommendation 27 states:

It is recommended that consideration be given to the question whether it is appropriate to relieve a teacher of the obligation to notify the Child Abuse Report Line pursuant to section 11 of the Children's Protection Act when the only knowledge that that teacher has of possible abuse or neglect of a child has been obtained from another teacher who has already notified the Child Abuse Report Line. That recommendation could be effected by an amendment to section 11 of the Children's Protection Act along the lines of the following:

This section does not require a teacher in an educational institution (including a kindergarten) to make a notification where that teacher's knowledge of the fact that gave rise to the suspicion was gained from another teacher in that educational institution and that other teacher had already made a notification under this section.

Paragraph 675, in regard to this recommendation, states:

Consideration should also be given to the question whether it is appropriate to relieve a teacher of the obligation to notify CARL when the only knowledge that that teacher has of possible abuse or neglect of a child has been obtained from another teacher who has already notified CARL. An amendment could be made along the lines of the following:

This section does not require a teacher in an educational institution (including a kindergarten) to make a notification where that teacher's knowledge of the fact that gave rise to the suspicion was gained from another teacher in that educational institution and that other teacher had already made a notification under this section.

I note that a lot of time and bureaucracy is taken up in the education department. I also note that some of the policies in relation to the health and welfare of our students do not seem to be enacted very well.

In relation to child protection matters, I want to reflect on a policy announcement made by the Premier Weatherill, the member for Cheltenham, in regard to putting more money (\$2 million) into our schools for fitness programs. The \$2 million funding the Premier has committed is to start implementing the Healthy and Strong Children policy over four years. Part of the policy the Premier has put out is to double to 82 the number of schools taking part in the Stephanie Alexander Kitchen Garden program, with a grant of \$439,000. That is fantastic, but the problem is that schools such as the Coomandook Area School are screaming out to me about how they are going to pay their water bill. In fact, in the last Coomandook school newsletter states:

Assets and Grounds Committee are working with...[the Principal] and...[the Groundsman] to review and improve our water system and usage—

which incorporates a massive water recycling program of millions of litres that are caught from the town of Coomandook and pumped up to the school—

as our...[Department of Education] budget is inadequate to cover costs. Although our usage has reduced over recent years, our costs have tripled. The committee is looking to reduce watering in areas around the school which are not used by students and...[reducing] watering on some areas of the oval.

Well, so much for the Premier's great policy announcement of getting our kids out and getting them fit and into sports. I know what happens at Coomandook. I am not sure whether or not it is linked to the child protection policies of the school—I think that it is partly because of that—but our children are not allowed to play on one half of the oval. So, that will be easy: we just will not water half of the oval. The kids cannot even go out there and play cricket. They cannot use the cricket pitch because you can field on only one side! It is just ridiculous. And this would be happening all across the state.

What the minister, the Premier and the education department need to do is work with our schools and work with our kids so that they can supply the appropriate education, the appropriate protection methods, so that instead of just feeding a bloated bureaucracy which is left to its own devices, we could actually get some real outcomes for our kids. I just want to talk about the Stephanie Alexander Kitchen Garden. It is a fantastic idea.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order. The member for Hammond has had a fair go at doing his little bit for his electorate, but the gardens actually have nothing to do with the legislation before us.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I rule in favour of the point of order. The member is straying and he needs to constrain himself to the bill before us.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I may have digressed. What I would like to say with regard to all issues to do with education, including our children's protection, is that we really need to see in this state a commitment to make sure that not only are our kids protected in the school environment but that they can get the appropriate education.

Part of that education, I believe, is about health and wellbeing and working in a protected environment. The local school pool at Coomandook, because of maintenance issues, does not look like it is going to be able to open this year. It is just ridiculous when these things should be fixed and should be factored in.

With regard to child protection issues, the member for Unley the shadow minister for the Liberal Party put it very well, putting the chronology of events of what has happened for well over 12 months. It is a disgrace, it is a real disgrace that this has happened. There is the case of a missing email, where no-one seems to know where it went. There is the case of three education ministers, over time, mixed up in this: the former Minister for Education the Premier, the former Minister for Education the member for Hartley Grace Portolesi, and now the current Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order. Is the member for Hammond, by using the term 'mixed up in this', suggesting that we are in some way involved in relation to child abuse that has been inflicted on children?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the point of order, please?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Well, imputing improper motives. He is reflecting adversely on members of parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask the member to continue but, as I have already asked him, to try to confine his remarks to the bill before us, please.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. What I am saying is that these events have happened under the auspices of three separate ministers. In any department, the minister is at the head, they are the ones ultimately responsible. We see that, in many pieces of legislation in this house, in many acts, in many clauses, the minister has the final say and the final discretion. So, that is why ministers of the Crown are the ones finally responsible for how these things are managed and reported.

I am not for once suggesting that any of these ministers are involved in child abuse. I am not saying that at all, if that is what the minister is trying to say. I am not saying that at all. What I am saying is that the minister at the time is absolutely responsible. We see, from the recent material that came out in question time today, that it is still happening as recently as April of this year and that there are issues in the system around notification and around protecting our children at school.

I guess my point is, and it does not matter where the children go to school—we have seen issues throughout the urban area and we have seen issues in the country areas on what happens under this system that obviously has not been working. I note that these provisions are in the bill so that people do not get tied up in knots—that is how I see it—in worrying day and night whether a situation has not been reported, but I also note that the default position is that people should still notify the Child Abuse Response Line so that we get that notification.

I appreciate the protection of a defence this will give to people in case, for some reason, they fail to report or they believe it has been adequately reported, whether through another staff member or a police officer. That is how I see the amendments that have been drafted. We support these amendments, and it will be interesting to see what other legislation comes through as a result of the Debelle inquiry.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (18:35): I thank the member for Hammond for his contribution. I can assure him this government has a very strong commitment to protecting children in our school environment. As of next year, there will not only be criminal history checks of teachers going into our schools but also background screening for all new teachers and something like 15,000 teachers renewing their registration. I would point out to the member for Hammond, if he does not know, that when we took government there were something like 30,000 teachers across the system who had not had so much as a criminal history check.

I want to thank the member for Morialta for his contribution. He raised the issue of recommendation 25 of Mr Debelle's report in relation to electronic notification (online reporting). That was introduced on 1 July this year, and I am advised we have over 4,000 electronic notifiers registered and able to report on line with CARL. That is up from 260. In relation to recommendation 37, we have increased the screening unit staff by 10 people, which is a significant increase.

The member for Unley said I am challenged in relation to providing a report on the progress of Mr Debelle's 43 recommendations—which the government has accepted in their entirety. Twenty-two of the 43 are currently completed, and I am happy to detail those for those opposite if they so wish.

However, I can tell members that recommendations 28 and 29 required legislation that was brought to the house by the Attorney-General and has passed both houses of parliament. That may have slipped people's notice. Recommendations 28 and 29 have already had legislation passed.

Recommendations 26 and 27 are the subject of this particular piece of legislation and, hopefully, this will also be afforded quick passage. We are not dealing with recommendation 28, as was mentioned by the member for Unley. It is unfortunate that he did not quite know what recommendations we were dealing with. It is also disappointing that his contribution, essentially, was to read somebody else's words. The best he could do was read an article. For him to comment that what we are dealing with today is just the low hanging fruit is ridiculous, and he really has to stop stating half truths. We have put in a concerted effort to implement Mr Debelle's recommendations and, in fact, many of them were underway prior to the release of his report.

This legislation, importantly, does not remove the requirement to lodge a mandatory report notification in relation to child abuse but what it does, importantly, is provide a defence for not doing so in certain circumstances. I thank the house for its support and we look forward to two more of Mr Debelle's recommendations being completed.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (18:39): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

As I have outlined, this is an important piece of legislation. It is, again, an indication of the government's commitments to implementing the Debelle recommendations—an inquiry,

importantly, that was established by this government. We have a very strong history of putting child protection at the forefront. We have invested many millions of dollars in increasing child protection here in South Australia. Our focus has been protection of children and not simply grabbing a headline.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 18:41 the house adjourned until Wednesday 13 November 2013 at 11:00.