

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 26 November 2013

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:00 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.

VETERINARY PRACTICE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 October 2013.)

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:03): I indicate that the opposition will be supporting this piece of legislation and that I am the lead speaker on this bill. I should also put on the record that I am still a registered veterinary surgeon and my daughter Sahra is also a registered veterinary surgeon working at the University of Adelaide's Roseworthy veterinary school.

This piece of legislation has been a long time coming. I remember speaking about it when we debated the national registration of medical practitioners, how there was a real need to have, if not national registration, at least mutual recognition of registration of veterinary practitioners across Australia. What we are seeing now is just that. It is not going to be a national board. We are still going to maintain our state and territory boards, but we are going to have a mutual recognition across all states and territories so that when, as vets, we move interstate for work purposes or in responding to emergencies, our registration will transfer so that it is not the bureaucratic nightmare that it can sometimes be and we do not suffer the time delays that sometimes can happen.

I suppose the best example of this is when I graduated from Murdoch University in 1982, I worked in racehorse and stud practice in Western Australia, and part of my job was working for Bloodstock Air Services. I used to fly Melbourne-Perth four times a week, then to South-East Asia and New Zealand on weekends. While that might sound very romantic, flying around with racehorses and millions of dollars worth of livestock, you end up smelling like a horse's backside most of the time.

The thing that was very forefront in my mind was the fact that, while I was registered in Western Australia, I was administering restricted medications to horses, cattle and sometimes dogs—we flew some greyhounds—in other states. We would fly to Melbourne, then sometimes we would fly to Sydney, as well, and you could end up in New Zealand on the same day. So, it was always an issue. Whether I was practicing illegally back then, I am not going to enter into that now. I was on commonwealth territory at all times.

So, it was an issue, and this legislation is going to overcome that issue. The ability for vets to transfer their workplaces all over Australia is something that is happening more and more. We have thousands of veterinary surgeons working across Australia in all sorts of practice, and I will talk about those in a moment. There is a need to recognise their high levels of training. It is always said that it is more difficult to get into veterinary science than it is to get into medicine. I suppose that is because we are treating all species, not just specialising in one, as doctors do. As vets we are well qualified. We know a lot about a lot. It is not knowing a lot about a little, it is a lot about a lot. As a profession, it is one that is very highly regarded.

I know when I was doorknocking during my first election campaign in 2001, a lady did say to me, 'You're the vet, aren't you?', because I was running on the slogan 'Vote for the vet', because people do like vets. She said, 'You'll be right, you're going from one lot of mongrels to the next,' which I thought was a real affront, not only to my former patients but also to my colleagues in this place. I know there are some difficult characters to deal with, but I do not think we are mongrels but well-determined and decent people. The fact that veterinary surgeons are held in the highest regard is something that I always accepted with great humility.

As a vet, when you had a family coming in with their pets to be treated, you often had an insight into relationships between members of the family, and also with their pet, that not very many people see, particularly when the decision comes to end an animal's life, it is a very stressful time for anybody, and I think people in this place who have had to have an animal euthanased can vouch for that. Seeing parents crying in front of their children is stressful. There was one particular

case that struck me. I put a rabbit down for a family; this rabbit had myxomatosis. I gave the rabbit an injection of the solution we used, and I looked up and one of the kids who was with them, a little girl, was not looking at me, she was looking at her father. I looked at the father and he was crying. I said to the mother later on, 'What was that all about?' and she said, 'She's never seen her father cry before.'

At times, it is really quite an intense experience being a vet. You need to be able to cope not only with the stressors of diagnosing your clients but also dealing with the owners of those clients. Finding a place where you want to work and where you are comfortable working and changing your workplace is something that happens. I worked in Western Australia, as I say, in racehorse and stud practice and I did some rural practice as well, then we came to South Australia in the mid-eighties.

When I first started here, I had to go through the registration process and declare myself, get the character witnesses to show that I was of suitable, good character and was able to become registered as a vet here. Then we established the type of practice we had. Back in the eighties, I was down at Happy Valley and lived at Kangarilla. We had seven dairies in the practice, we did a lot of dog and cat work and a lot of horse work. We had a lot of young vets come and work for us and they cut their teeth on some of the work we were doing in the practice.

We did everything ourselves then, from just giving vaccinations and worming, right through to complex orthopaedic reconstruction work after motor vehicle accidents in small animals, in dogs and cats. We also had a large animal anaesthetic machine, one of the very few around the area, and we did large animal anaesthetics, repairing injuries in horses and cattle. Many of the young vets who came through, as I say, cut their teeth in my practice. They sometimes made a few mistakes, and that is something that we all learnt from, but then they moved on to other areas, some interstate, some within the state. Not having to go through that registration process each time is something everybody in the veterinary profession, as well as the bureaucrats, have been waiting for.

I will read into *Hansard* the submission from the Australian Veterinary Association about this piece of legislation. It provides a little bit of background on some of the issues associated with this legislation. The submission was from Graham Pratt, the Executive Officer of the South Australian and Northern Territory division of the AVA. The AVA have been very helpful, as has government officer Mark Peters, in making sure that this legislation is understood by the vets it will affect. The recommendation from the AVA was that the bill be passed by parliament. The background information they provide in their submission states that:

Separate regulatory systems in each state and territory hinder the mobility of veterinarians within Australia, hinder interstate competitiveness, and inconvenience clients with interstate or national interests as well as those requiring particularly veterinarian expertise only available outside South Australia.

Fortunately, with the new vet school at Roseworthy now, that expertise is coming from all over the world. If you have not been out to the new veterinary school, talk to me or give the vet school a call. I am sure they would be more than happy to show you around the vet school. It is an absolutely fabulous facility, one that was a long time in coming. I studied in Western Australia and my daughter studied in New Zealand, but it is great to see that in 2013, in a couple of weeks' time, there will be 35 people graduating as doctors of veterinary medicine from that school at Roseworthy. It is a very proud position for South Australian education to be in, particularly the University of Adelaide and the veterinary profession in South Australia. Continuing with the AVA submission:

National recognition of veterinary registration has assumed increasing importance in the last decade with the growing need to remove obstacles to the delivery of cross-border veterinary services. In addition, one of the objectives is to allow greater competition within the veterinary services market. As production animal enterprises consolidate or specialise and performance animals travel to compete nationally, reforms which enabled the integrated delivery of veterinary services on an Australia-wide basis are vital to the profession meeting existing and future market demands for veterinary services.

In conjunction with the Australasian Veterinary Boards Council (AVBC) and Australia's Animal Health Committee, the AVA helped develop the model for national recognition of veterinary registration across Australia.

About the Model

The national model was developed with the following aims:

- ensure that veterinarians, registrable in Australia, can be registered to practise nationally on the basis of a single application and single fee, while retaining current arrangements as far as possible

- provide for simple and effective implementation within current Veterinary Surgeons Board structure, easily applicable in all jurisdictions
- progress nationally uniform categories of registration eg general and specialist registrants
- be achievable with minimal legislative amendment
- have minimal cost implications for the general public and be easy to administer.

To date New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania have implemented the model. The Northern Territory has made the interim step of removing fees for secondary registration until the review of the Act is completed.

Fortunately, now we are seeing this legislation before the house so that we can have a national system in place. Other amendments in this bill cover the composition of the board.

The bill proposes to expand the membership of the Veterinary Surgeons' Board to include a nominee from the University of Adelaide.

I mentioned the fact that my daughter Sahra is a vet in South Australia. She is working at a clinic of the University of Adelaide's veterinary hospital at Roseworthy and she is tutoring the fifth and sixth-year students, so she would be eligible to be on the Veterinary Surgeons Board if she wished. I put that forward so everybody is quite clear about what is in this legislation and what my family circumstances are.

The first cohort of students from the veterinary school will graduate at the end of this year. Having a nominee from the university on the Board will provide an invaluable understanding and appreciation of the competencies of a veterinarian on graduation. This will assist the work of the Board and influence the expectations and understanding that the Board has of recent graduates.

Other amendments cover the recognition of veterinary courses:

In recent years there has been greater co-operation between jurisdictions in the recognition of veterinary qualifications. This has been in recognition of the national labour market for veterinarians. All veterinary boards have agreed to the AVBC accrediting university veterinary schools. This facilitates all states then accepting veterinarians from these approved veterinary courses.

As each state recognises registration from another state, if one state allows registration from a university that is not accredited by the AVBC this will cause some difficulty. Currently, the South Australian act lists the Veterinary Surgeons Board as the body that approves university veterinary schools and also gives the minister the power to override the board's decisions if their university veterinary course is not approved at any stage.

The proposed amendments will bring South Australia into line with other jurisdictions by removing the ministerial review power and altering the Veterinary Surgeons Board's role from approval to recognition of qualifications. Under the national system there will be a system of suspending veterinarians, as there is now in the state system. However, with the national system there will be immediate notification across the country. In the AVA submission they point out, regarding the suspension of veterinarians, that:

While the board may suspend a veterinarian's registration following a disciplinary proceeding, the AVA recognises that there may be rare occasions that the board will need to temporarily suspend a veterinarian prior to the final determination. With this aim in mind, the amendment provides for the board to suspend the registration of a veterinary practitioner until any investigation is completed only if the board is of the opinion that it is necessary to do so because there is a serious risk that the health and safety of the public or the health and welfare of animals will be endangered.

As I said, the AVA strongly supports this piece of legislation. I know many of my colleagues, whom I speak to regularly, are very supportive and very keen to see this come in, because they are carrying out work not only in South Australia but also interstate and sometimes overseas.

The University of Adelaide also put out a note about this piece of legislation. There was a legal risks compliance and education awareness alert that came out in October that pointed out the amendments that were being made to the legislation and, obviously, it was very supportive of the changes. It is a great thing, a good thing to see for vets in South Australia.

For the information of the house I will give a quick overview of the number of vets in South Australia and the areas they are practising in; they are now not just your local vet but are vets working in specialist areas and in rural and regional areas. We should not forget the rural and regional vets, because biosecurity in Australia is a tremendously important issue. Should we get a case of foot-and-mouth disease in Australia that goes undetected there would be billions and billions of dollars worth of damage to our economy.

As at 30 June 2013 we had 799 registered vets in South Australia. Of them, 627 had primary registrations—in other words, they were full registrations and they could practise in the area of private practice—and there were 114 secondary registrations. Until now these were paying the secondary fee, which will no longer exist under this new legislation. The primary place of practice of these 114 secondary registrations was in other Australian states or territories.

There are 11 limited registrations. I had actually looked at going from a full primary registration to a limited registration myself, because while I have not been in general practice for a number of years, I do want to be able to continue to buy restricted drugs to treat my own animals, both my domestic animals and our own farm animals. That is something I am discussing with the Veterinary Surgeons Board at the moment.

There are 47 nonpractising vets, and these are vets who also want to retain that right to be able to treat their own animals and purchase medications that are restricted to licensed veterinarians. There are 28 vets in South Australia who are also on the specialist register, and I will give a bit of a breakdown of those specialities in a few moments.

An interesting fact is that in 2012-13, of the 120 applicants who were granted registration by the board, 86 registrations were from new registrants, which are new graduates. They came from all over the world: 56 from Australia, five from New Zealand, 20 from the United Kingdom, one from South Africa, one from Canada, two from the USA, and one from Utrecht. The 56 applicants who obtained their veterinary degrees in Australia came from the following universities: 13 from the University of Sydney; 14 from the University of Melbourne; seven from Charles Sturt University; 10 from the University of Queensland; four from James Cook University; and eight from my alma mater, Murdoch University, a terrific university.

As I said before, the exciting thing for us as vets in South Australia—and all South Australians should be excited about this—is that after six years of very, very hard work—three years of a Bachelor of Science in Veterinary Biosciences and then a three-year Doctorate of Veterinary Medicine—we have 35 young graduates about to be awarded their final degree in a couple of weeks' time. I look forward to going up and celebrating their valedictory moment with them. I have offered to donate a parliamentary medal to the student who has the highest merit in veterinary public health—an area the Minister for Health and I would know is very important for all of us, not just in veterinary public health but obviously human public health because they are very closely related.

The veterinary specialists we have in South Australia cover a far broader area than when I first came to practice in South Australia. In fact, we used to have a visiting veterinary ophthalmologist come from Victoria every now and again. We did have a veterinary radiologist we could send X-rays to interstate, but we had no real specialists of any sort here. There was one equine surgeon, I think: the late Harry Frauenfelder. Dr Bill Marmion, from down at Morphettville, came on the scene a bit later, but now we have specialists in everything from animal behaviour to equine medicine, sheep medicine, pathology, dermatology, diagnostic imaging, ophthalmology and pathobiology.

We have got a lot of good pathologists working in South Australia who are vital for those bloods and those work-ups on your cases and also for herd medicine. We have one specialist in veterinary public health and food hygiene working at the University of Adelaide, two veterinary radiologists and six veterinary surgeons who are specialising in equine surgery and small animal surgery. They are working both at the Adelaide Veterinary Specialist and Referral Centre at Magill and also at the University of Adelaide.

We do have an issue with veterinary radiologists in South Australia though. We are struggling to get the EPA to understand that you do not need to be qualified as a human radiologist to run a CT machine. That is something I will speak to the minister and the Minister for Environment and Conservation about at some other time.

There was one issue with this legislation that I raised because, initially, to run a veterinary practice you had to be a registered veterinary surgeon, and then the powers that be in the tax office and also on the Veterinary Surgeons Board saw the light and allowed vets in South Australia to register themselves and work under a trust or under a company. My wife and I formed a family company. We worked under that company, we were employed by that company and there were tax benefits for us in that, as well as being able to just structure the business in a slightly different way that was, as I say, of benefit to us.

On the initial reading of the legislation, it was not quite clear whether veterinary service providers—these trusts and businesses—would be part of this national scheme but, on speaking to ministerial advisers and some of my colleagues, that is not an issue, so I look forward to seeing this legislation work the way it was intended. The South Australian board will still continue to exist with that one extra member from the University of Adelaide.

That board will also contribute to the Australasian Veterinary Boards Council, which is, as I have said, consulting from a national perspective on the accreditation of veterinary schools, looking at vets who come from overseas and their overseas qualifications, looking at the uniform criteria for recognition of qualifications for registration and advising on specialty registration.

The world of veterinary science is a very broad area. It is an area that I always wanted to be involved in as a small child. I was very excited to get into Murdoch University on my third try, after having done some agricultural science at Adelaide University. I look forward to seeing how this legislation works.

I have a couple of other things I would just like to talk about regarding national registration, which is going to be the next step. One of the things I can proudly say I did was that I was the first practice in South Australia to computerise—to put all my records on computer on Netvet, as it was called then. We ran this system. It was very efficient for us and actually increased the profitability of the practice considerably. That was not the reason we did it: we did it for efficiencies and for retrieval of histories.

Those computer systems have now advanced considerably, but we need to recognise that with computers came the internet. I started up www.netvet.com.au. We were selling medications that you could sell—not the restricted medications but medications that could be sold over the counter—online many years ago. Had I developed it further, I could have made some money out of it but it was one of those things: you concentrate on the dogs and cats in front of you, not the virtual ones on the internet.

However, that brought into question and still brings into question the fact that you can get veterinary advice from all over the world. Can you be sued for giving the wrong advice? I don't know. If you were to receive veterinary advice from overseas and also be sent veterinary medications from overseas, as does happen, and then something went wrong, what do you do then? What is the fallback position?

I might remind the house that veterinary surgeons belonged to one of the first professions where you could not register unless you had professional indemnity insurance. That is a very good thing because there are times when things do go wrong and you need to have that protection. However, on a global registration system, do you need to have that protection? I think you should, and the internet is an area we are going to have to look at.

Very recently, I was fortunate enough to attend a conference, the International Large Animal Rescue Conference at Roseworthy's veterinary school. We had a professor of equine veterinary science from the University of London skyping with us and giving advice to us over the internet. At that end of it, he was giving advice to other vets. If he was giving individual advice to clients you might wonder what the legal position would be there. I am sure that is for lawyers to look at, and I would certainly be very surprised if they are not looking at that as we speak.

I will just use this International Large Animal Rescue Conference as a further example of where vets need to have the flexibility of being protected by being recognised, having their qualifications recognised and having their professional training recognised. With a veterinary emergency, be it an exotic disease or, in the case we were looking at on 2 and 3 of November this year at Roseworthy, it was large animal rescue. With the floods and bushfires and the need for vets to travel interstate to assist with the recovery and rescue of animals from floods and fires, we saw evidence at this conference, from vets from the eastern states, of horrendous injuries that were inflicted or suffered by animals during these floods and fires.

The need for vets to go over there and, at a moment's notice, assist in practices with native fauna, with domestic dogs and cats and also with farm animals was something that vets readily offered to do. Many of them went and many of them were over there for quite a while. They came from South Australia and other states. They also contributed to the social recovery of that area because as we all know we are very close to our pets, whether they are dogs, cats, horses, a pet goat or even a pet cow.

The Large Animal Rescue Course was put on by Horse SA, and I thank Julie Fiedler from Horse SA for having coordinated this course. Veterinary surgeons from all over the world came to this conference. There was one particular lady, Dr Rebecca Jimenez, from the US who is a world expert in large animal rescue and she was able to demonstrate and give us the benefit of her knowledge of techniques used in large animal rescue. We hope, as vets, that if we are faced with a disaster or with individual rescues, we can put that knowledge into place.

Certainly now with this legislation we know that we can travel all over Australia in all the states and territories—and I would hope in New Zealand eventually, too—because it is just a short distance across the ditch there. As I said, my daughter Sahra trained in New Zealand and then came back to South Australia to practise so I think we should have the ability to travel over there as well.

The importance of pets to our economy is in the billions of dollars. The importance of our farm animals to our economy is in the billions of dollars. We need vets who are highly trained and we need vets who are experienced and who can take the best advantage of the economic circumstances to set up practice and deliver services in a way that is not only desired by them as individuals but also is required by the society we live in.

This piece of legislation is good legislation. It is long overdue but we need to make sure it is going to work. We congratulate all those who were involved in developing the legislation. It is strongly supported by all members on this side and I look forward to seeing it work in the near future. With that, I look forward to being able to perhaps go back into practice once I finish in this place, in many years' time, and deliver my practice experiences to new graduates and younger vets, and also be able to do it anywhere I want in Australia.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:30): I rise to make some comments in regards to the Veterinary Practice (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2013 and note the Liberal Party's support for the bill. Very briefly, what the bill is about is mutual recognition. It is not a national registration scheme, but it is about mutual recognition across the states in recognising veterinary professionals' qualifications so they do not have to reregister either in a neighbouring state or elsewhere in Australia.

I think it is very sensible legislation in that regard, especially when you see how much of the country in South Australia obviously abuts other farmland, etc., that vets can deal with issues across borders. I specifically think about my electorate across from Pinnaroo and further south down through MacKillop and the electorate of Mount Gambier where vets more likely than not have to perform their duties on one side of the border or the other.

There are also some administrative changes in the bill which address whether the Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia can recognise courses or veterinary education on the recommendation of the Australasian Veterinary Boards Council. I think this will save duplication, whereas up until now the South Australian board has been independently approving such courses, and this legislation, when it becomes law, will remove that duplication.

I would also like to acknowledge the contribution that vets make to all of us, whether you are a pet owner or whether you are like me and have a property. In the past (40 years ago), we had a commercial Poll Hereford operation, and occasionally a vet had to assist in pulling a calf. It is quite interesting at the time, as a young lad on the farm, witnessing what happens when cattle get bloat. Essentially, the vet puts a knife into the right area—it has to go in the appropriate place in the beast—and they essentially deflate the cow, bull or steer.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes; that's right. It's very interesting and technical work and obviously it demands a high degree of training, but it is very vital in rural industries, especially in the management and health of your stock. Certainly in regard to pets—and I know that people can spend thousands of dollars on pets—vets help keep them in good health and repair broken limbs or other issues that they need to deal with to keep those pets healthy. Certainly a big step that has been taken in this state, as far as the education program for veterinary surgeons is concerned, is the school at Roseworthy, and this was a great leap forward, not just for training of vets but—

Ms Chapman: Thank Julie Bishop for that.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes; thank Julie Bishop—thank you to the member for Bragg. This is a great leap forward, because I had real concerns that over time Roseworthy was fast disappearing. We saw the wine school come into Waite and the farming disciplines out there wind back, and we

also saw the farm agriculture course taken away. I was really concerned that the agriculture education standing we certainly had in South Australia was going downhill, quite frankly. So it is with much pleasure in the last few years that I have seen the vet school get up and going.

They are doing great work out there. I know they have even studied fur seals up there which obviously have come from somewhere in the sea. They have quite an amazing set-up there, where they can operate on horses and large animals. This is great work, and I have witnessed some of the work when they have had dogs on the table at Roseworthy. This is fantastic, when I thought that Roseworthy was heading one way as far as an educational facility for the state was concerned, that it is onward and upward.

Having the veterinary school here meant that people who wanted to train to be a vet did not have to travel to Queensland or elsewhere to get those courses. It keeps our people in this state and hopefully they can take up those practices in this state. Especially in the country, you have longstanding veterinary surgeons and they become almost part of the family, because you get to know them at all odd hours of the day and night when they have to come out to emergencies. You are charged for those emergencies, I must say, but when you need them you have to have them, because the health of your stock is paramount.

I have seen some great work done by vets over the years, and I think there is plenty of work to go. I think we will produce some great veterinary surgeons at Roseworthy, and they will service the needs of people not just here in South Australia but across the country in years to come. It is a really great profession, helping people right across the state.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:36): As one ends the last week in one's career, one has to take the opportunity to make a contribution. On this issue, it is quite easy, because it is a subject that is pretty close to my heart. Can I commend the member for Morphett very much for his presentation today. More importantly than that, it is great to have a vet in the house, particularly since we do not have a doctor at the moment, I don't think. If we do not have a doctor, a vet is—

Mr Gardner: A medical doctor.

Mr VENNING: We don't have a medical doctor in the house, so the vet will do. Can I say how lucky I have been, that in nearly 24 years I have not had a sick day. There are days when you are not quite so flash, but the vet was here to give me the horse treatment and on we go.

Mr Pederick: He didn't get his gun out, did he?

Mr VENNING: Well, that was the end. If you can't be cured, you know what they do, don't you? You put him out of his misery. It did not come to that. I have appreciated the member's camaraderie and friendship and also his expertise in this area. How much passion he has in this area is obvious in relation to his speech. No doubt he is going to go back to that.

As a farmer, I always had a lot of respect and admiration for our veterinary surgeons, because we need them. There is nothing more stressing as a farmer than to have sick stock—nothing worse. Whether it be dairy cows or beef cattle, or whether it be horses that are sick and you do not know what is wrong with them, thank goodness we have a vet who will usually come at all hours of the night.

Yes, they can charge pretty well, but who minds? What price do you put on to try to save an animal? Particularly if you have a herd and you have one sick, you have to be very careful it does not go through the whole lot. I can remember many years ago we had leptospirosis in my herd of day-old calves. It was panic; absolute panic. The vet picked it straightaway, and we were able to save most of them.

I think the registration of vets is very important, and I hear what the member for Morphett has just said, but in times past, I realise that in isolated areas we had people practising as vets who were not registered. Just as well they were, because we just did not have enough people around. In my young days, much younger days, in the Gladstone area, we had a Mr Frank Landers, who learned the trade from his dad. His dad was a registered vet, from the very old days.

Frank Landers was quite legendary. He would come out in the old Holden Statesman with the old suitcase in the back and he would look at your sick animal. I have to say, 90 times out of 100, he got it right, and thank goodness. We all knew he was not registered, but thank goodness he was there, because Clare was the closest vet after him. That was well over an hour away. Frank would usually be there within 15 minutes. That was not always the case. It is good to have registered vets, but if there is nobody else available and if somebody has a bit of a track record, I

hope the system would allow some latitude for them to continue, because they do provide a great service.

Also, the member for Hammond just mentioned the new veterinary school at Roseworthy. Can I say how pleased I am that that is there and we have had an inspection of that because, as he said, Roseworthy was certainly being scaled down. I regretted very much the removal of the viticulture course, the head office and all the library section from there. It was going downhill every day.

I am pleased to see this veterinary school there, particularly the size and magnitude that it is and the expertise that it has. I am very pleased that the member's own daughter is there. Next time I have a sick dog, or whatever, I will be ringing up my good colleague to get a private consult. But I am very pleased that Roseworthy has this new lease of life.

It's good to see that the registration, and therefore the accreditation, of vets is being standardised across the country, because I think that says we are now a very mobile community. Particularly as the member was saying before, he would get on a plane and do the races at Randwick, and it is only a matter of an hour and a half and you are in a different state. So it is good to have some regularity in this, for the vets to say, 'Well, his accreditation is the same here as it is there.' At least it is recognised as such in each state.

We all have livestock and it is very important that we have our vets, but I think more important at my time of life is our dogs and our cats. I know that the member for Morphett has been very passionate about his dogs and cats and I think it has been reasonably lucrative business for him, but who cares. I think our dog is due for a parvo today. I think he is probably getting his parvo before the Christmas holidays. We are so attached to our animals and when they get sick we certainly need a vet. I commend the member for Morphett for bringing this to the house, and I hope he keeps his hand in with his practice because we certainly need good vets like him. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (11:41): I rise to speak on this Veterinary Practice (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. I think we should recognise that the result of this bill is not a national registration but rather recognition right throughout the country of the state registration so that veterinary surgeons will no longer have to register within each state.

The Australian Veterinary Association has been working on this with the various state jurisdictions since 2005 and according to them this nationally agreed model will allow veterinarians registered in other states or territories to practise in South Australia. It will remove red-tape, improve competition, increase access to specialist services and allow greater freedom of movement for veterinarians responding to national crises. Reciprocal legislation is already in place in Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania and Queensland.

I might say that within my own business we use vets from New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, depending on their expertise, and it has always seemed silly to me that those people have to be registered in every state to be able to practise.

This bit of legislation is very pertinent for the veterinary surgeons in Mount Gambier, because their client base actually goes a fair way into Victoria also, so they have always had to have registration in both South Australia and Victoria. With Victoria being only 20 kilometres from Mount Gambier, naturally a lot of the farms just across the border use the veterinary surgeons from Mount Gambier. This will take a lot of the costs away from those vets in having to have dual registrations and a lot of the red tape, etc., so to me it makes a lot of commonsense.

Also, I note in the bill that when interstate locums go to work for a veterinary surgeon it will be up to that veterinary surgeon to verify their identity and their credentials, so as far as I am concerned this bill is a step very strongly in the right direction and I will be supporting it.

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) (11:44): I thank honourable members for their contribution to the debate and their support of the bill.

Bill read a second time.

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) (11:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTOR VEHICLES (DRIVER LICENSING) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 November 2013.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:45): I rise to speak on the Motor Vehicles (Driver Licensing) Amendment Bill 2013 and indicate that the opposition is supporting this legislation. The bill has been debated and passed in another place, and minister Hunter, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, has steered the passage of that bill through the other place.

The opposition had presented an amendment to provide for the exemption that would be granted under the processes of this bill to be conditional upon the completion of an intensive drivers education course and an assessment of competency. That amendment has been rejected by the government and, accordingly, the bill before us is in its original form.

The opposition is very disappointed that the amendment has been rejected in circumstances where the presentation of this bill for our consideration and the information provided in briefings all clearly aligned with the recognition of the importance of an educative role being played in the event of the exemption being granted in circumstances which we accept.

I will just outline the purpose of the bill for our house. The government claimed that there were a number of impediments to those in Aboriginal communities—in particular the APY and MT lands—being able to access, obtain and retain employment opportunities when they were resident on the lands, and they were not able to access driver's licences, or they had but had lost them, and circumstances prevailed where they were disadvantaged as a result of those circumstances.

On this side of the house we fully recognise that education is a very important passage and pathway to opportunities in life. We also recognise that a driver's licence is often a passport to having success. What are the problems? The government says that the process of obtaining a driver's licence in South Australia through a graduated licensing scheme is onerous, expensive and inalienable to many people who live on these remote communities. Why is this the case?

The government acknowledges that there are difficulties in complying with the graduated licensing scheme, most specifically the requirement for 75 hours of supervised driving experience having to be undertaken before the young person can proceed along this graduated scheme. The house is familiar with our graduated licensing scheme, because we have only recently debated legislation to introduce even more layers of compliance that are necessary and, from our side at least, some unnecessary and onerous aspects to which we are opposed.

But, we all agree, I think, in this house, on the importance of people who are learning to drive to have as much opportunity as possible to do that in a cost-effective way, over a period of time during that vulnerable period of being at risk when they are just learning to drive, especially after the L-plate period, where one has a responsible adult, perhaps a parent or older sibling, in the car helping the new driver learn the ropes. In that first 12 months of the P1, we understand the significance of the vulnerability in that period.

So, what has happened is that in having a graduated licensing scheme, which goes from L-plates to P1 to P2, now under the government's recent bill there is going to be a restriction one way or the other until you are about 20 if you started this exercise when you turned 16. That is a very long period of time, and part of that process is to have 75 hours of supervised driving experience in the first tranche.

There are some aspects of this scheme that are not required in remote or rural areas already. For example, my understanding is that the hazard test, which under the recent amendments was brought forward, needed to be undertaken at the local Services SA office on a computer at the time of transition from the L-plate to the P1-plate. We are happy with that, but that is not a process which I understand is necessarily imposed in remote parts of South Australia, because quite clearly there is not a Services SA office out there in reasonable proximity for people.

So, for that little aspect of it, there are already some exemptions, so I do make the point that it is quite a long period and there are a number of steps that mostly young people—but some

of course start this later in life—have to progress through to be able to acquire their driver's licence. There is a limitation of access to services, which I have touched on. We agree that, in remote parts of South Australia (and particularly the APY and MT lands are classic areas), there is limited access to services.

The government also points out that there is the cost of progressing through the licensing system. I almost had to laugh when I read that, actually, because whose fault is that? The cost of actually undertaking these levels is onerous, and of course it is even more onerous if you go along to each of these steps and you fail certain steps and have to pay the fee again and come back and make another appointment and the like. So, these processes are not cheap and, of course, if one is on a limited income—a pension or a low income—then that is even more of a financial burden to them.

There is the limited access to roadworthy vehicles, and we agree that probably in the Aboriginal areas that we are talking about, in the APY and MT lands, this would be a challenge, not because there are not roadworthy vehicles up there—there are actually lots of vehicles up there—but they are not necessarily accessible to young Indigenous youths who are living on the lands. They may be owned and operated by government representatives, or they may be for people who are traversing the lands.

Just because there are plenty of vehicles up there it does not necessarily mean they have access to them. Certainly, if they are owned within families on the lands, there is the issue as to whether they are in a sufficiently roadworthy state to be a useful tool to learn to drive in and of course to be tested in.

Then there is the cessation of business orders on the client files of a number of residents. As I understand the process, which I assume is still the case, when someone is convicted of an offence—it may have nothing to do with driving offences; completely unrelated, in fact—if fines are issued and penalties apply, a failure to meet with the fine obligations can ultimately result in a cessation of business order, which means that the person then cannot be served.

You cannot actually go into a Service SA office and say, 'I want to progress the next stage of my driver's licence,' because they have a bar on them that restricts them from being able to access that continued service. Part of the penalty process is that, until you have paid your fine and the cessation of business ordered is removed, you cannot get access to further services. Obviously, if someone had a COB order on them, that would be an impediment for someone being able to progress.

Difficulties have been raised in acknowledging a notice of disqualification within the required time. That speaks for itself. There are difficulties in booking a practical driver's test. I do not understand why that would be particular, unless it is to a specific agency, but I suspect that is more a question of accessibility to supervising drivers or qualified persons. Next, they say there are increased costs and complexities associated with obtaining a driver's licence from a remote community. We agree with that.

There is not too much that does not have an increased cost or is more complex as a result of being in a remote regional community. This is just one of many, to be honest. Even an apple costs a lot more, obviously, because it has to be transported in a refrigerated vehicle to be available on the lands. Of course, there is massive extra cost in logistics and transport for just about everything. Distance can be a significant threshold in raising a barrier against accessibility.

We are told there are language barriers. I do not think that is unfair. Again, it would cross a number of areas where children may not be sufficiently proficient in English to be able to understand all the tests that are required to be followed through if one were living in the city. I think it is fair to say, though, that on the occasions I have visited the APY lands there is a high level of understanding amongst the younger children of the English language for those who are attending school. Indeed, a number of these children do have an opportunity to travel to Adelaide.

Some are resident under our Wiltja program, which provides education at the Woodville school and which provides children with a number of opportunities. I think it is fair to say that, of the 3,000-odd people who are living in the APY lands, for example, an enormous number of that population are mobile, have sometimes come from other regions and are not necessarily Anangu people. In any event, we accept there is sometimes a language barrier.

Then, of course, there is the lack of qualified supervised driving personnel to train L-plate drivers on the land and a lack of understanding of the driver licensing-related requirements. So,

there are a number of thresholds that effectively become barriers to a younger group in the community being able to acquire or have reinstated a driver's licence. The importance of a driver's licence, when someone wants to live in a remote area and there is not necessarily employment in that area—or, even if there is, it requires a vehicle to travel to and from that work or to do that work—is probably self-evident.

The reason the opposition is agreeable to progressing this significant exemption and granting the minister the power to grant an exemption to overcome some of these hurdles is, I think, in direct response to the fact that we accept there is a need and we accept that the government's position, in the work it has done on this, has justified us granting the minister this power. We also agree with the process, that is, that it be by ministerial exemption.

What is very puzzling to us is the government's refusal to add into this process of exemption the condition of having an intensive driver education course, as it has described it, and an assessment of competency. In everything we have been presented with, there has been an understanding of and proposals put regarding the need for the exemption (for all the reasons it has said), and that it would be coupled with and supported by a different approach; namely, that there would be some form of intensive driver education.

Over the course of the development of this we had briefings—and I thank those from the department who provided those briefings—on the bill, and they recognised that there was clearly going to be provision for a road safety education and intensive driver training program. We were not only told about it, we were given the detail of how it was going to work. We were pleased to hear the process that would be undertaken, and that there would be access to a training facility.

I made a note of the particular facility that was being developed on the lands to accommodate this. The training centre—which, if not already open, is to be opened at Umuwa on the APY lands—would have personnel retained to provide the course and would have access to vehicles for the purposes of the course. There was an indication that the cost would be something like a million dollars a year for the first 12 eligible persons, as nominated by elders in the community, to do the training and complete that work.

These are young men who are over 20, so they are not as young as those we would normally be starting out on a graduated licensing scheme, but they are people who would be nominated as being suitable. Funds would be necessary for them, and there would be \$120,000 to provide some process for them to be exempt.

I found it extraordinary. I should say the language of the minister, in his contribution to the parliament, is always on the basis that we need to provide a streamlined, different pathway for these people. 'For all these reasons, it is important that they have their licence, and we can do it if we bring in the personnel, if we give them some incentive and training and provide them with a car to do it in. These are all the necessary ingredients that will cost money, but we are going to be committing to do this.'

I suppose the only inconsistency with all of that is that I subsequently had a meeting with representatives of the Motor Accident Commission. When I raised with them the importance of their contribution to road safety and being able to help support this scheme, which we understood was in the form of a fund that could be accessed to do it, their indication was that that would not be happening and they would not be financing this.

It is not for us on our side of the house to say where government gets its money from. We like to have it disclosed in the budget each year but, if the Motor Accident Commission are saying to us that it is not going to be available and that occurs, then who is going to pay for this and where is it going to come from and out of what budget, or is the government planning to simply allow these applicants to have a licence with no threshold, with no training, with nothing?

That would be easy. A minister could simply say, 'Give me the 12 names. They have been nominated; we will just simply sign them off. We will ask them to do a bit of extra training down the track, but we will give them a licence.' They might be 25, they might have had a licence and lost it, they might be disqualified from being able to access it for one of the other reasons I have said, or they may be in a situation where they have never applied for a licence, they have not got much money, they have not got their own car, but it is known that they have been driving around and they think they will be okay.

So, you get someone to sign a form to say that these are the nominated people and that the minister would like you to sign a form here granting exemption with no actual threshold of

training or assessment being necessary. Now, that is a concern, because that would be entirely inconsistent with what has been presented by the government and in briefings, but we raise it as a concern because the very source of the funds to actually support such an initiative at a cost of \$1 million a year are saying they are not going to be providing for it.

It is true that the government has had the benefit of the generosity of the Motor Accident Commission for this year's budget. The government says that the Motor Accident Commission had a really good year—it is like having a good crop—so it decided that the Motor Accident Commission would give \$100,000 to the government for road safety initiatives. This is the way it has been described by the government.

The Motor Accident Commission says, 'Yes, we are happy.' Did it actually have any say about how it was going to be applied? 'No.' Anyway, whatever happened, the government has got the \$100 million out of the Motor Accident Commission, it has got its hands on that money and spent \$52 million of it on projects it has identified as being road safety initiatives, and there is another \$48 million sitting in a fund, waiting to be allocated by a new task force—which, I think, has now actually been put together by the government—to apply the balance. Can it come out of that? Apparently not.

I am at a bit of a loss because we are told one thing and clearly the situation is another. That does not mean that the government cannot find the \$1 million a year to do this. However, the fact that they have resisted our saying, 'Look, you can set conditions for these things and we think as the minister it is reasonable for you to be able to set conditions', at the very least, surely, if their intent is genuine, they would say, 'Yes, a driver intensification course; a snapshot collapsed into an intensive period of training; have a test to see that you are up to standard.' You would think that would be a basic condition that the government would accommodate. No, it has not. There is not much point in our putting it up again: we can count and we know we cannot win that argument here.

We are not going to reject the proposal to make it easier for people who are disadvantaged, young people in this situation who are disadvantaged on the APY and MT lands. We are not going to do that, but we are very disappointed that the government, when it had the opportunity to really secure what it said the situation was going to be in the legislation, has backed away from it at 100 miles. It is quite disappointing and it is also not very helpful in the lawmaking process here which time and time again we have been victims of because of them indicating one thing and then really delivering up another.

It does not give us a lot of confidence that they are genuinely interested in ensuring that we give these young people an opportunity. Could it just be that they are picking up this project, an excellent idea, and trotting it in a few months before an election? That is possible—have not actually worked out where we are going to get the money from yet but we just need to push this through. It would be very disappointing if that is in fact their objective here because we think there is merit in the process of providing some exemption.

Again, I am a little sceptical about what the government's motive is in introducing this. I do not see this as an issue of road safety, although the road safety minister has the passage of this bill in this house. In fact, without conditions specified in the bill—for example, of having the intensive driver training—it is totally inconsistent with the road safety message that the government presented to us as a parliament just weeks ago when it insisted that we tighten up and add more layers or levels to the graduated licensing scheme.

Identify the circumstances, the geographical barriers for these people and recognise that we could work out a new program that is not all 'one size fits all'—a great idea—but they were in here preaching to us only weeks ago that it was necessary to take all P1 drivers off the road between midnight and 5am. There was a major road safety issue attached to this. We needed to act to ensure that we protect the lives of young people, and one of the initiatives was that we take them off the road between midnight and 5am.

Sure, they added some conditions in under pressure and all those things but the message was very clear: road safety is the highest priority of this government blah, blah, blah. We heard it all. Hang the inconvenience—so what if young people's parents in the country have to get out of bed in the middle of the night; so what if they had to rely on other people? That is one message to us—and we accepted a number of the initiatives. We have consistently accepted initiatives that we think are of demonstrative benefit to young people learning to drive. That is why we have actually

ended up with quite a long and intensive process relative to what we did, of course, in the generation of most of the people sitting in this room.

I do not know about you, Mr Deputy Speaker, but it was a little bit easier in the days when we got a licence. I think I remember driving to the police station at 16, and pulling up and the local constable came out and said, 'We'll just drive around the block, Vickie, and we'll come in and get your licence.' This was quite normal. It is very important that we recognise that, because of the age group vulnerability the statistics in our fatalities in particular, but also in serious injuries, we should do something about it.

We have acquiesced to this. We recognise the importance of that. However, on the flipside, they come in here and say, 'Let's introduce a program that's going to strip away all these other layers that we say are an impediment to this particular disadvantaged group.' And we say, 'Yep, that's a very good idea, because we recognise the importance of the licence.' Yet they do not allow to be put with it the necessary prerequisite, that we see, for there being a balance between the opportunity to drive and get a job, or keep a job, or do a job, and the road safety imperative that goes with it.

The government has announced, with some very significant federal government funding, the upgrading of the main road into the APY lands based on road safety requirements, initiatives that are part of the road safety agenda. These are all important things when the government wants to say, 'We care about road safety.'

Well, if they care about the road safety of the young people that they are proposing to give a licence to they would commit, and they would say to this parliament, 'Yes, we have allocated the money for this; yes, we will ensure that the eligible persons who apply for this, or who are nominated from the community, are given the support that they will need to be able to have these exemptions,' otherwise, we are just completely dismissing the importance of the road safety and protection of this particular group, as if they are not disadvantaged enough.

The government themselves, in their own contribution, have highlighted the high level of data of young people being representative in our fatality and injury statistics. It is absolutely puzzling to me, perhaps it is because they have not really thought about the detail, and they are keen to try and look like they really care about this project. I do not think that it is a situation where the idea of providing this extra intensive training, and the idea of the importance of giving people access to a licence to be able to get employment and the like, has just suddenly dropped out of the sky.

This is not some light bulb moment that somebody has published in the middle of this year, with the government thinking it is a great initiative—'We will see if we can get some support from the opposition, we'll go ahead with it.' Oh, no; this whole concept has been around for years, and it just seems as though the government has been kicking and screaming in coming to the barrier on this. I could project that perhaps it is the fact that it is under the era of new minister for Aboriginal affairs, the Hon. Ian Hunter, in the other place, that there is some enlightenment on this. This is an issue that has been brought to the attention of our government many times, and over the last few years in particular submissions have been presented.

I wish to acknowledge, as indeed minister Hunter did in another place, the work of the Palya fund and trust. This is a group of trustees who operate a trust on behalf of some of the arts community on the APY lands, and they do great work. It is my understanding, briefly, of the material that they publish that they are a body that is interested in encouraging Aboriginal people, local people, to have projects and ideas to resolve the health and problems that they might have in their communities and to raise funds to apply to those projects.

For the transparency and accountability requirements, they have a board of trustees. Judge Peter McCusker is one who I am aware is a trustee, and who has for years now been promoting a number of projects for the advancement of people in that community. One of the most important has been the Mutuka project, which is for training young Anangu people to obtain employment as drivers.

Members would probably be aware that in the APY lands, for example, at present there is a major camel project. It is different ways of dealing with a pest problem in the desert, namely, the huge numbers of camels and the destruction to the desert community. You cannot drive trucks or work in the rounding up of the camels, which are ultimately taken to the Peterborough meatworks, unless you have a driver's licence to get to work or to drive the trucks or to be in the field providing for this.

You cannot provide supply trucks for things in or out, whether it is art supplies or food coming in, or other produce going out—the artwork and so on that is done—unless you have a driver's licence. Whether you are driving a car, a truck or a utility, you need to have that as a prerequisite. As I understand it, the Mutuka project ('mutuka' being the Pitjantjatjara for the word 'motor car') is one which provides the training. It is conducted under the instruction of qualified people, of course. It teaches training in vehicle care and basic maintenance, and it trains people how to drive different types of vehicles.

You only have to live in a remoter part of South Australia to understand the importance of understanding how to operate a vehicle and change the oil and a tyre and all the necessary things if you are living in a remote area. Great; this is very important. One of my sons says he does not need to learn to change a tyre because that is what we have the RAA for. That may be so, but for people who live in remote parts of the state, it is very important that they learn these skills.

The Palya Trust has been very active in this field in developing this project, because they understand the importance of giving these young people an opportunity. There are others in the community, particularly in the transport industry. I think Ray Scott is another one who has been active in this space to try to give young people a chance to pursue a career, but they need a driver's licence. For so many opportunities, it is a prerequisite.

I thank Judge McCusker and others who have been presenting this over a number of years now. I appreciate at least that the current minister, the Hon. Ian Hunter, has taken up the initiative, but there does need to be some accountability, I suggest, for the failure to agree to the importance of having the testing. I just conclude by saying that we were presented with the project being operative in the Northern Territory, of a similar nature. They provide training. Interestingly, they do not provide it in Alice Springs. They provide it along the coast and in some other areas where there are job opportunities, rather than in remote parts.

My understanding is that when this initiative was first flagged, it was actually flagged to be an option available in the northern suburbs and at Port Augusta where there would be automatic access to other types of employment, certainly a more diverse opportunity of employment. That would be logical actually but, nevertheless, the government has decided they will present this as an initiative in the APY lands and MT lands. That is fine, but they do need to dedicate the funds to do it and they do need to ensure that the training facility is resourced with people to train and the vehicles to be able to train in before they progress this initiative.

I will conclude by saying that there is quite a bit of industry amongst the community who live on the APY lands, nowhere near enough perhaps, but it is fair to say that there has been an extraordinary advance in the work in arts, particularly on the APY lands. When I first visited Ernabella when I was a young girl in about 1976, I went down there from Alice Springs with a truckload full of art supplies because my grandmother lived in the Northern Territory and she had an art gallery and art supplies business.

I can remember driving down in a non-air-conditioned truck and it took forever but, anyway, we got down there. This was pre the APY act. Obviously this area had the support of the Lutheran community that operated at Ernabella and I have to say it was a very different environment. There was a little school there. I remember it because I can remember taking in boxes of paints and paintbrushes as we unloaded the truck.

Thirty years later I went back to the same town. It had changed its name to Ernabella. It was still geographically a very beautiful place, but I was shocked to see how the built infrastructure in that environment had changed. A new aged-care facility had been built there and there had been some other infrastructure developed. On recollection, there had been a problem with the health clinic that had been burnt down and a few other things. All of that side was disappointing, but what was really encouraging to see was that with the elder women particularly in the community and in the other towns, such as Fregon, there had been a pulling together, there had been a strengthened resilience, there had been an advancement of the arts opportunities amongst those communities.

It was fantastic to see because they had diversified, not just to paintwork and woodwork, which had been more common in the mid-seventies, but to many other types of art with different textiles and fabrics, and I was immensely impressed at what had been occurring. It just seemed to be able to give an enormous amount of energy to an enterprise which they clearly loved to do and which could generate income and self worth in those communities to be able to advance some economic independence which is consistent with the Palya trust's objective and that is that the

local people work out solutions and work towards those solutions themselves. That was immensely encouraging.

Where good people, like Judge Peter McCusker, have worked to ensure that we give those people an opportunity and encourage the advancement of that, we on this side of the house support that, but we do say that, if you want to change the rules, if you want to be able to modify this very significantly—here we are going to give the minister complete power to be able to grant the exemptions and to be able to grant the licences for all the reasons we have discussed—then at the very least there must be this commitment of the resources to do it. We think that should be in the legislation because at this point there is little trust left when we get told one thing and then the money starts to evaporate around us. That is deeply disappointing, and we want that commitment to be given.

If the minister says today, 'We don't want to have it in the legislation. We want to be able to keep the flexibility. We'll set all that by regulation down the track,' let him say that, but we say that it is critical that we do not let these people go out to pursue their opportunity of employment with their driver's licence without the protection of those two qualifying features to protect passengers in their vehicles or other road users with whom they might share the road.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:30): I rise on behalf of the people of Stuart to make quite a few brief points. The APY lands are not in the electorate of Stuart but there is a strong connection between the electorate of Stuart and a range of Aboriginal communities, including the APY lands. Certainly I have had a reasonably strong connection with that area in the past through my former business interests on the Stuart Highway and, of course, a bit with regard to the Natural Resources Committee since coming into parliament.

I will first say very clearly that the opposition supports the intent of this legislation and compliments Judge McCusker for pushing it along. He was, among others, the person who brought it to people's attention. I was very fortunate to meet with Judge McCusker and the Leader of the Opposition Steven Marshall to discuss this several months ago. Certainly the two key aspects were trying to improve safety and also trying to improve opportunities for employment. There are others, but they are really the two that stand out to me as the key opportunities here, and they are supported by myself and my opposition colleagues.

The issue that the member for Bragg mentioned, that there should perhaps be a heightened focus on intensive training and on capacity testing, is quite important. She also mentioned the issue of cost and where the cost is coming from. I will not go back over all of that, but that is an important issue, not that the cost would not be justified but that, of course, the cost needs to be well spent. It needs to be effectively spent. If you are not giving the very best training available and if you are not testing the people who have undertaken that training, then obviously the cost will not be as well spent as it could be.

I think there would have to be some guidelines with regard to how often a person gets to participate in a program such as this. The delivery of a program to the appropriate person would be terrific, but if for some reason they do not actually make it through the program, if they do not attain the skills or the right attitude necessary, do you give them one chance, two chances or three chances? There would have to be a cut-off point where you would say to this person, 'You have been given this opportunity and you haven't grasped it with both hands in the way we had hoped you would, so we're now going to give it to somebody else. You won't get another go.' Determining where that point in time is is going to be difficult, but I think it is important that that certainly does happen.

Past the point at which ideally a program such as this is put into place, I think it is very important that the community—and I use that word in an all-encompassing fashion—then accepts that adherence to the standard road rules and obligations of being a licensed driver in a registered roadworthy car must be applied across the whole landscape. I think that is a very important thing. I know from personal experience that, number one, that is not the case and, number two, that it is very difficult to make it the case. I do not underestimate for a second how hard that is.

But, I think if a program and an opportunity like this is put into place, to allow Aboriginal people on the lands to essentially lift their game, to get a training opportunity, to take that training opportunity and learn to drive responsibly both in a practical, hands-on way but also with regard to attitude, that once that has been delivered and once it is thrown out and accepted, then it would be appropriate to take a much harsher view with regard to the application of existing laws with regard to people driving unregistered cars or driving unlicensed. I think that goes hand in hand: you give

an opportunity to get away from the difficult circumstances that there are at the moment, but then it is perfectly fair to apply the rules that exist at the moment, as well. I think that is a very important aspect that must be applied here.

It would be remiss of me not to touch very briefly on the coincidence with other non-Aboriginal people living in remote South Australia. I do not suggest that they get access to the same sort of program, because I do think that generally the opportunities to learn to drive that are available for non-Aboriginal people in remote South Australia are sufficient. I think there are other issues that need to be addressed. For example, it is exceptionally difficult for a person living on a remote station in South Australia to get their vehicle inspected and given the tick of approval if, for some reason, it is found not to be roadworthy.

It is a very difficult practice indeed for a person who, quite appropriately, finds that their Toyota ute or whatever it happens to be is not roadworthy. They have a sticker on it and they are given a little bit of time to sort it out, but it is actually not that simple to get it inspected and brought back up to standard. So, I think that is something that needs to be addressed, but, with regard to the training, I think the access for non-Aboriginal people in equally remote parts of the state to get a licence is actually sufficient. It is not easy, but we do not need a special program for those people. There are some other things that need to be improved for those people.

With regard to this training program, I think it is a very positive thing. I would like to just touch on the legislation that has recently gone through the house here with regard to the extra rules and regulations applying to L and P-plates. The house and the minister know very well my views on that. I certainly did support some of those and I certainly did oppose some of those additional obligations, but I guess it would very important to know that those additional obligations that have been brought out to apply to South Australia would also apply equally to all people on the Aboriginal lands, and I say again, all people on the Aboriginal lands who have had the opportunity to go through a program like this, or for whom it has been deemed that the program would not be appropriate for one reason or another.

For me, it is a fantastic program and opportunity and quite appropriate, but once the opportunity has been given, all regular obligations that would be expected to apply anywhere, from King William Street all the way to the top of the Stuart Highway, Mount Gambier or Port Lincoln, should then start to be applied on the Aboriginal lands, as well. I think this is going to be a very important thing.

I guess I would also just say from the bottom of my heart that I would encourage any young man or woman who gets this opportunity on the lands to take it, grab it, do everything you possibly can. If there is going to be a program where appropriate vehicles, trainers and testing are going to be available for you so that you can get a driver's licence and so that you can start to access many of the opportunities that come with having a driver's licence, whether you live in suburban Adelaide, country South Australia or remote South Australia, please take this opportunity with both hands. It is a very important opportunity, and I really do encourage anybody on the lands who has the chance to do it to do so.

I would also like to just ask this house and also people who would provide this program and the people who would avail themselves of this program on the lands to consider what might be an unintended consequence of this opportunity, as well. It is fantastic for people to get a driver's licence and fantastic for them to be able to improve significantly their chances of getting employment, because really, until you have a regular income, it is impossible for somebody's life to really become all it can be.

It does not matter whether you are a disadvantaged person in metropolitan Adelaide or a disadvantaged person in remote South Australia, that is equally true. However, what is not equally true is that it is very likely that, if a young Aboriginal man or woman accesses regular full-time employment while they live on the Aboriginal lands, they may well move away from the Aboriginal lands. I am not saying that is a problem, but I am asking everybody who considers this issue to think about that very clearly.

It may well be that an unintended consequence of this program is that some of potentially the best and the brightest who will take the opportunity and succeed through this opportunity, with the best intentions of trying to improve the life and opportunities of all the people living on the lands, might move away from the lands and decide to pursue a broader life away and off the community.

No doubt, for those people that would be a fantastic opportunity that they would choose and take voluntarily, and if they did that I would respect their decision. I would say, 'Fantastic. Please, do whatever you want with your life. Make it as good as it can possibly be.' However, it might be that some of the people who remain on the lands lose their family members, their friends and potentially some of the best and brightest. That might be an unintended consequence of this. I think that is something that needs to be considered very carefully as well.

I certainly support the intent of this program. I strongly recommend that, once it is in place and people have had the opportunity, people on the lands driving unregistered vehicles and/or without a driver's licence must genuinely face the same outcomes as people who are doing that anywhere else. We must also consider the possibility that, through opportunity for individuals on the land, they might choose to leave the land, and there are a whole range of positives and negatives that go with that.

The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (12:42): I, of course, rise to support this measure, as the APY lands have been a very big part in my life over the last 16 years as the local member. I have spent many, many weeks in the APY lands over this time and am still learning about the APY lands, the people, the culture and the issues. I have had concern in the past about driver's licences and some of those issues, because it has been very difficult for the people in the lands.

I have had a sort of love/hate relationship over the years with the people of the APY lands (Anangu) because I have represented the government, but I have always tried to do my best for the people there, understood their issues and worked as hard as I could, and it has certainly caused me a lot of grief in my time. I believe that so many of the issues can be sorted out quite simply, but bureaucracy often takes over. There are cultural issues and often legal issues, and tardiness prevents some of these things from happening. It still amazes me that this is the case.

However, I believe this measure is a very positive measure that will assist those people. Often there are a lot of problems through lack of understanding of the culture, the people and certainly of the isolation. Most public servants, ministers, journalists, etc. fly in and they do not understand how far away it is from both Adelaide and Alice Springs, which tends to be more of a centre for them rather than Adelaide. People do lack that understanding of the isolation of where they are actually living and the transport problems, etc. that occur because of that.

I have to say that in my 16 years in parliament I have certainly seen some great changes in what is happening there. While it is very confronting for somebody who goes to the lands for the first time at this stage, I can truly say that I have seen some immense changes and I am pleased that this has happened. I am not going to walk away and say that we have solved their problems, because certainly we have not, but I am heartened by the changes and by the attitudes in what is happening there are present.

I ask that those people who go there who become instant experts, after spending a couple of hours in the lands, back off, and that they always consult the people of the lands. They should always respect the elders who are there, they should respect the elected hierarchy there, and they should particularly look to and talk to the women, who are, I believe, the backbone of the APY lands.

Consultation is a very difficult process when you are working there, but it is achievable. People often think they can go there and solve things in one session, a couple of hours, but that is not the way things work in the APY lands or in Aboriginal culture. You need to sit down and you need to talk to them, you need to listen to what they are saying, and you need to wait.

You cannot do it quickly, and I think that is a mistake that governments have made for many years, particularly when working with communities like the APY lands. There is a different culture at work there. We make instant decisions because that is what we do as a Western culture; we make those instant decisions, but that does not work on the APY lands or any of the other Aboriginal communities that we have in this state.

I have known some wonderful people in the APY lands over my years, many of them now 'finished', as we say. These are Anangu people as well as people who have worked in the APY lands. When I first started those who worked in the APY lands were always accused of being 'missionaries, mercenaries or misfits'. That certainly was the case, and it caused many problems; however I believe this has changed now.

I see a whole new generation of people working there, people who do understand what is happening there and who are doing incredible jobs against all odds, because they are very isolated

and are a long way from anywhere. They do not have things at their fingertips like we do, who are further south. There are people like Mark Weaver, who is one in particular that I will single out. He was a police officer (an ex police officer now) who is working in the lands. He does amazing work there, and he really does understand—

Mr Venning: Policeman of the Year.

The Hon. L.R. BREUER: Yes, he was a Policeman of the Year at one stage in South Australia. He is working up there and doing some amazing work. People like him, who do understand what it is all about, are wonderful. I have singled him out but I can name many, many others; he is just a great example of somebody who has devoted his life to the police force, worked in Coober Pedy with Aboriginal people and who decided to move into the lands. He has done some amazing work there.

With people like him, and others who are working there, I believe we can only go forward from now on. So I certainly support this sort of legislation, and I hope there will be other legislation like this that comes in. I believe it can improve prospects and, therefore, people's lives. Having a driving licence, etc., does make a difference to them. I say 'Ngapartji, ngapartji,' which sort of means 'You get back what you give,' and I think that is important for us to always keep in mind when we are working with the lands.

Working in the APY lands has been an incredible experience for me over the last 16 years, and I have certainly learned so much. One of my greatest honours was to become a Yankunytjatjara woman when I was given my Aboriginal name, worked with the women and went through the business there. I think that will always be my greatest honour during my time in parliament, apart from becoming the first woman Speaker.

However, I did get a great understanding of what goes on there. I hope I will be able to continue to work in the APY lands and with Aboriginal people. I think we really need to now seriously look to the future—what do they need, what else can we do to assist them—and go from there.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:48): I want to commend the member for Giles for her fine speech. I found it most interesting. Driver's licences have been discussed many times in my time here, and I also commend the member for Bragg for her representation here this morning—and, indeed, on her wider role as the opposition spokesperson on transport and infrastructure.

I agree with the bill, and the need for it to help support Aboriginal people on the lands to obtain or regain a licence whilst ensuring driver standards and road safety outcomes are maintained. I have visited the lands on two occasions, and have found the place not only beautiful but also very challenging in relation to meeting the people there. It is a beautiful part of our state; we have not given these people some of our wastelands. It is certainly a magic place.

I have difficulty understanding why the average person cannot go there without a permit—I still have difficulty with that. I think it would help everybody if people could go there because they would appreciate the lands, they would appreciate the people there, and I am sure that the population at large would be a lot more sympathetic to what happens on those lands—likewise, with a bill like this.

I urge the people living on the lands to take the opportunity to avail themselves of the repercussions of this bill. We support this legislation and, in due course, our Aboriginal people, but with an amendment that there be a conditional exemption. The exemption will be conditional upon the completion of an intensive driver education course and assessment of competency.

As I think the member for Stuart just said, I would like to take the opportunity to say it is not just the people on the lands who have great difficulty in getting a driver's licence or renewing a driver's licence. When I got my licence many, many years ago, before most of you were born, I just did a driver's test with the local policeman at the Crystal Brook police station, and that was only three or four days after I had passed the questionnaire, which we all knew because it was the same questionnaire. You even knew the questions, so it was not that difficult. There was a minimal fee that was practically nothing.

I got my truck licence up-front, so I had the policeman sitting alongside me in a truck as I drove around the town. It was a big truck. It was a five-tonne truck, which was big in those days. I was like so many other country people who had come off the farm and had been driving for between six and eight years around the farm before sitting for the licence at the age of 16.

Today, these same people with the obvious driving skills have to go through the same driver education course as everybody else. I believe that applicants should have the opportunity to prove their proficiency first up, so they do not have to go through the whole course. Certainly, there are things in that course they should all do, particularly in relation to road safety, road rules and the competency of being able to use blinkers and things like that because, on the farm, those sort of things get missed out.

Certainly, they have to show competency in those things but, in relation to being able to handle a vehicle confidently, brakes and all those things, I think that there should be a shortcut for those people who can prove that they are competent. Many of these people live in an isolated area of our state, in similar areas to the lands, and they have the same problems as those mentioned in this bill. I will just talk about the difficulties that they can have in relation to getting a licence:

- difficulties in complying with the GLS requirements, in particular the 75 hours of supervised driving experience;
- the limited access to services;
- the cost of progressing through the licensing system;
- the cessation of business orders on client files with fines, which are often unrelated to driving offences, that compound to make payment of fines and removal of CRBs affordable;
- difficulties in acknowledging a notice of disqualification within the required time;
- difficulties in booking a practical driver's test; and
- increased costs and complexities associated with obtaining a driver's licence in a remote community and other factors of isolation which cause them some grief.

The other problem with this is the cost of it. We encourage people to get a driver's licence. We want everybody to be licensed and registered, but consider what it costs today to get a driver's licence. This morning, I asked a young driver who had just got her licence what it actually cost her to get her licence, and I was horrified. A 16 year old had to pay \$1,270 all up.

I think I have got this right. Once they passed the initial test, they got their L-plate. It costs \$200 up-front to get the L-plate. Then they do the 75 hours of driving, of which 12 hours has to be with a qualified instructor at a minimum of \$60 per hour—\$720. What about those who go the full 75 hours? It would be unaffordable. To pass the P-test costs another \$200, to go to P2 costs another \$100 and to get the full licence costs another \$50. My maths tells me that is \$1,270. I think that is exorbitant.

It is quite exorbitant for a young person of, say, 16. Where do you think that money is coming from? It is coming from mum and dad. It is all very well if they have got a lazy \$1,200 in their pocket. So, guess what happens? They either do not get their licence or they just do not drive.

A lot of the things we do in this place—okay, we choke ourselves with bureaucracy and all these rules but when it turns out to be practical a person living out in the donga thinks, 'Blow it; why bother? I'll go and buy an old VN Commodore for \$800 and just drive it.' That may be okay on the farm, but when they drive in the city unlicensed it is not okay at all. We want them to be registered, we want them to be licensed and we want their vehicles to be roadworthy because, when you are driving on the road like I do, you expect that person to be safe.

No wonder we have a high proportion of unlicensed drivers in South Australia with these costs. I drive in excess of 60,000 kilometres a year and that is, in my time here, 1.5 million kilometres. I always trust that the person coming down the road towards me is competent, awake, licensed and insured. I believe that driver's licences on farms has always been a contentious issue with young farmers, 16 year olds, wanting to help with the harvest and drive the truck to the local silos.

It has always been a problem, and we have had to get exemptions and all sorts of things to allow a lad who is obviously competent to drive the truck (because usually it is only the father and son on that farm) to the local silo, which is usually only four, eight or 10 kilometres away. However, there is always a problem of making rules for everybody that really excludes them. Young farm workers and many young people coming out of school early have little choice but to go and work on a farm and they must be able to drive a truck. They are very much restricted as to what they can do on a farm if they are unable to drive a farm truck.

Over the years I have become a little concerned. We have always had the local police station do these tests, and other things like lifting defect notices in country communities in some instances. You now have to wait until the Regency Park people come around to lift defect notices or take them to Regency Park, and you have to get a licensed instructor to do the test when there is a police officer sitting there who is quite happy to do it. I know they are strapped for time, but I am sure in far-flung areas the police officer would be only too pleased to do that.

As in my case, there was no problem, and I think I have been a reasonable driver and have had no major accidents in my life—only one which was not my fault a couple of years ago, and I was lucky to get out of that. I think we have to be a little bit commonsensical about this. These issues have been raised in this place by myself, the member for Fisher and several others because it is all tied up with responsible driving and all doing the right thing.

Along with speed limits, drink-driving, of course, has very much been an issue for me in this place, particularly adding the drug-driving element of it. I am very pleased, in my last week in this parliament, to reflect back that parliament did eventually succumb to public need and agreed to introduce drug testing of drivers. We have seen, since that time, that it has been quite huge in relation to the defence that we did not think was there. I hope the government will be sympathetic and agree to our amendments. I commend this motion.

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) (12:58): First, I would like to thank the Hon. Ian Hunter, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, for introducing this bill in the Legislative Council. It was my hope and intention to get this bill through the current parliament. The member for Bragg is correct that this proposition has been around for some little time.

I would like to acknowledge the presence of Judge Peter McCusker. Judge McCusker came to see me probably six or eight weeks ago with former premier John Bannon to put their case. There were three factors that enamoured me of this particular proposition. It was a seed that fell on fertile ground. The first was my involvement in the select committee on the juvenile justice system that reported in 2006. I notice the member for Bragg nodding her head; she was a member of that committee.

It was the first select committee that I served on and probably the first that the member for Bragg served on. What struck me about the particular select committee was the high rate of incarceration of young Indigenous youth in the juvenile justice system. I was absolutely staggered; I had no idea they had such depth, if you like, of contact with the juvenile justice system. That then extends into the adult system. Unfortunately, like Caucasian youth, there is generally a progression from the juvenile justice system into the adult system. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 13:01 to 14:00]

STATUTES AMENDMENT (YOUNG OFFENDERS) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (RESTRICTED BIRTHING PRACTICES) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

MAJOR EVENTS BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

COMMUNITY HOUSING PROVIDERS (NATIONAL LAW) (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

DISABILITY SERVICES (RIGHTS, PROTECTION AND INCLUSION) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

MINING (ROYALTIES) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA)
(PROTECTION OF TITLE—PARAMEDICS) AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SMART METERS) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**MOTOR VEHICLES (LEARNER'S PERMITS AND PROVISIONAL LICENCES) AMENDMENT
BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION FRAMEWORK

261 Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (13 July 2011) (First Session). With respect to 2011-12 Budget Paper 4—Volume 3, p135, Sub-program 3.2—

What is the climate change adaptation framework?

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:

Prospering in a Changing Climate: A Climate Change Adaptation Framework for South Australia outlines the process for adapting to climate change. The purpose of the framework is to assist all South Australians to plan for the impacts of climate change and take action.

The framework was released in August 2012 and provides a comprehensive approach to preparing South Australians for the impacts of climate change. The framework is publically available and can be accessed through the South Australian Government Portal, sa.gov.au.

APY EXECUTIVE

338 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11 September 2012).

1. What are the facts and circumstances that lead to the resignation and retirement of APY General Manager, Chris Malcolm?

2. Were there any issues the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs was dissatisfied with that led to Mr Malcolm's departure?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport): The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has received this advice:

The former General Manager of APY, Mr Chris Malcolm, decided to resign from the position due to personal reasons.

I am not aware of any issues that may have led to Mr Malcolm's departure.

APY EXECUTIVE

339 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11 September 2012).

1. Does the APY Land Rights Act require that the minister must approve the person selected by the Executive to be the General Manager of APY, as opposed to approving the terms and conditions of the employment of the person selected by the Executive and if so, what are the specific provisions of the APY Land Rights Act which confers that power on the Minister?

2. Have representatives of the Minister been directly or indirectly involved in the selection process of the APY Executive?

3. Has the Minister personally approved all persons appointed to the APY Executive by the APY Executive Board?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport): The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has received this advice:

1. The *Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act 1981* states that:

Section 13D (2)

The General Manager will be appointed by the Executive Board.

Section 13D (4)

The General Manager will be appointed on conditions (including conditions as to remuneration) determined by the Executive Board with the approval of the Minister and for a term specified in the instrument of appointment and, at the expiration of a term of appointment, is eligible for reappointment.

Section 13D (5)

The Minister must determine to approve, or not approve the conditions of appointment within 28 days after receiving the conditions, and may, in determining whether to approve the conditions, take into consideration any matter the Minister thinks fit.

2. As a matter of courtesy, the APY Executive Board keeps the Minister's office informed when a selection process is underway for the position of General Manager, APY.

3. No.

COMMUNITY CONNECT

510 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol.1, sub-program 6.1, p. 84: Community Connect—

1. How much money is in the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund?

2. How many staff are currently employed to administer the fund and have there been any changes?

3. How many people are receiving therapeutic treatment through the state-wide gambling therapy service and what treatment and/or intervention to they receive?

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 Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund (GRF) has an annual budget of \$6.005 million.

2. There are currently seven FTE staff employed within the Office for Problem Gambling, Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (DCSI). Funding is allocated from the GRF to DCSI for 5.5 FTE for program management and services support. DCSI contributes funding for 1.5 FTE. No changes have been made to the number of FTE or classification of staff employed to administer the GRF in 2012-13.

3. In 2012-13, the Statewide Gambling Therapy Service registered 325 new treatment clients.

The Statewide Gambling Therapy Service is a specialist treatment service funded to provide cognitive behavioural and exposure therapy for problem gamblers. The service has a specific clinical focus on the treatment of a client's urge to gamble and on extinguishing this urge through a program of cognitive behaviour therapy.

INDIGENOUS HOUSING

559 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 July 2013). With reference to 2013-14 Budget Paper 4, vol.1, p. 94—

1. Why did the Commonwealth reduce their funding by \$79 million under the National Partnerships for Remote Indigenous Housing and National Building?

2. How many Indigenous housing homes have been sold?

3. Have any of the new dwellings constructed across public, community and state owned and managed Indigenous housing programs been sold and what are the details?
4. How many remote Indigenous houses have been built under the National Partnership Agreement?
5. What types of houses have been built under the Aboriginal Housing Capital Program and are there any one or two bedroom homes for families?
6. How is overcrowding in Aboriginal households monitored?
7. What innovative funding models for Aboriginal Housing have been developed?

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 reference in the Budget Papers states that the \$79 million decrease in income is primarily due to reduced Commonwealth Government funding. National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing (NPARIH) funding reduced by \$39.8 million in 2012-13 as a result of the Commonwealth Government bringing forward \$22.2 million from the 2012-13 funding year, and paying those funds in 2011-12. This created a \$44.4 million difference in funding between those years, partly offset by a \$4.6 million increase in funds in 2012-13 that was budgeted to occur, prior to the bring-forward being announced.

Commonwealth Government funding under the Nation Building—Economic Stimulus Plan reduced by \$30.7 million in 2012-13, as funding for the program ended in 2011-12. Expenditure of funds previously received continued into 2012-13.

The other significant explanation for the reduction in income in 2012-13 was reduced sales of goods and services. The reduction in the sale of goods and services is mainly due to the movement in corporate overhead allocations between 2011-12 Actual and 2012-13 Budget and accommodation savings from the across government facilities savings measure that was implemented from 2012-13 onwards.

2. Since the start of the agreement in 2009, 36 existing Indigenous housing dwellings have been sold.

3. No newly constructed dwellings funded by NPARIH or state owned and managed Indigenous housing have been sold.

4. As at 30 June 2013, 152 new houses have been built under NPARIH. These are located in remote Aboriginal communities across South Australia.

5. A mixture of two, three and four bedroom dwellings have been constructed throughout the South Australian metropolitan and regional areas under the Aboriginal Housing Capital Program. Two bedroom dwellings are offered to singles and couples, with three and four bedroom dwellings offered to families.

6. Overcrowding is monitored using the Canadian National Occupancy Standard (CNOS) which is the measure used in the National Affordable Housing Agreement Performance Indicators Report, and is the preferred standard used by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Each month, Housing SA applies the CNOS across public housing tenancies to produce a point-in-time report identifying the number of Aboriginal households living in overcrowded conditions. Further point-in-time reports are provided annually for the publicly released Report on Government Services and the National Agreement Performance Information.

Housing SA's Chintaro system is a housing management system. The system is used to support the delivery of tenancy, rental and maintenance services to remote and non-remote Aboriginal communities across South Australia. It will assist Housing SA to identify the level of overcrowding within these communities.

7. Funding models for Aboriginal housing remain under development at this time.

OLYMPIC DAM EXPANSION

582 Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (30 July 2013). How will the government monitor the \$650 million commitment by BHP over 4 years to re-scope Olympic Dam?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I am in regular discussions with members of the BHP Billiton leadership team regarding the development of the Olympic Dam expansion and participate in formal discussions with the Olympic Dam Taskforce Steering Committee.

BHP Billiton regularly updates the steering committee with regard to its progress towards re-scoping the Olympic Dam expansion project.

SMART METERS

592 Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (30 July 2013). What plans are there for the installation of smart meters for households and businesses and what would be the cost of such a scheme?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I am advised the South Australian government does not support a mandated accelerated roll-out of smart meters as there is insufficient evidence that smart meters will deliver a net economic benefit for South Australian consumers.

The South Australian Government does however support a market-driven competitive roll-out of smart meters. This will provide consumers with the choice to install a smart meter where they identify a benefit, such as having better information on their energy use, access to remote energy readings or access to more retail tariff options.

I see you have copied Labor policy on this front in an attempt to create a 'new' Liberal energy policy.

The Standing Council on Energy and Resources (SCER) is currently developing arrangements to encourage the market-driven competitive roll-out of smart meters and other smart metering infrastructure and to ensure the appropriate consumer protections are in place for consumers with a smart meter.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

595 Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (30 July 2013). What impact is wind and solar energy having on base-load generation investment and what are the limits of wind and solar before base-load investment is unviable?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I am advised that the Australian Energy Market Operator's Historical Market Information Report 2013 indicates 1,203 megawatts of wind and 400 megawatts of rooftop solar generation in South Australia in 2012-13. All of this investment has occurred since 2003. In the same period investment in an additional 409 megawatts of conventional generation has occurred.

Investment decisions in relation to conventional and renewable generation are made by private owners and proponents of projects and are influenced by the expected returns from the National Electricity Market, the Commonwealth's Renewable Energy Target and the carbon price.

FORESHORE MANAGEMENT

In reply to **Mr PENGILLY (Finniss)** (31 May 2012).

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:

In 2011-12, the government allocated \$512,000 to the Coast Protection Fund.

As at 30 June 2012, the Coast Protection Board had allocated \$347,670 (69 per cent of the fund) in grants to councils. The remainder of the fund is allocated to monitoring and evaluation (such as the coastal survey program), investigations and research, land management costs and administrative overheads.

In 2012-13, from an appropriation of \$509,000, the Board allocated \$355,970 in council grants.

COORONG, LOWER LAKES AND MURRAY MOUTH REGION

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop)** (26 June 2012) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport): The Minister for Water and the River Murray has received this advice:

Narrung Bund

The Narrung bund was constructed using steel sheet piles, concrete blocks, steel ties and approximately 40,000 cubic metres of imported sand. Phase 1 of the project removed the sheet piles, concrete and steel and a combined total of approximately 29,000 cubic metres of imported sand. It is estimated that approximately 1,000 to 2,000 cubic metres of sand was lost from the site during construction and removal through scouring and transport by currents. The remaining material is heavily mixed with acid sulfate bed sediments and, for environmental reasons, is not able to be removed to land disposal.

Phase two work at Narrung was completed on 18 October 2012. Phase two required a dredge to remove peaks that were identified as having the potential to have implications for normal navigation and to ensure there would be no significant impacts on water exchange between Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert.

Goolwa Channel Regulator at Clayton (Clayton Regulator)

The Clayton Regulator was constructed using approximately 165,000 cubic metres of imported sand.

Pre-removal surveys determined that some imported material was covered by, or mixed with, acid sulfate sediments. In order to reduce the risk of acid sulfate soils being removed, the contract for regulator removal specified the removal of 80,000 cubic metres of imported material. During the removal process it became evident that the extent of mixed material was greater than expected. This, in conjunction with some difficulties experienced in excavating rocky material, resulted in a total volume of approximately 38,000 cubic metres of clean material being removed to land.

Currency Creek Regulator

The Currency Creek regulator was constructed using approximately 71,000 cubic metres of sand, 3,500 cubic metres of crushed rock and small quantities of geotextile and plastic geogrid.

On-ground works commenced in April 2013 and stages one and two have been completed. Stage one involved the removal of the mixed material from either side of the sand core of the regulator, exposing the sand core to ensure as much as possible can be removed. This material was disposed of in an underwater disposal site located one kilometre from the regulator site. Stage two involved the removal of an estimated 28,000 cubic metres of clean sand to an on-land disposal site. This is the total volume of sand that could be removed to ensure that no acid sulfate soils were removed to land.

All work to remove the Currency Creek regulator was completed in August 2013, the spreading of the stage two disposal location on private property is not yet completed and the rock is currently stockpiled on site. These items have been delayed due to wet weather resulting in the contractors unable to continue working. These tasks will be completed once site conditions improve around November 2013.

GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition)** (26 June 2012) (Estimates Committee B).

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

2011-12

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation:

Former Department for Environment and Natural Resources—Controlled

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Goolwa to Wellington Local Action Planning Association	1,984,208	Watercourse restoration in critical reaches, bore monitoring and Aleppo Pine removal	Y
Primary Industries and Resources SA	1,085,000	Priority capacity, surveillance and control needs for SA's Natural Resources Management Biosecurity and Implementing the National Action Plan for Feral Camels in South Australia's Aboriginal lands & rangelands	Y
Adelaide & Mt Lofty Natural Resources Management Board	998,080	Implementing priority Torrens Taskforce actions and protecting and managing priority ecosystems in the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Region	Y
SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board	940,913	On-ground works and community engagement for wetland biodiversity and ecological restoration, Regional integrated pest animal management programme in the SA Murray-Darling Basin, weed warriors in the SA Murray-Darling Basin, supporting Natural Resources Management volunteers in the SA Murray-Darling Basin, and Southern hairy-nosed wombat population survey—Murraylands	Y
RSPCA Adelaide Inc.	717,682	Contribution towards the management of the RSPCA	Y
Kangaroo Island Natural Resources Management Board	550,540	Implementing the Glossy Black-Cockatoo recovery and threat abatement plan, reinstating threatened plant species and communities in eastern Kangaroo Island, engaging Kangaroo Island landholders to manage biodiversity and restore habitat, restoration of the Harriet River riparian zone, protecting native vegetation and soils on Kangaroo Island, and Implementing bioregional marine pests management actions in Gulf St Vincent	Y
Anvil Capital	453,000	Facilitate installation of rooftop solar hats and sun hoods as part of a tri-generation system and facade upgrading at 1 King William St	Y
Northern and Yorke Natural Resources Management Board	450,000	Managing biodiversity through increased community capacity and landholder participation	Y
Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board	444,000	Implementing landscape scale biodiversity management to protect the Coffin Bay coastal wetland system, Eyre Peninsula, and Implementation of high priority WildEyre Conservation	Y
Milang and District Community Association	329,850	Asparagus weed control Finniss, Milang and Point Sturt region	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Friends of Parks Inc.	235,110	Biodiversity Blitz—Yorke Peninsula, Coffin Bay Parks native plant revegetation project, Biodiversity Management Action Plan for Anstey Hill Recreation Park, protecting Kangaroo Island's Little Penguin colonies, Stonyfell Creek restoration project, Coolatai grass control in Cobbler Creek Recreation Park, woody weed control in Mylor Conservation Park, selective veldt grass control in ASCP 2012, Wottons Scrub Biodiversity Action Plan—Year 4, woody weed and Periwinkle removal in Belair National Park, restoring Bandicoot habitat through Erica control, strategic vegetation management in Moana Sands Conservation Park, restoration of Eucalyptus microcarpa grassy woodland, restoration at Mutton Cove Conservation Reserve, Tapanappa Road, roadside weed management project, and Department of Environment and Natural Resources' Volunteer Support Grants to encourage and support volunteer participation in managing the environment and heritage by assisting Friends of Parks groups and Departmental volunteers to undertake small projects.	Y
SA Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board	232,000	Improving management of pastoral lands for ecological & productivity benefits, and a model for applying significant environmental benefits in the arid region	Y
Alinytjara Wilurara Natural Resources Management Board	216,000	Bringing back Warru: long-term conservation through building a Warru 'Pintji'	Y
Conservation Council of SA Inc.	213,879	Facilitating non-government organisation engagement in SA regional natural resource management processes	Y
Maralinga Lands Unnamed Park Group	200,000	Annual grant to implement the Co-Management Agreement between Maralinga Tjarutja, Pila Nguru and the State of South Australia	Y
Local Government Association of SA	200,000	To develop state-wide capacity and capability to undertake sustainable, effective and integrated adaption to climate change	Y
Nature Foundation of SA Inc.	185,000	Grant of capital funding to the Land Purchase Fund SA	Y
Salisbury Council	124,641	Hosting of SA Urban Forest—Million Trees Programme Project Officer, and Projects—Edinburgh Biodiversity Corridor MT-602 and Dry Creek Biodiversity Corridor MT-650	Y
Adelaide City Council	118,000	Tainmundilla Riparian Revegetation Project (Stage 4) and Park Lands Infill Plantings 2011-12	Y
University of Adelaide	80,000	Salary support for Professor of Plant Conservation of Biology. Year 2 of 5.	Y
Flinders University of SA	72,087	Supporting collaborative research initiatives to fill knowledge gaps that support policy and management priorities	Y
Eco Insights	71,650	Supporting collaborative research initiatives to fill knowledge gaps that support policy and management priorities	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
University of Adelaide	137,000	Salary support for HBS Womersley Chair in Systematic Botany	Y
Riverland West Local Action Group	62,110	Supporting education of youth in sustainable water management, increase the profile and awareness of volunteering in Natural Resources Management, supporting Regent Parrot Recovery Project volunteers, increasing participation and community awareness of biodiversity activities, and raising cultural awareness with an interpretive indigenous garden	Y
University of Adelaide	60,575	Funding to support Marine Botanist, specialising in marine Plant Systematics and Conservation	Y
YP Alkaline Soils Group Inc	57,870	Facilitating adoption of modern farming techniques, improved condition of Southern Yorke Peninsula Woodlands with grass & shrub under stories, and understanding soil carbon in sustainable farming systems	Y
Aboriginal Lands Trust	56,300	Protecting Stony Plains chenopod shrub land, and protecting Eastern thick-billed grass wren habitat	Y
Nature Glenelg Trust	55,000	WetCAT Project: Field verification and review of a method for assessing wetland condition in the South East	Y
Lower Eyre Pest Management	54,560	Controlling Rhamnus at Coffin Bay	Y
Alexandrina District Council	52,000	Support to the council in removal of Aleppo Pines in the Clayton area, identified as a threatening weed species	Y
Nature Foundation SA Inc.	50,000	The first of two 2011-12 CEO Management Subsidy Grants	Y
Future Farm Industries	50,000	South Australian contribution for the Commonwealth Cooperative Research Centre	Y
Ninti One Ltd	50,000	Contribution towards the management of the Cooperative Research Centre for Remote Economic Participation	Y
Department of Premier and Cabinet	50,000	Contribution towards the World Solar Challenge	Y
Royal Zoological Society	49,980	Engaging the Aboriginal Community in Natural Resources Management at Monarto; and Stringybark and South East cocky habitat on-ground works on four South East farms	Y
Ngarrindjeri Regional Authority	40,000	Support to the Ngarrindjeri Regional Authority in removal of Aleppo Pines on Hindmarsh Island, identified as a threatening weed species	Y
Central Local Government Region of SA	40,000	Provide support for the position of Regional Climate Change Coordinator within the Central Local Government Region of SA	Y
Trees for Life Inc.	38,620	Community weed collection task group, AnaBat monitoring on Bush for Life sites, and woody weed control in the Maitland area	Y
Mid Murray Local Action Group	34,900	Invasive species management for ecosystem restoration in conservation parks and natural resource management awareness in the Murray Region	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
South Australian No-Till	33,000	Advanced seeding systems for permanent soil cover, and web delivery of sustainable land management e-media	Y
Ngopamuldi Aboriginal Group	32,000	Support to the Ngopamuldi Aboriginal Group in removal of Aleppo Pines, Boxthorn and other threatening weed species at the Raukkan Community on Narrung Peninsula, identified as a threatening weed species	Y
Agricultural Bureau of South Australia	30,000	State Natural Resources Management Programme Community Grant—Soil health in the west—balanced, innovative & sustainable	Y
Birds Australia	30,000	State Natural Resources Management Programme Community Grant—Red-tailed Black Cockatoo community actions in SA	Y
SA Native Title Services Ltd	30,000	Far West Coast Natural Resources Management Management Plan	Y
Thistle Island Management	30,000	Eradication of exotic rats from Thistle Island—Phase 2	Y
Renmark to Border	29,600	Sustainable water use of the Pike River anabranch	Y
Karpinyeri Incorporated Association	29,500	Protection of threatened orchids for Indigenous bush food promotion	Y
Sixth Creek Catchment Group Inc.	29,000	Merchants Road riparian zone restoration	Y
Mid North Grasslands Working Group	28,500	Restoring grassy woodlands in SA's mid north	Y
Angas River Catchment Group	27,500	State Natural Resources Management Programme Community Grant—Restoration of Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 listed Peppermint Box woodland in Strathalbyn	Y
Murray Mallee Local Action Group	26,690	Cultivating native grass for sustainable agriculture productivity	Y
TAFE SA Regional	26,080	Coastal rehabilitating and dune stabilisation, Upper Spencer Gulf	Y
The Climate Group Trust	25,000	Implementation for the LightSavers initiative by advancing LED and Smart Adaptive Lighting solutions in Adelaide.	Y
Port MacDonnell Landcare Group	24,500	South East Cooperative Coastal Conservation Initiative—Coastal Community Small Equipment Grants	Y
Agriculture Kangaroo Island	21,750	State Natural Resources Management Programme Community Grant—Digging deep for improved land management on Kangaroo Island	Y
Nature Foundation SA Inc.	20,000	Final round of the 2010-11 CEO Management Subsidy Grants	Y
The Climate Trust Group	20,000	Implement the Electric Vehicle Fleet Work in Australia by increasing awareness and interest in electric vehicles within commercial and government fleets	Y
The Climate Trust Group	20,000	Implement an international engagement project in SA enabling South Australian policy makers to interact with international experts in climate change policy	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
City of Charles Sturt	20,000	Project: City of Charles Sturt Biodiversity and Revegetation 2011-12	Y
L Thomson (Two Wells Hardware and More)	20,000	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
Nature Conservation Society of SA	20,000	Support for a Nature Conservation Society Ecologist position	Y
Lower Eyre Agricultural Development Association	19,120	Controlling the spread of resistant fence line weeds	Y
Barossa Valley Machinery	19,101	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
Mallee Sustainable Farming Inc.	17,900	Trialling forage shrub plantations around Waikerie	Y
Friends of Carrick Hill	17,210	Carrick Hill Grey Box woodland restoration project	Y
Coorong District Council	16,500	Support to the council in removal of Aleppo Pines in the Meningie area, identified as a threatening weed species	Y
Balaklava Area Committee Inc.	16,000	State Natural Resources Management Programme Community Grant—Feasibility study for Balaklava stormwater and wetlands project	Y
National Trust of SA	16,000	Threatened species habitat restoration on National Trust Reserves in the Adelaide Mt Lofty Ranges and the SA Murray-Darling Basin	Y
Wetland Habitats Association Inc.	16,000	Protection of Paiwalla wetland's threatened, protected and endangered species	Y
Deakin University	15,995	Filling the knowledge gaps and measuring performance of the People and Parks Visitor Strategy	Y
Willunga High School	15,630	Willunga High School community Indigenous garden	Y
Tulka Progress Association	15,000	Managing the spread of environmental weeds from Tulka	Y
Environmental Defenders Office	15,000	Funding towards the continuation of projects to benefit the environment and heritage of SA	Y
Stockport Community Association Inc.	14,900	Gilbert River system restoration	Y
S. Schwert	14,855	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
T. Greenrod	14,300	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
Waikerie Primary School	14,090	Waikerie Primary—outback garden	Y
Tamrae Pty Ltd	14,000	Facilitate the design and construction of a west-facing solar facade at 164 Fullarton Road Dulwich	Y
Easter Hills & Murray Plains Catchment Group Inc	13,130	Enhancing Malleefowl food stocks at Monarto South and Bat monitoring at Monarto Zoo	Y
Port Neill Progress Association Inc	13,000	Winning the war on weeds at Port Neill	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Bicycle SA	10,500	State Natural Resources Management Programme Community Grant—Environmentally sustainable trail management—Cudlee Creek	Y
District Council of Robe	10,091	South East Cooperative Coastal Conservation Initiative—Coastal Protection Grant	Y
City of Marion	10,000	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
Burra Regional Art Gallery	10,000	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
T. & W. Fawcus	10,000	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
Hildabuilt Pty Ltd	10,000	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
N. Hoskyns	10,000	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
District Council of Mallala	10,000	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
Mannahill War Memorial Inc	10,000	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
K. McCallum	10,000	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
District Council of Peterborough	10,000	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
Two Wells Regional Action Group	10,000	Heritage Agreement Funds provided to individuals for capital works on heritage listed properties	Y
Arid Recovery Ltd	10,000	Assistance of PitGrid Survey within the Olympic Dam Special Mine Lease	Y
Finniss Catchment Group	10,000	Finniss River riparian improvement	Y
Friends of the Parnkalla	10,000	Rhamnus alaternus control & revegetation, Parnkalla Walking Trail	Y
Marine Discovery Centre	10,000	Three new coastal signs	Y
Regional Development Australia	10,000	To deliver a stage 1 integrated vulnerability assessment for the Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island regions	Y
TOTAL:	11,881,997		

Department for Environment and Natural Resources—Administered

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
Royal Zoological Society	5,700,000	Annual funding grant	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
SA Murray Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board	3,062,182	SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board 2010-11 Business Plan	Y
South East Natural Resources Management Board	2,389,000	South-east Natural Resources Management Board 2011-12 regional base level investments	Y
Adelaide & Mount lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board	2,209,000	Restoring rural landscapes in the Adelaide and Mt Lofty Ranges region	Y
Alinytjara Wilurara Natural Resources Management Board	1,751,000	Alinytjara Wilurara Regional Natural Resources Management Programme 2010-13	Y
SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board	1,674,760	SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board 2010-11 BP regional base level investment	Y
Northern and Yorke Natural Resources Management Board	1,567,000	Northern and Yorke Natural Resources Management Board 2011-12 BP regional base-level investments	Y
Adelaide City Council	1,385,000	Water offset grant	Y
Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board	1,191,400	Ecological and cultural landscape restoration on Eyre Peninsula	Y
SA Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board	1,042,000	State Appropriation payment for SA Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board	Y
Kangaroo Island Natural Resources Management Board	926,200	Kangaroo Island Natural Resources Management Board 2011-12 BP regional base-level investments	Y
Alinytjara Wilurara Natural Resources Management Board	772,000	Alinytjara Wilurara Natural Resources Management Board	Y
SA Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board	753,000	Improving natural resources management in the arid lands of SA	Y
Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board	667,000	Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board	Y
SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board	645,732	Improving land management in the SA Murray-Darling Basin	Y
Kangaroo Island Natural Resources Management Board	584,000	Kangaroo Island Natural Resources Management Board	Y
Northern and Yorke Natural Resources Management Board	511,000	Northern and Yorke Natural Resources Management Board	Y
SA Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board	499,000	Valuing people and building capacity for managing functioning ecosystems in the arid lands	Y
SA Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board	407,000	SA Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board 2011-12 BP regional base-level investments	Y
South East Natural Resources Management Board	335,000	South-east Natural Resources Management Board	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board	333,040	Protecting threatened flora from rabbits on Eyre Peninsula through skill development and best practice management.	Y
Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board	318,560	A collaborative approach to improving land management outcomes in erosion prone soils on Eyre Peninsula	Y
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	281,531	Protecting the ecological character of the Bool and Hacks Lagoons Ramsar site	Y
Kangaroo Island Natural Resources Management Board	260,800	Eastern Plains fire trail (Phase 3)	Y
SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board	246,298	Rehabilitation of the Pike Mundic Wetland complex (PMWC) floodplain	Y
Kangaroo Island Natural Resources Management Board	163,000	Large scale restoration to increase Kangaroo Island threatened plant habitat	Y
District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula	151,700	Coast Protection Board—North Shields Seawall	Y
Adelaide & Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board	150,000	Conserving healthy habitat and nationally threatened species	Y
Aboriginal Lands Trust	138,649	Native Vegetation Council—Willow removal works and pest and weed control	Y
Greening Australia	133,000	Native Vegetation Council—restoring the Southern Flinders Grey Box	Y
Department of Primary Industries and Resources	128,000	Weeds of National Significance coordination—SA—PIRSA	Y
SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board	110,618	Engage farming groups involved in Natural Resources Management	Y
Adelaide Hills Council	103,967	Native Vegetation Council—Upper Torrens Management Project	Y
SA Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board	100,000	Protecting the Diamantina River wetland refuge from feral pig damage	Y
SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board	97,403	Destruction of the feral pig population on the Riverland Ramsar wetlands	Y
Bush Heritage Aust	91,300	Native Vegetation Council—Boolcoomatta reserve—final milestone payment	Y
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	90,000	Landscape scale aerial fox control for the nationally threatened Andu Wallaby	Y
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	71,400	Investigating and communicating lessons of past climate change	Y
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	69,300	Landscape scale reduction in risk of soil erosion in the Flinders- Olary bioregion	Y
Bush Heritage Aust	68,100	Native Vegetation Council—Bon Bon	Y
Woodcutters Rd Environmental Protection Society	68,000	Native Vegetation Council—Significant Environmental Benefit Community Conservation Enhancement across a landscape	Y
Trees for Life	60,688	Native Vegetation Council—Bush Action teams—sustain on-ground bushcare	Y
Trees for Life	60,688	Native Vegetation Council—Taheny Para Wurle Basin rehabilitation	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
Friends of Moores Road Inc.	60,000	Native Vegetation Council—Significant Environmental Benefit Morialta to Coralinga biolink project	Y
Trees for Life	55,000	Native Vegetation Council—Significant Environmental Benefit Building landowner capacity to restore landscapes	Y
Alinytjara Wilurara Natural Resources Management Board	50,000	Phase 1—bioregional assessment—Alinytjara Wilurara	Y
Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board	50,000	Phase 1 Bioregional assessments—Eyre Peninsula	Y
Northern and Yorke Natural Resources Management Board	50,000	Phase 1 Bioregional assessments—Northern and Yorke	Y
SA Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board	50,000	Eradication of priority national boneseed outlier infestation in arid lands SA	Y
SA Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board	50,000	Phase 1 Bioregional assessments—SA Arid Lands	Y
SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board	50,000	Phase 1 Bioregional assessments—SA Murray-Darling Basin	Y
South East Natural Resources Management Board	50,000	Phase 1 bioregional assessment—South-east	Y
District Council of Barunga West	50,000	Coast Protection Board—Pt Broughton Seawall	Y
Forestry SA	49,200	Native Vegetation Council—Habitat management & rehabilitation of Wandilo Forest	Y
Landscape partnership	48,650	Native Vegetation Council—SEB native habitat improvement by landowners	Y
Landscape partnership	41,650	Native Vegetation Council—Significant Environmental Benefit native habitat improvement by landowners	Y
Goolwa to Wellington Local Action Planning Association Incorporated	39,210	Native Vegetation Council—Prospect Hill conservation cluster bushland restoration project	Y
SA Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board	35,000	Native Vegetation Council—supporting Native Vegetation Council Industrial support officer salary	Y
Delta Society Aust Ltd	35,000	Dog & Cat Management Board—Delta dog safe programme	Y
Kingston District Council	35,000	Coast Protection Board—Sand replenishment at Wyomi Beach	Y
Trees for Life	33,993	Native Vegetation Council—Significant Environmental Benefit bush action teams	Y
University of Adelaide	33,570	Native Vegetation Council—restore Grey Box woodland—Waite Conservation Reserve	Y
Royal Zoological Society SA	33,300	Native Vegetation Council—Regeneration of native habitat at Monarto	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
Forestry SA	32,800	Native Vegetation Council—Habitat management & rehabilitation of Wandilo Forest	Y
Woodcutters Rd Environmental Protection Society	32,000	Native Vegetation Council—Significant Environmental Benefit Community Cons Enhancement across a landscape	Y
Naracoorte Lucindale Council	30,000	Native Vegetation Council—Roadside Vegetation survey	Y
Port Augusta City Council	30,000	Coast Protection Board—Foreshore protection	Y
Goolwa to Wellington Local Action Planning Association Incorporated	26,140	Native Vegetation Council—Prospect Hill Cons cluster bushland restoration project	Y
Royal Zoological Society	21,180	Stringybark and South East cocky habitat on-ground works on four South East farms	Y
Austland Management Pty Ltd	20,874	Native Vegetation Council—Restoration of Semi- arid woodland	Y
Trees for Life	20,572	Native Vegetation Council—Taheny Para Wurlle Vegetation rehabilitation	Y
University of Western Australia	20,000	Study of long-term changes in the phenology of Australia's temperate marine macroalgae: has climate change impacted the world's most diverse algal flora	Y
City of Port Adelaide Enfield	20,000	Coast Protection Board—Western Region climate change vulnerability maintenance	Y
Upper Wakefield Catchment Natural Resources Management Group	16,200	Native Vegetation Council—Upper Wakefield catchment improvement	Y
Nature Conservation Society SA	15,445	Native Vegetation Council—Assessing impact of regulation 5(1)(b)	Y
City of Victor Harbor	15,000	Coast Protection Board—The Esplanade groyne extension	Y
Conservation Council South Australia	14,933	Native Vegetation Council—Fire response of Mt Lofty Southern Emu Wren habitat	Y
Bush Heritage Australia	14,000	Native Vegetation Council—Boolcoomatta Reserve rabbit control	Y
City of Onkaparinga	14,000	Coast Protection Board—Christies Beach sea wall repairs	Y
Nature Foundation SA	13,502	Native Vegetation Council—Buloke Woodland revegetation	Y
City of Victor Harbor	13,200	Coast Protection Board—The Esplanade shore parallel geotextile tube	Y
Northern & Yorke Natural Resources Management Board	12,827	Native Vegetation Council—Wakefield River revegetation survey	Y
Mantung Maggea Land Mgt Group	12,713	Native Vegetation Council—Heritage Agreement mgt grant	Y
Nature Conservation Society SA	11,645	Native Vegetation Council—Monitoring grassland recruitment for modelling	Y
Conservation Council SA	11,420	Native Vegetation Council—Protecting Fleurieu swamps	Y
Flinders University	10,727	Native Vegetation Council—Prioritising reserves to enable resilience to climate change	Y

Name of Grant/Contribution Recipient	Amount of Grant/Contribution (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to grant agreement (Y/N)
Trees for Life	10,000	Native Vegetation Council—Significant Environmental Benefit Building landowner capacity to restore landscapes	Y
Kangaroo Island Council	10,000	Coast Protection Board—works & KI sewer pump	Y
Wattle Range Council	10,000	Coast Protection Board—Southend sand replenishment	Y
TOTAL:	32,726,067		

Environment Protection Authority

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Cooperative Research Centre (CRC)	150,000	Contribution towards research to enhance Australia's industrial, commercial and economic growth through development of sustained user driven co-operative public-private research centres.	Y
National Packaging Covenant Ind Assoc	15,000	South Australia's contribution towards the scheme to manage packaging. Contribution agreed at ministerial level.	Y
National Environment Protection Council	13,000	South Australia's contribution to the National Environmental Protection Council Service Corporation.	Y
Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities	12,000	Contribution towards the 2011-12 AELERT Secretariat Funding. Contribution agreed upon under the COAG agreement.	Y
Conservation Council	10,000	Annual Conservation Council contribution as per the agreement reached by the Environment and Conservation Portfolio Chief Executives on a cost sharing arrangement.	Y

Zero Waste SA

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
ARRB Group (SA)	5,000	Recycled aggregates project	Y
Adelaide City Council	8,380	Rundle Mall Precinct 2011 project	Y
Adelaide City Council	25,700	Waste Resource Recovery Pilot for High Density Developments	Y
Adelaide Hills Recycling	22,500	Adelaide Hills Recycling C&D Resource Recovery Facility	Y
Alexandrina Council	9,091	Salvage Shed for the Strathalbyn Transfer Station	Y
Amcor Packaging (Australia) Pty Ltd T/A Amcor Recycling SA	30,497	Amcor Recycling at Work	Y
Australian Food and Grocery Council	12,000	Quick Service In-store Recycling #NAT 88/10 project	Y
Bin IT Waste Removal	25,000	Solid Waste Recycling and Reuse—Mt Gambier	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Bowden Printing Pty Ltd	4,500	Eco-efficiency Services Project—Stage 2	Y
Central Local Government Region of Councils	30,000	Barossa, Yorke and Lower North—Central Region Waste Strategy Implementation Support	Y
Central Local Government Region of Councils	30,000	Southern Flinders—Central Region Waste Strategy Implementation Support	Y
City of Burnside	215,050	Ventilated Food Waste System—City of Burnside	Y
City of Mount Gambier	12,607	Commercial Food Waste Programme Implementation	Y
City of Port Lincoln	85,000	Port Lincoln Transfer Station Upgrade	Y
City of West Torrens	4,546	Food Waste Recycling Education Programme—City of West Torrens	Y
Clare & Gilbert Valleys Council	7,500	Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council—Clare Waste Transfer Station	Y
Clarence Park Community Centre	2,000	It's in your hands community project	Y
District Council of Barunga West	6,480	DC Barunga West Kerbside Services	Y
District Council of Cleve	7,500	Cleve District Transfer and Recycling Facility	Y
District Council of Grant	62,225	Port MacDonnell Waste Transfer Station	Y
District Council of Loxton Waikerie	47,500	Ventilated Food Waste System—DC Loxton Waikerie	Y
District Council of Loxton Waikerie	132,000	Waikerie Waste Transfer Station	Y
District Council of Orroroo Carrieton	3,000	Kerbside Waste and Recycling System—DC Orroroo Carrieton	Y
District Council of Robe	85,000	Robe Waste Transfer and Resource Recovery Centre	Y
District Council of Tumby Bay	12,000	DC Lower Eyre Peninsula and DC Tumby Bay e-Waste Collection	Y
District Council of the Copper Coast	90,000	Kadina Waste Transfer Station	Y
Fleurieu Regional Waste Authority (FRWA)	25,489	Fleurieu Regional Co-ordinator, Operations, Education and Contract Management	Y
Food Waste Recyclers Pty Ltd	27,885	Food Waste Recyclers Recycling at Work	Y
FoodSA	1,200	Sustainable Business in Food Programme	Y
FoodSA	23,035	Sustainable Supply Chain Practices for the South Australian Food Industry	Y
Foodbank of SA	5,400	Foodbank Energy Audit	Y
Innovate SA Inc.	12,200	Forums on the Financial Business Case for Sustainability for SMEs	Y
Integrated Waste Services	50,000	Establishment of high quality C&I Materials Recovery and Sorting Equipment at IWS Transfer Station	Y
Jeffries Group	910	Jeffries Recycling at Work	Y
McLaren Vintners	8,085	McLaren Vintners Eco-efficiency Review 2011	Y
Naracoorte Lucindale Council	13,636	Naracoorte Transfer Station Construction	Y
Naracoorte Lucindale Council	16,000	Naracoorte Transfer Station Waste Oil Collection Station	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Northern Adelaide Waste Management Authority (NAWMA)	255,000	Resource Recovery Centre	Y
Northern Areas Council	20,000	Kerbside Waste and Recycling System—Northern Areas Council	Y
Onkaparinga Waste and Recycling Management Pty Ltd	26,000	Onkaparinga Waste and Recycling Management Pty Ltd Extensions	Y
OzHarvest Adelaide	67,505	Expansion of OzHarvest Adelaide—Vehicle #2	Y
Peats Soil and Garden Supplies	60,000	Green Waste Grinding Project	Y
Peats Soil and Garden Supplies	57,500	Kerbside Screening Project—Peats Soil and Garden Supplies	Y
Printing Industries Association of Australia, SA & NT Branch	7,250	Develop an Industry Specific Waste & Recycling Contract Quotation/Tender Schedule and Guide	Y
Propak Industries Pty Ltd	94,147	Bio-Fill capability and capacity upscale project	Y
R.G. Cave Nominees Pty Ltd	84,000	Kerbside Recyclables Baling Facility	Y
REDARC Electronics	6,700	REDARC Waste and Recycling Improvement Review 2011	Y
Remondis Pty Ltd	64,388	REMONDIS Pty Ltd Recycling at Work	Y
Restaurant and Catering SA	950	Advice: SA Restaurant & Catering Industry Contract Terms and Guidance	Y
SA No Till Farmers Association	3,500	Struvite as a Phosphorus Replacement project	Y
SITA Australia Pty Ltd	87,206	SITA Recycling at Work	Y
Signal Waste and Recycling Pty Ltd	32,218	Signal Recycling at Work	Y
Solo Resource Recovery	17,093	Solo Resource Recovery Recycling at Work	Y
TF & MJ Bull	4,705	TF & MJ Bull Recycling Facility	Y
The Flinders Ranges Council	6,620	Quorn Transfer Station and Resource Recovery Facility	Y
The Garage Sale Trail Pty Ltd	6,000	The Garage Sale Trail Event	Y
Transpacific Cleanaway Pty Ltd	68,958	Transpacific Cleanaway Pty Ltd Recycling at Work	Y
University of Adelaide	3,748	Review of Waste & Recycling at Roseworthy Campus 2011	Y
Veolia Environmental Services	154,609	Veolia Environmental Services Recycling at Work	Y
Visy Recycling	2,031	Visy Recycling at Work	Y
Waste Carriers Australia Pt Ltd	84,000	Tatiara Regional Resource Depot	Y
Waste Management Association of Australia	65,000	Compost for Soils funding	Y
Wattle Range Council	13,636	Construction of 3 Resource Recovery Facilities; Millicent, Penola and Beachport	Y
Yorketown Progress Association	1,454	Sort and Save Shed Extension—Yorketown	Y

Minister for Water and the River Murray:

Former Department for Water

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Attawood, AJ & AL	\$26,194.39	Payments for protecting remnant vegetation (significant wildlife habitat) in the Upper South East Region	Y
Attorney Generals Department	\$22,400.00	Contribution to the Kungun Ngarrindjeri Yunnan Agreement	Y
Bilyarra Black Pty Ltd	\$14,511.46	Payments for protecting remnant vegetation (significant wildlife habitat) in the Upper South East Region	Y
Brinkworth, TK & PA	\$13,056.71	Payments for protecting remnant vegetation (significant wildlife habitat) in the Upper South East Region	Y
Bureau Of Meteorology	\$23,472.73	The facilitation of monitoring of essential river-flow data for flood warning purposes	Y
Bureau Of Meteorology	\$58,998.00	Payments made by the department on behalf of the Stormwater Management Authority	Y
Bureau Of Meteorology	\$24,063.00	Return of unspent Monitoring and Extension of Hydrologic Monitoring Systems Programme funding as per project agreements	Y
City Meat Co Pty Ltd	\$13,525.65	Payments for protecting remnant vegetation (significant wildlife habitat) in the Upper South East Region	Y
City Of Charles Sturt	\$16,972,793.11	Contribution to the Stormwater Project—Water Proofing the West (which has the capacity to reduce potable water demand by up to 555 megalitres per year)	Y
City Of Marion	\$1,492,625.00	Contribution to the Stormwater Project—Oaklands Park	Y
City Of Onkaparinga	\$4,747,000.00	Contribution to the Stormwater Project—Waterproofing the South (which has the capacity to reduce potable water demand by up to 1,300 megalitres per year)	Y
City Of Playford	\$6,475,000.00	Contribution to the Stormwater Project—Water for the Future (which has the capacity to reduce potable water demand by up to 640 megalitres per year)	Y
City Of Salisbury	\$2,500,000.00	Contribution to the Stormwater Project—Unity Park (which has the capacity to reduce potable water demand by up to 400 megalitres per year)	Y
Commonwealth Science and Industrial Research Organisation	\$5,000,000.00	Funding provided on behalf of the State Government for the Goyder Institute for Water Research	Y
Coronary Park Pty Ltd	\$27,860.94	Payments for protecting remnant vegetation (significant wildlife habitat) in the Upper South East Region	Y
Delro Pastoral Ltd	\$190,128.39	Payments for protecting remnant vegetation (significant wildlife habitat) in the Upper South East Region	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Department of Sustainability, Environment and Water (Commonwealth)	\$86,745.45	Contribution to the Water Efficiency Labelling Scheme	Y
Department of Sustainability, Environment and Water (Commonwealth)	\$222,885.00	Jurisdictional contributions for two programmes, the Great Artesian Basin Coordinating Committee and the Lake Eyre Basin Ministerial Forum	Y
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	-\$172,140.60 (*)	Return of unspent National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality funding to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources for on-passing back to the Commonwealth who originally provided to the Department for Water for the Salt Interception Scheme	Y
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	\$165,000.00	Environmental Flows and Wetland management project	Y
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	\$2,650,500.00	Contribution to the Stormwater Project—First Creek Adelaide Botanic Gardens (which has the capacity to reduce potable water demand by up to 100 megalitres per year)	Y
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	\$10,000.00	Contribution of funds to assist in resourcing the Natural Resources Management Research & Innovation Network	Y
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	\$515,000.00	Department for Water's contribution for purchase of Pike River land	Y
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	\$2,728,000.04	Murray Futures Programme contribution to the Coorong Lower Lakes Early on Works Project (accrued and disclosed under 'Other Grants' in the Department for Water financial statements as at 30/6/12)	Y
Department of Primary Industries and Regions, South Australia	\$826,000.00	Funding provided for the Irrigation research, technology diffusion and education project	Y
Environment Protection Authority	\$289,000.00	Salary & related contingency expenditure for the employment of staff to implement the River Murray Water Quality Improvement Plan	Y
Environment Protection Authority	\$200,000.00	Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Area—Acid Drainage Project	Y
e-Water Limited	\$213,000.00	Contribution to the e-Water Cooperative Research Centre and National Hydrologic Modelling Platform	Y
Flinders University of South Australia	\$125,000.00	Partnership Organisation funding for the National Centre for Groundwater Research and Training	Y
Gregory, Helen Dianne	\$10,324.55	Payments for protecting remnant vegetation (significant wildlife habitat) in the Upper South East Region	Y
Mitton, Dr MJ & DS	\$54,719.54	Payments for protecting remnant vegetation (significant wildlife habitat) in the Upper South East Region	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Monash University	\$34,090.91	Contribution to the Cities as Water Supply Catchments programme	Y
Murray-Darling Association Incorporated	\$11,608.35	Funding for the association to maintain the Management Action Database on their website	Y
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	\$319,540.30	State Contribution to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority Salt Interception Scheme	Y
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	\$442,516.00	Return of unspent Murray Futures Programme funding as per agreement	Y
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	\$28,346,000.00	State Contribution to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority	Y
National Water Commission	\$20,461.00	Return of unspent funding for the project—Improving Environmental Water Policy as per the funding agreement	Y
Port Pirie Regional Council	\$427,272.73	Funding provided for a Water Supply Augmentation Preliminary Feasibility Study	Y
Regional Development Australia	\$50,000.00	Develop a vision and high-level framework for the River Murray corridor below Lock 1 Blanchetown	Y
SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board	\$280,000.00	Funding provided for an Environmental Works & Measures Feasibility Project	Y
SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board	\$35,868.56	Incorporating cultural water into water planning policy	Y
SA Water Corporation	\$25,000.00	Funding provided for Water Modelling 2011-12 programme	Y
SA Water Corporation	\$3,910,000.00	Contribution to the Stormwater Project—Barker Inlet (which has the capacity to reduce potable water demand by up to 300 megalitres per year)	Y
SA Water Corporation	\$6,090,000.00	Contribution to the Stormwater Project—Adelaide Airport (which has the capacity to reduce potable water demand by up to 270 megalitres per year)	Y
South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board	\$3,300,000.00	Operations and maintenance of the South East Drainage system	Y
Struan Valley Pastoral	\$18,770.33	Payments for protecting remnant vegetation (significant wildlife habitat) in the Upper South East Region	Y
University of South Australia	\$11,700.00	Internship grant—Engineering Student	Y
Wetlands & Wildlife	\$93,765.18	Payments for protecting remnant vegetation (significant wildlife habitat) in the Upper South East Region	Y
TOTAL	\$88,942,256.72		
Plus Grants less than \$10,000	\$36,528.06		
TOTAL AS PER 2011-12 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	\$88,978,784.78		

(*) An amount of \$380,937 was accrued in 2010-11 as a recognition of the grant payment anticipated to be made that year. After the finalisation and audit of the project's financial

statements, an amount of \$208,796.40 was returned to the Commonwealth in June 2012, via DENR. This accounting treatment reflected a negative balance of -\$172,140.60 being reported in the Department's 2011-12 financial accounts, in accordance with accounting standards.

SA Water

In 2011-12, SA Water processed grants to over 32,000 recipients.

Name of Grant Scheme	Amount of Grant (\$)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Rainwater Tank Plumbing Rebate Scheme	1,343,000	Rebate provided for plumbing a new or existing tank into an existing home	N
H2ome Rebate Scheme	2,414,000	Provided to encourage households to achieve greater water saving inside and outside the home	N
Standalone Rainwater Tank Rebate Scheme	2,049,000	Rebate for standalone rainwater tanks of 1,000 litres or more	N

SCHOOL AUDIT ARRANGEMENTS

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (14 November 2012).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs): I have been advised:

1. The respective needs of the department and audit are determined by legislation such as the *Public Finance and Audit Act*, Treasurers Instructions and *Australian Accounting Standards*.

Section 31(1)(b) of the *Public Finance and Audit Act* provides for the Auditor-General to audit the accounts of the department for each financial year. The Auditor-General's Department carries out the annual financial statements audit to provide assurance that:

- the financial statements reflect the financial position of the department at the end of the preceding financial year and the results of its operations and cash flows for that financial year; and
- the controls exercised by the department in relation to the receipt, expenditure and investment of money, the acquisition and disposal of property and the incurring of liabilities are sufficient to provide reasonable assurance that the financial transactions of the department have been conducted properly and in accordance with law.

In the Department for Education and Child Development (DECD) context, the Auditor-General makes use of the work undertaken by internal audit in relation to the audits of schools in order to assess the risk of material misstatement of the financial statements.

This arrangement has supported DECD in implementing financial controls over schools' financial accounting functions and to reflect their financial accounts in the DECD financial statements.

The current school audit program covers the audit of annual school financial statements and a review of key controls. The Auditor-General places a degree of reliance on the school audit program in forming his opinion on the DECD consolidated financial statements and its control environment.

The requirement for every site to be audited every year is not embodied in the *Education Act or Children's Services Act*. The requirement for financial statements to be prepared, audited and presented to governing councils is reflected through ministerial directions under the *Education Act 1972*.

These requirements are embodied in the Administrative Instruction Guidelines (AIGs) Section 5(17) which states that 'Councils and affiliated committees (and principals for the school fund account) must send a copy of the audited statement of accounts for the previous school financial year to the Chief Executive no later than 1st June each year.'

The current school audit arrangements meet this requirement and therefore, by undergoing an annual audit of their accounts, all schools meet the respective needs of the department and audit.

2. The Auditor-General has formed the opinion that the Department for Education and Child Development financial report gives a true and fair view of the financial position of the department. He also believed the controls exercised are sufficient to provide reasonable assurance that the transactions of the department have been conducted properly and in accordance with the law.

In forming this opinion, the Auditor-General made use of the work undertaken by internal audit in relation to the audits of schools to assess the risk of material misstatement of the financial statements.

Overall the results of the school audits were satisfactory and did not present a risk of material misstatement of the departmental financial statements.

3. As stated, the results of the school audits were satisfactory and did not present a risk of material misstatement of the departmental financial statements.

CHILD PROTECTION

In reply to the **Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport)** (21 March 2013).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs): I have been advised:

The Department for Education and Child Development refers all possible criminal offences to the South Australia Police (SAPOL) for their assessment. If SAPOL's own investigations find sufficient evidence to charge individuals, the matter will then proceed to court.

CHILD PROTECTION

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (16 May 2013).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs): I have been advised:

This information is in the public domain and can be found at:

<http://www.decd.sa.gov.au/educationinquiry>.

ASBESTOS, SCHOOL

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (16 May 2013).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) has advised that of 611 Department for Education and Child Development sites with asbestos, 581 had their annual check undertaken during 2012. The remaining sites had their check just outside the annual timeframe (in either late 2011, or early 2013).

CHILD PROTECTION

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (25 July 2013).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs): I have been advised:

The briefing of 7 June did not contain that information.

SOUTH EAST FOREST INDUSTRY ROUNDTABLE

In reply to **Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier)** (16 October 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 the following:

The South East Forest Industry Roundtable (SEFIR) was briefed during the entirety of the sale process.

SEFIR provided advice on the conditions for the sale of the forward rotations, which were included in the transaction documents to the satisfaction of the SEFIR. SEFIR did not provide any specific conditions relating to the Glencoe nursery.

The government always intended that the operator of the forward rotations post-sale would have use of the Glencoe nursery products.

The successful bidder, OneFortyOne Plantations Pty Ltd (OFO), submitted in its bid for the forward rotations that it had based its valuation on the assumption that Glencoe nursery would be included in the sale and therefore included the value of the Glencoe Nursery as part of its total bid price. The \$670 million purchase price received from OFO included the value of the Glencoe nursery assets.

There are many stringent conditions securing the future of the nursery, some of which include:

- the Glencoe land is to be used only as a nursery
- roads and tracks must be maintained
- fire-fighting, prevention and detection capability must be maintained
- pests and weeds must be controlled.

CHILD PROTECTION INQUIRY

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (17 October 2013).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs): I have been advised:

Ms Baldock answered this question when she appeared before the upper house enquiry on Saturday 18 October 2013.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—

- City of Unley Annual Report 2012-13
- City of West Torrens Annual Report 2012-13
- District Council of Franklin Harbour Annual Report 2012-13
- District Council of Kimba Annual Report 2012-13
- District Council of Robe Annual Report 2012-13
- Flinders Ranges Council Annual Report 2012-13
- Tatiara District Council Annual Report 2012-13
- Wattle Range Council Annual Report 2012-13

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

- ANZAC Day Commemoration Council—Annual Report 2012-13
- Premier and Cabinet, Department of—Annual Report 2012-13

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

- Regulations made under the following Act—
- Public Corporations—Lifetime Support Authority

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

- Land Agents—Real Estate Reform Review and Other Matters—Indemnity Fund
- Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—Real Estate Reform Review and Other Matters—Miscellaneous
- Liquor Licensing—
- Dry Areas—
- Beachport—Robe—Two Wells—New Year's Eve 2013
- Woodside Area 1—December 2013

By the Minister for Health and Ageing (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Health Advisory Council—

Central Adelaide Local Health Network Annual Report 2012-13
Coorong Health Service Annual Report 2012-13
Hills Area Annual Report 2012-13
Kingston Robe Annual Report 2012-13
Mount Gambier and Districts Annual Report 2012-13
Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Annual Report 2012-13
Naracoorte Area Annual Report 2012-13
Northern Adelaide Local Health Network Annual Report 2012-13
Penola and Districts Annual Report 2012-13
Port Augusta Roxby Downs Woomera Annual Report 2012-13
South Australian Ambulance Service Volunteer Annual Report 2012-13
South Coast Annual Report 2012-13
Veterans Annual Report 2012-13
Women's and Children's Health Network Annual Report 2012-13

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Australian Children's Education and Care Quality Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
Council for the Care of Children—Annual Report 2012-13
Dame Roma Mitchell Trust Fund for Children and Young People—Annual Report 2012-13
Education and Care Services Ombudsman, National Education and Care Services FOI and
Privacy Commissioners—Annual Report 2012-13
Education and Early Childhood Services Registration and Standards Board of South
Australia—Annual Report 2012-13

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Act—
Motor Vehicles—Rounding of Fees and Refunds

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

Regulations made under the following Act—
Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia—Prescribed
Public Authorities

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

Hydroponics Industry Control Act 2009—Annual Report 2012-13
Witness Protection Act 1996—Annual Report 2012-13

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

South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission—Annual Report 2012-13

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

Outback Communities Authority—Annual Report 2012-13
South Australian Rock Lobster Industry Primary Industries Funding Scheme—
Annual Report 2012-13
Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2012-13

By the Minister for Transport Services (Hon. C.C. Fox)—

Regulations made under the following Act—
Passenger Transport—Miscellaneous Variation

By the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

Regulations made under the following Act—
Rates and Land Tax Remission—Water Rates—Council Rates

By the Minister for Tourism (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Adelaide Convention Centre Corporation—Charter June 2013
 Animal Welfare Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2012-13
 Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium, Board of—Annual Report 2012-13
 General Reserves Trust—Annual Report 2012-13
 South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council—Annual Report 2012-13
 Regulations made under the following Act—
 Radiation Protection and Control—Non-ionising Radiation—Commercial Cosmetic
 Tanning Services

EDUCATION POLICY

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:10): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Today I released the 10th in our series of Building a Stronger South Australia policies—High Quality Education. This follows policies on Future Fund, jobs and skills, public transport, safer policing, transport, housing in the city, premium food and wine, healthy and strong children, and children, technology and gambling.

There are few things more important to our children's future and the future prosperity of our state than providing a high quality education. That is why it matters so much that the number of young people staying at school until year 12 is now at a 10-year high. Our state cannot afford to have almost a—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Our state cannot afford to have almost a third of young people dropping out of school early as they were before Labor took office in 2002. With South Australia now leading the nation in young people staying at school to improve their future opportunities, we are now turning our focus to lifting the quality of our education system. We know that, apart from parent support, the single most effective way to lift the quality of our children's education is to lift the quality and status of teachers and leaders.

We want to see our teachers and school leaders regarded as amongst the most important professions in our community and we want those teaching and leading our children to be among the most highly skilled and respected in the world. That is why, as part of this policy, the government has announced that from 2020 all new South Australian teachers will have a masters qualification and further qualifications will be required to become a pre-school director or school principal.

Scholarships of up to \$20,000 will also be offered to enable 240 teachers already in schools to undertake a masters, and scholarships of up to \$12,000 will be offered to support our emerging leaders to better manage and lead our schools.

Under the policy there will be more specialist public schools to give greater choice to families about their children's education. We will do this by offering grants of \$50,000 to encourage more public schools to specialise in an academic field, language or arts. Many schools already specialise and we will work with them to promote this and make it easier for parents to find these schools.

We have also announced our intention to establish a second 1,000 student high school in the city by 2019. The new school, plus the 250 student expansion of Adelaide High School underway, will allow—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated. Leave has been granted. The members for Adelaide and Heysen are called to order. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The new school, plus the 250 student expansion of Adelaide High School underway, will allow for zoning changes to ensure more young people living in the inner city suburbs can attend a public school in the city. We have made this decision

because our vibrant city agenda will lead to thousands more people living in the city in coming years and because we have listened to families in the inner city suburbs who want to send their children to high schools in the city. Expressions of interest will be called for immediately to identify potential sites for the new school.

Today I have also announced, with the vice-chancellor of the University of South Australia, our vision for a world leading education precinct at the University of South Australia's Magill campus. Under this proposal a new birth to 12 school will be built on the Magill campus, bringing together school, early childhood services, and special education, and setting South Australia up as a centre of excellence in teacher training. This policy presents a new direction for public education, building on the reforms of the past decade and making sure that South Australia has the kind of high quality public schooling it deserves.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (14:19): I bring up the 83rd report of the committee, entitled South Australian Taxation System.

Report received and ordered to be published.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:20): I bring up the 90th report of the committee, entitled Bushfire Preparedness of Properties in Bushfire Risk Areas.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 91st report of the committee entitled Whyalla Regional Fact-Finding Visit, 23 and 24 October 2013.

Report received and ordered to be published.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:21): I bring up the 15th report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into the Occupational Health and Safety Responsibilities of SafeWork SA.

Report received and ordered to be published.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:22): I bring up the 35th report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into the Sale and Consumption of Alcohol: Interim Report.

Report received.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (14:23): I bring up the 36th report of the committee, entitled Report on A Visit to Newcastle (NSW) in relation to the committee's Inquiry into the Sale and Consumption of Alcohol, 9 to 11 October 2013.

Report received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:24): I bring up the 489th report of the committee, entitled Minnipa High Level Tank Replacement Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr SIBBONS: I bring up the 490th report of the committee, entitled Salisbury East High School Redevelopment.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr SIBBONS: I bring up the 491st report of the committee, entitled Para West Adult Campus Relocation to TAFE SA Elizabeth.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr SIBBONS: I bring up the 492nd report of the committee, entitled Replacement of SA Water's Telemetry and Radio Equipment in the Metropolitan and Outer Metropolitan Regions.

Report received and ordered to be published.

QUESTION TIME

MID-YEAR BUDGET REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the Treasurer. Has the Treasurer received advice that as of 30 September there was a \$128 million deterioration in the year end operating balance?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:25): These are all matters for the imminent Mid-Year Budget Review.

MID-YEAR BUDGET REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): I have a supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: If it be a supplementary.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the Treasurer update the house on the state government's budget performance through to the end of September this year?

The SPEAKER: We are moving from the specific to the general. Treasurer.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:26): It is the same answer. It will be happening soon, and then you will have no further excuses not to release your policies.

Members interjecting:

MID-YEAR BUDGET REVIEW

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Another supplementary, sir—

The SPEAKER: When the hubbub on your own side subsides, and we can hear you.

Mr MARSHALL: A supplementary, sir. When the Treasurer says that we do not have long to wait, can he announce to the house when the Mid-Year Budget Review will be provided?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:26): Very soon.

COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:26): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house about the effects on South Australia of recently announced commonwealth government positions?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:26): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is only 10 weeks since the election of the new commonwealth government (it seems longer, doesn't it?) and South Australia is feeling the brunt of its fiscal conservatism. We already knew that it was going to cut \$500 million out of automotive assistance, and that sector is facing months of extraordinary uncertainty, which is not only bad for that sector and reckless in relation to decision-making by Holden, it is also very bad for the South Australian economy.

Yesterday we heard from the federal education minister that he will tear up funding agreements reached with states and territories, including South Australia. Not only do we stand to lose \$400 million of funding in the later years of the agreement, but schools face uncertainty from now on as to whether they will be getting any additional funds. This comes on top of the commonwealth government reneging on agreements for the funding of the Gawler rail electrification line, the Tonsley Park interchange, and the Torrens to Torrens upgrade of South Road. Together these represent \$536 million of funding. In the regions—and you would have thought the commonwealth government would at least pay some respect to its natural constituency—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The commonwealth is renegeing on our agreement for the upgrade of the road through to the APY lands, where its share was \$85 million, and it has taken away \$10 million of Farm Finance from South Australia.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Speaker, most—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Most shamefully, \$650 million in River Murray upgrades and water buybacks has been deferred, threatening to choke our state's lifeblood and undermining the nature of the agreement we reached to save the River Murray. The commonwealth is also withdrawing funding so vital to our local communities, with \$11 million in cuts to the Regional Development Australia Fund. These cuts will affect dozens of local clubs and community groups—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned for the first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Together these cuts total over \$2 billion—\$2 billion in only 10 weeks—and we have had 10 weeks of only stunning silence from the Leader of the Opposition in the face of this. He is silent because he knows what is coming from his side of the equation; he knows what is coming next. He will not reveal it to us; it is a secret to the rest of us, but in the light of—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: standing order 98. I believe the Premier is not addressing the substance of the question, which was about commonwealth initiatives.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the Premier has drifted from the nub of the question. I will listen to what the Premier has to say carefully.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: What we have seen in recent weeks is a pattern of very clear statements that are made in the lead-up to a federal election but with very little scrutiny, unfortunately, because, sadly, people had already made their minds up about the result of the last federal election. That will not be a strategy available to the Leader of the Opposition. He is not going to be able to hide in the same way—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir—

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —that the Prime Minister of Australia was able to hide.

The SPEAKER: The Premier, leave to continue the answer is withdrawn. The leader.

BUDGET FORECAST

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Premier. Can the Treasurer confirm that 10 of the government's savings measures have been classified internally as 'red' with a projected end-of-year savings shortfall of approximately \$41 million?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:30): The Mid-Year Budget Review will reveal all of the steps that we have taken in relation to our savings initiatives. The question on everybody's lips is: what are they going to cut to fund their \$230 million of throwaway to the business community?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order, sir—

The SPEAKER: I think the Treasurer has finished. In the interim, if the leader would be—

Mr Venning: He certainly has; he certainly is.

The SPEAKER: I know it's his last week, so it's with great reluctance that I call the member for Schubert to order. And his interjection has quite made me forget the other two people I was going to warn. Member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Mr Speaker, the member for Schubert has been here for only 23 years, and I ask you to show some leniency when it comes to being familiar with the standing orders!

The SPEAKER: Yes, thank you. The leader, with a supplementary.

BUDGET FORECAST

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Yes. The Treasurer just outlined to the house that all will be revealed in the Mid-Year Budget Review, but can he confirm today that, after the Mid-Year Budget Review adjustments, the expected year-end deterioration of the state budget will be approximately \$21 million?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:31): Mr Speaker, you will be able to reflect on the truth or otherwise of that by reading the Mid-Year Budget Review.

BETTER SCHOOLS REFORM

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the Minister for Education and Child Development advise the house about the ongoing implementation of the Better Schools reforms?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:32): I think it's fair to say that shock waves have resonated in relation to the implementation of the Better Schools reform. We negotiated a package with the federal Labor government that meant an increase of funding to South Australian schools of \$1.1 billion by 2019. Every student, whether they go to a public school, an independent or Catholic school, would be getting the same base level of funding, with loadings for a range of other factors. The focus was on the individual children.

The Premier and I also announced that we would bring forward additional funding from the state contribution. That commitment meant that funding that would have been provided in the later years in 2017 and 2018 would be brought forward with an extra \$17 million invested in all schools, starting next year.

Better Schools has now been put at significant risk by the Abbott government. Mr Abbott has obviously tasked his ministers to slash their budgets. Christopher Pyne has been caught red-handed, shamefully trying to pull money out of our schools. We signed a six-year deal. The first cut from the Liberals was to commit to only four years. The first cut—\$400 million—out of public, Catholic and independent—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: Before you were in your position of grandeur, you often referred to Erskine May and members reading their answers. Could you please advise if you still believe that to be the case?

The SPEAKER: If the member for Unley could approach the Chair—the 'grandeur' of the Chair, as he puts it—and show me the particular passage, I will rule on it. Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir. If that was not bad enough—a \$400 million cut to the three sectors of schools—Christopher Pyne has said that he now wants to renegotiate the deal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I anticipate that the point of order is going to be that the minister is referring to the member for Sturt and the federal Minister for Education by his Christian name and surname. Of course—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: That is quite in order, because he is not a member of this parliament, and the standing order is designed to prevent quarrels between members of this house by not referring to them by their given name. For instance, if the Minister for Education were to refer to His Holiness Pope Francis, she could refer to him as Frank, if she so wished. The Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir. If cutting \$400 million from our schools was not bad enough, Christopher Pyne, the member for Sturt—so that people know where he is located—says he wants to renegotiate, but he has said on radio, and I quote, 'The funding envelope remains exactly the same.' Weasel words, sir. What it means is the same amount of money but more states. This is like your nanna turning up to your birthday with \$20 in an envelope for you but saying that you have to share it with your sister. I know how well that would go down with you, sir—like a lead balloon.

We are not interested in renegotiating. We have a signed deal. There is a very simple question for Christopher Pyne, the member for Sturt, and the opposition leader in this place: will they guarantee that every government and non-government student will get every cent they were promised under the six-year Better Schools agreement?

It could have funded an additional 14 teachers, an extra million dollars for each school in this state. It would have funded 14 teachers or 18 SSOs, or access to any number of numeracy and literacy programs, or purchased more support for students with special needs. The states that signed up—not just Labor states, not just South Australia, but Liberal states as well—told the Minister for Education, Christopher Pyne, to back off. We have signed an agreement and we expect you to honour—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: standing order 98. I believe the minister is debating the issue. The hypothetical possibilities that she raises have nothing to do with updating the house on the status of—

The SPEAKER: No, it is not a hypothetical question and it is not a hypothetical answer. The minister is sharing with the house what she believes are the consequences of the commonwealth policy. They may be conjectural and the opposition may disagree with them but, alas, you have to listen to them. The Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir. I ask the South Australian opposition leader to put the interests of South Australia first, to put the interests of South Australian schools first, to put the interests of South Australian students first, to stand up for South Australia.

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired.

CAR PARKING LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. How can the public be certain how much the car park tax will cost, given that the government has now provided three different revenue projections: \$34 million, \$26 million and \$30 million a year prior to this tax even being implemented?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:38): The simple explanation is that we have carried out the detailed survey work of precisely the number of car parks in the city. We have also made adjustments to the number of exemptions. So, exemptions will also include residential car parking spaces; loading bays; disabled car park spaces; car park spaces for emergency vehicles; short-term parking by the general public on the hospital site; car park spaces provided for special event parking, including occasional car parking within the Parklands; bus layovers; and car park spaces for display vehicles, service vehicles and stock vehicles. So, two variables have occurred. One is that we have had a more accurate count of the number of car park spaces. The second variable that has changed is that we have expanded the number of exemptions.

CAR PARKING LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): Supplementary. Given the Premier has advised the house that he has conducted a comprehensive survey of the number of car parks in the city, can the Premier confirm that the government will now pay more than \$4 million a year in car park tax on its own car parks?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:40): No, I can't confirm that.

CAR PARKING LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): Can the Treasurer provide any indication of what the additional cost will be to the people of South Australia?

The SPEAKER: A very open-ended question. Treasurer.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:40): Well, there is a report that we released when we announced this car parking levy and there are benefits, not just costs; there are benefits associated with this arrangement. The benefits are the investment in very substantial upgrades to the public transport infrastructure, in particular investing in Paradise—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, you asked about costs. I say that they need to be balanced with benefits. Paradise, Mount Barker and Clovelly Park will be the first locations to be funded from the levy, and indeed that will save people money. It won't cost them money, it will save people money as they park in those park-and-rides and take the trams or public transport into the city. So, commuters will be encouraged to use other forms of transport. I know that the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party would like South Australia to remain a sleepy country town, but we have ambitions for it to be a thriving, vibrant metropolis, and for that you need—

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Heysen.

Mrs REDMOND: I think the Premier has entered into debate.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think the Premier has entered into debate, but before any further supplementary, I warn the member for West Torrens for the second and final time.

CAR PARKING LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: This is a third supplementary.

Mr MARSHALL: Yes, you are quite right. Will the health department be allocated additional funds to pay the car park tax on its 1,890 car parks?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:41): These are matters for agencies to manage within their budgets. There are arrangements where some of the costs associated with car parks within the South Australian public sector will be exempt. For other fleet vehicles there may be a modest cost to government, but others will be borne in terms of negotiations between the employer and employees. The balance of any budget effects will be borne by agencies.

Mr MARSHALL: Could I ask a supplementary to the health minister, sir?

The SPEAKER: No, I think three supplementaries on top of a question is a lot, and in fact I warn you for the first time for that bellowing interjection. The member for Ramsay.

RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will the minister inform the house of the importance of investing in urban rail and the impact of proposed cuts by the federal government on this investment?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:43): On the issue of public transport let there be no doubt: no state government has invested in public transport to the extent of this government. We are currently undertaking the biggest ever single investment in Adelaide's public transport system.

This government recognises that investment across all of our rail networks is an investment in our future. We know that rail investment is intrinsically linked to our investments in our communities. This government believes in transport infrastructure, as it will become an economic driver for our state. That is why we have invested \$1.4 billion in the rail revitalisation program. This project has:

- created more than 3,600 jobs;
- rebuilt 166 kilometres of track across the network;
- installed 240,000 new concrete sleepers;
- removed 220,000 timber sleepers;
- installed 70 kilometres of wires and over 1,200 masts and portals;
- constructed a 620 metre rail underpass at the Goodwood junction—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will continue. It has:

- constructed a 1.2 kilometre viaduct over the Onkaparinga River;
- built new stations at Elizabeth, Munno Para, Seaford Meadows and the Seaford terminus; and
- started construction of new stations at St Clair and Wayville.

Some in our community would say that spending on infrastructure is a false economy. We do not believe that. That is why we are proud of the work we have done on the Outer Harbor, Belair, Gawler and Seaford/Noarlunga lines. This government wants to build on our efforts in investing in urban rail. That is why we want to see the Tonsley line duplicated and electrified and the Gawler line electrified to Salisbury. Unfortunately, the Liberal Party and the commonwealth government feel differently.

Despite the fact we had contracts signed, or we were out to tender, the commonwealth government has pulled its funding from these important projects, ripping the heart out of the north and the south. In fact, work on Tonsley was well underway and the boots were on the ground when the federal government pulled the money. Unlike members opposite, this government does not support ripping away funding from the Tonsley and Gawler lines.

We do not support it because it acts as a handbrake on the economy. We do not support it because it cuts more than 1,000 jobs from the economy across both projects. We don't support it because our construction sector needs projects now, not in five years time. Believe it or not, Mr Speaker, I agree with Phil Sutherland, a declared member of the Liberal Party and supporter and the chief executive of the Civil Contractors Federation when he says:

...and the call now to the new Coalition government in Canberra is make sure you honour the infrastructure commitments...the former government has made.

Unfortunately, sir, Mr Sutherland is at odds with members opposite. This government believes there is a crucial role for the commonwealth to play in supporting urban rail projects. That is why we are willing to stand up for the people of the south and the north and fight to keep these projects in the pipeline. Unfortunately, members opposite would gladly see these projects disappear to improve the balance sheets of their friends in Canberra.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir: referring to members opposite on what they may or may not believe is surely debate.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think you're right. The leader.

CAR PARKING LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Can the minister inform the house of the cost of the car park tax on his department's 1,890 car parks over the forward estimates?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:47): I have already answered that question, sir.

CAR PARKING LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:47): It's almost hilarious. I would like to ask a supplementary to the health minister, if possible. Which health services will be cut to pay for the health department's component of the car park tax?

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) (14:47): Well, isn't it wonderful to hear the opposition talking about hospital cuts, because if there's one group in this chamber who hate hospitals—in fact, there's one thing they hate more than a hospital, they hate a new hospital even more.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health will be seated.

Mr Marshall: Is that it?

The SPEAKER: No, no—

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order—

The SPEAKER: I don't need the point of order from the member for Heysen; I anticipate it. It is somewhat over the top to say that a member of the house 'hates' hospitals. Could perhaps the Minister of Health break down his reasoning into smaller parts and then make it sequential and logical?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Sir, every time with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, or EPAS, or any of the hospital developments, which this government has proudly undertaken, what do we get from the opposition? Moaning and groaning. Every time this government invests a dollar in a new hospital a little part of them dies. A little part of them dies with every dollar that this government invests in our health system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, uphold that—

Mr Marshall: Can we get an answer from him?

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order. Is there a supplementary?

Mr Marshall: Is there an answer?

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor.

TRADE, INDONESIA

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade. Can the minister update the house on South Australia's trade relationship with Indonesia?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (14:49): I thank the member for Taylor for her question. Sir, I should point out very quickly to the house that the trade relationship with Indonesia is quite healthy. It remains an important trading partner for South Australia, with two-way trade in 2012-13 totalling over \$600 million. Indonesia is South Australia's sixth largest export market and second largest market for agrifood exports, with a value of \$354 million. There is also a top export market for South Australian wheat and meslin, with 27 per cent of all wheat and meslin exports going to Indonesia.

The government, while it does not have a trade office in Indonesia any more, continues to assist people wishing to export to Indonesia, with TradeStart, Gateway and an excellent relationship with Austrade. I tell you that it is not this government's policy, and never will be, to sit overseas and criticise our own state while we are on a trade mission; we will never do that. We will never sit overseas and criticise our own state, run our own state down at the same time as trying to drive exports into that state.

What we will do, and what I have done over the last three years, is build a bipartisan relationship with people in trade. I have taken the member for Waite with me on three occasions this year. I have taken him to the United Arab Emirates, India and China, and we have worked together to drive exports for this state. It has been surprisingly successful, and should I return as

minister for trade next year I will continue to do so, because it is important for this state to have a bipartisan approach to trade.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned for the first time, and it would be a tragedy if in his final week of sittings of this house he were to depart early. I would not wish that.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: It would be a tragedy. Don't do that, sir. Have mercy.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Manufacturing.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: I am prepared to take the pain, sir, from him. I will continue to work with the opposition. I will continue to take the member for Waite, or whoever the shadow trade minister is at that time, with me overseas to work on trade missions, because it is effective. When we are overseas with people, they are surprised that the minister and the shadow minister of the two major opposing parties of this state are there together, working overseas to further trade in their country, and I will continue to do that.

I certainly will not be advocating while I am overseas trying to ingratiate myself with a market. I certainly won't be advocating the shutdown of the manufacturing industry in this state as the Leader of the Opposition did. I won't be saying that we should keep the high-end parts—the R&D and design—in Australia but actually get the manufacturing done overseas, because this government wants manufacturing done in this state, in this country. We're trying to improve manufacturing with our manufacturing works. We have a clear and effective strategy to do that and will not be moving manufacturing offshore, as seems to be the policy of the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite has a supplementary question.

TRADE, INDONESIA

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Trade. If, as we have just heard, the relationship with South-East Asia and Indonesia is so important to the government, and given that South-East Asia is our most important trading partner—

The SPEAKER: Yes, let's have the question.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: —why after 12 years does the government have no strategy to engage with Indonesia or South-East Asia, no representation, and no specific programs to engage with our country's destinations?

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel will cease making goat noises up the back, and he is called to order. The Minister for Manufacturing.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (14:52): Just one goat, sir. We had a review of the trade offices, the Hartley Review, in 2012, I think it was. The Hartley review recommended concentrating our efforts in the two major markets and in fact our major trading partner, China. It recommended concentrating on China and India, two of the biggest markets in the world, concentrating our resources into those economies to get them right, and then look for other markets.

Let's not fall into the South Australian trap of trying to be a little bit to every person, and try to do something well in a concentrated fashion, to spend a lot of time and effort, as we have, on developing a China/India strategy and engage in a meaningful and developed way with those countries before we do exactly the same thing into South-East Asia, or wherever else we may choose to do that.

The SPEAKER: There is a supplementary question from the leader.

TRADE, INDONESIA

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): Can the minister update the house on the government's progress towards achieving its goal of \$25 billion of exports by 2013—this year?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (14:53): That's exactly what the China and India strategies are designed to do. They are designed to help us lift the exports—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: They are designed to help us reach the goals that we set for ourselves. Sometimes after a setting a substantial goal we don't meet it, but you have to keep pushing at goals. You have to have a plan, you have to have a policy. What we don't see from the opposition is any sort of policy, or any indication of how they intend to go about growing the economy.

The SPEAKER: A third supplementary.

TRADE, INDONESIA

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood—Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): Can the minister outline to the house what the export total was for South Australia last year and what it was when Labor came to power almost 12 years ago, and what progress the government has made, if at all, in terms of exports during that time?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (14:54): I am happy to get those numbers, but what I will say is that exporting manufacturing jobs overseas, shutting down the manufacturing industry after Holden goes, getting rid of Holden and getting rid of manufacturing seems to be what the opposition wants.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: That is not the sort of export we want. We do not want to be exporting jobs and importing goods. We want to be exporting goods and services, and you cannot do that if you do not manufacture here.

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the second and final time. The member for Morialta is called to order, though the number of his transgressions is such that he should have been ejected, and the Minister for Health is called to order for encouraging that kind of behaviour.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, an accessory after the fact.

SUPERANNUATION BENEFITS

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Finance. What effect will the Abbott government's plan to scrap the low income superannuation contribution have on low paid workers in South Australia?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:56): Thank you, member for Kaurna. As members may be aware, the commonwealth government has announced its intention not to continue with the low income superannuation contribution. This government has gone to considerable effort in the past two years to establish a public sector scheme by which low paid public sector workers can benefit from the commonwealth's low income superannuation contribution scheme.

In January this year, Super SA Select was established in line with the principles of the federal government's Cooper review into superannuation which sets out the future direction of superannuation schemes in Australia. Public sector employees who earn less than \$37,000 a year could join Super SA Select and receive up to \$500 per annum in superannuation payments without impacting on their living wage.

I issued a media release on Thursday 10 January this year encouraging low paid public sector employees to join this new fund. The difference from the fund that we have and all other public sector employees have in that it is a constitutionally non-protected scheme, so that on the payment of pensions the pensions are taxed, unlike our scheme.

This was a first for government. This government brought in Super SA Select because we recognised that an estimated 28,000 Super SA members would have missed out on this commonwealth payment, including many young workers and those working on a casual or part-

time basis, because the commonwealth payment only applies to members of taxed superannuation schemes.

These 28,000 low paid public sector workers are only a fraction of the total number of people who have been affected in South Australia by this cut. Supermarket cashiers, labourers and tradespeople working on our state's many construction projects, and cleaners in our schools and hospitals, will now be denied this superannuation benefit.

Interestingly, concurrent with this announcement, the federal government also announced that it was going to ditch the tax that was going to be paid on superannuation pensions in excess of \$100,000 per annum, so low paid workers were being penalised while high income pensioners being paid a pension in excess of \$100,000 a year were actually being returned to non-tax status.

So, on the one hand low income workers are being hit and on the other hand high income individuals are receiving a particular benefit. Now, this begs the question: where does the state opposition stand on this matter, because it does impact on a state government superannuation scheme, and what are they going to do about low paid workers in South Australia?

CAR PARKING LEVY

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. Will the car park tax be subject to GST, which will take the impost to \$825 per car park per year?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (14:59): I will bring back an answer to the house.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The transport development levy is levied in the sum of \$750, and the way that is applied to each individual car park is going to be a matter for the individual car park owner about the way in which they apply that tax. The incidence of that tax will largely depend on the competitive forces that exist within that particular segment of the car parking market. So, first one needs to understand what will be passed on to car parking users, and then one would be able to calculate the effect of whether there is a GST payable on that, but I will bring back a further answer to the house.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: A supplementary?

The SPEAKER: Just before you do so, the member for Heysen is warned for the first time and so is the member for Kavel. Member for Davenport.

CAR PARKING LEVY

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:00): Has the Premier asked the Department of Treasury, in the 12 months since the Treasurer announced this tax, whether GST would be applied to the tax, and if so, what was Treasury's answer, and if not, why not?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (15:01): I think it depends essentially on the nature of the particular enterprise, which is subject to the particular car parking levy. For instance, if they otherwise have a GST liability, then this may be offset—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —this may flow through and be offset by the GST that might otherwise be payable. I will bring back a complete answer to the house.

ALCOHOL-FUELLED VIOLENCE

The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (15:01): It is wonderful to have a question. My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the minister inform the house about how community organisations are helping to tackle the issue of alcohol-fuelled violence and related harm?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:02): Can I thank the honourable member for her question. The government takes the issue of alcohol-fuelled violence and the harm that it brings very seriously. A package of measures in a new

late night code for licensed venues, together with new liquor-licensing laws, demonstrate this government's determination in tackling this problem head on.

Early indications are very positive, both statistically and anecdotally, with a reported 25 per cent drop in alcohol-related incidents relating to licensed premises in the city compared to previous years. The government cannot address this issue in its entirety without help from the community. Therefore, the government is supporting organisations who share the objective of reducing the harm caused by alcohol, particularly when it concerns young people.

The Sammy D Foundation is one such organisation, which the state government has supported through several grant funding agreements, thus far totalling \$960,000. The Sammy D Foundation was formed by Ms Natalie Cook and Mr Neil Davis following the death of their son, Sam, who died after being hit at a house party in Brighton in 2008. Alcohol-fuelled violence and related harm can have a devastating impact on South Australian families, and Ms Cook wants to share Sam's story with other young people, with the aim of preventing their further suffering.

I am informed that, over the past four years, the foundation has delivered its presentation and workshops to approximately 7,500 young people across South Australia. Follow-up research suggests that this program has resulted in changes to the way young people think about violence, with 94 per cent of young people demonstrating a change in attitudes at six and 12 weeks following the program.

Earlier this month, Ms Cook's important community work was nationally recognised when she was picked for the News Corporation Pride of Australia Medal for Courage. Members of the house would join me in congratulating Ms Cook for her work addressing this important issue.

It has been recently brought to my attention that the federal government is considering withdrawing \$297,000 in funding from the Sammy D Foundation as part of savings measures. This funding was allocated by the previous federal government as part of its \$40 million crime prevention funding, all of which is presently under threat from the current federal government. Such cuts would have a devastating impact on the organisation's capacity to deliver its programs to young people across the state.

I will be writing to the federal Attorney-General, the Hon. George Brandis, to reinforce this government's opposition to these cuts. Today, I am also calling on the Leader of the Opposition to add his voice and stand up to his federal colleagues on this issue. We need a multifaceted approach to tackling alcohol-fuelled violence that also focuses on long-term behavioural change. This is what the Sammy D Foundation is striving for and the government is appreciative of the work they are doing.

CAR PARKING LEVY

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:05): My question is again to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer advise what the fringe benefits tax impact will be through the introduction of the proposed car park tax for car parking that the government provides its own employees?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (15:05): It has been asked and answered before. It depends on whether one increases the remuneration to the employees and, therefore, this is regarded as a benefit that flows through to those employees, in which case it has the effect of increasing the relevant remuneration to the employee and so, therefore, is not a fringe benefit but is in fact part of their remuneration package.

That would be the first possible means by which this could be dealt with. If it is paid for by the employee themselves, of course, the question of fringe benefits does not arise. They are the only two particular circumstances that could arise: one is that the employer essentially meets the cost of the relevant levy and the second is that the employee themselves meets the cost. If the employer meets the cost, it is dealt with through the usual PAYE tax system; if the employee meets it then it is their responsibility.

CAR PARKING LEVY

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:06): My question again is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer advise if the car park tax will increase payroll tax, WorkCover and fringe benefits tax liabilities for business, given his previous answer that said it was built into the remuneration?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (15:06): This question has

been asked before and I gave the same answer last time: it will if that is the means by which it is dealt with, and each individual agency will be making judgements about how they do that with their individual employees. If it actually increases the level of remuneration, of course it increases the basic payroll and it increases the relevant payroll for the purposes of calculating any other levies or charges.

SA HEALTH AWARDS

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the house about the recent SA Health Awards?

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) (15:07): I thank the member for Port Adelaide for her question and interest in the SA Health Awards. On Friday 15 November I had the pleasure of attending the 2013 SA Health Awards. The awards provide an opportunity to acknowledge the individuals, teams, programs and projects that have gone the extra mile to make positive changes to our hospital and health services. The calibre of the 25 finalists highlights the level of professionalism and dedication of our staff working across our health system. All of the nominees worked extremely hard to ensure we continue to provide the South Australian economy with exceptional health care. Across the nine categories, some of this year's winners included:

- SA Digital Telehealth Network project. This project is making a major difference to country South Australians by delivering remote clinical services closer to home, helping to close the inequity gap.
- Rethink Mental Illness campaign. This campaign successfully encouraged South Australians to understand mental illness to reduce stigma and discrimination of people who experience mental illness.
- Country Cancer Services project. This project has led to the establishment of 15 chemotherapy units in country South Australia and has helped ensure each unit meets statewide and national safety and quality requirements for patients, staff and the environment. I acknowledge members opposite who attended with me at the opening of these chemotherapy units.
- Dyslexia Action Group Barossa and Gawler Surrounds. This group sees GPs, principals, teachers, parents, health professionals, politicians and local government members working together to help make important changes to improve the health and educational outcomes of children with dyslexia.
- Rural Emergency Responder Network. This is a network of specially trained rural South Australian GPs who attend out-of-hospital emergencies in partnership with the SA Ambulance Service and the MedSTAR retrieval service to ensure the best possible health outcome for patients.

On behalf of the state government and SA Health, I would like to congratulate each of the nominees and winners for their hard work and dedication to our world-class health system.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Why has it taken the government four years to adopt the Liberal Party plan for a second city high school and to adopt the Liberal Party plan for a stand-alone autism school?

The SPEAKER: Can the member for Unley confirm that he read that contribution? Did you read that contribution?

Mr PISONI: I had some notes, sir.

The SPEAKER: Copious notes; excellent, good. The Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:10): What I can confirm today is that we have made a raft of major announcements in relation to education here in South Australia, education that will improve the lot of children in this state. We want our kids to leave school with the best education we can possibly provide. That means providing them with teachers who have the highest qualifications; that means providing them with high quality school environments; that means

investing in our schools and the redevelopment and expanding of Adelaide High School and the other major high schools in the near city.

We are doing a range of things in relation to improving our schools. Importantly, we signed a six-year deal with the federal government for \$1.1 billion of investment here in South Australia for children in our schools. However, what we find out is that not only is \$400 million being scrapped, but \$1.2 billion is now out of the funding envelope—

Mr PISONI: I have a point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Point of order for the member for Unley.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —so we have less money, with more states.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is called to order for continuing to speak after I had called on a point of order.

Mr PISONI: I know that the minister has been talking up Liberal policies on education all week, but the question was specifically about the government taking on the Liberal Party—

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the first time for taking an entirely bogus point of order—in fact, never getting to the point of order—just for the purpose of making an impromptu speech. Is the Minister for Education finished?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: But wait, there is more.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: There is more, sir. Christopher Pyne was quoted as saying, on 30 August in *The Australian*, that they would honour the commitment that the Labor government made, the same amount of money would be going to our schools. What we know now is that he has expanded the number of states involved in a smaller envelope of money. So, rather than \$2.8 billion it is down to \$1.6 billion. It would be really nice to hear the member for Unley standing up for our schools—

The SPEAKER: No; the minister is not responsible for the member for Unley.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:13): A supplementary, sir, if I may. The minister referred to commitments made by governments—

The SPEAKER: The minister was being entirely irrelevant when she said that, and you are being entirely irrelevant asking her about it.

Mr PISONI: Why did the government—

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley will be seated.

SPENT CONVICTIONS

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (15:13): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney ascertain why the spent convictions legislation appears not to be fully implemented? I have had two people contact me in the last week, both relating to minor larceny offences—one 43 years ago and the other 14 years ago—which are still on their police clearance certificate.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:13): I thank the member for Fisher for his question. As members would know, he has had a longstanding interest in this particular area of the law and has spent some time moving matters in this place. He has also written to me regularly about these matters, so I do appreciate his interest in the matter. As the member would appreciate, there have been some changes in the not too distant past to the spent convictions legislation which were designed to deal with the perceived anomalies—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is called to order. The member for Heysen is warned for the second and final time, and we would not want to see petrol prices cause her eviction for the second sitting day in a row.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can I say that I would be very happy to look at the particular matters to which the member refers and see whether there has been any obvious difficulty in relation to the application of the law in those matters or whether the law itself needs further modification. I would be happy to look at those matters.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT ADVERTISING

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): I feel so privileged; thank you. My question is to the Premier. Why did the government cut funding for antismoking advertising at the same time it started funding ads for a tram network that hasn't been designed, hasn't been costed and hasn't been budgeted for?

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned for the first time. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (15:15): We make no apologies for informing the people of South Australia about probably one of the most far-reaching transport plans—the transport and land use plan—that will reshape the way in which we live in this city and in this state. It has allowed us to generate a community debate—something that I know is foreign to those opposite—where we actually put in front of the community positive plans for our future: 10 policies about building a stronger South Australia that are now in the public sphere for debate and discussion.

The way in which we are seeking to generate that debate is, in a modest way, drawing to people's attention the fact that there is a transport plan and publicising what it means for them and their community. So, we make no apologies for drawing that to the attention of the South Australian community. We are getting a very rich debate, and I think what's emerging is that people are actually excited by the possibilities of building a stronger South Australia, and they fear the risks of an opposition that wishes to weaken South Australia by cutting and undermining those things which are creating the strength in our state.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:17): My question is directed to the Premier. I am wondering whether the Premier can advise the house on the recent national discussions on the goods and services tax.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Treasurer, Minister for State Development, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for the Arts) (15:17): Members would be aware that in the media yesterday there was speculation that tomorrow's meeting of the Standing Council for Federal Financial Relations (once known as the treasurers' conference) would be contemplating changes to the GST. This continues to be the noise that emerges from Coalition governments in the Eastern States: that the GST should be broadened to cover food, health and education, or that the rate should be increased, or that the process of allocating the GST between the states, known as horizontal fiscal equalisation, would be altered.

These changes are completely unacceptable to this government. We will never stand for a GST to be extended to food, health or education services or the rate to be increased, nor will we permit the HFE arrangements to be thrown away. To do so would hurt households already doing it tough across the nation. I also note that these ideas are advanced at the same time as relieving burdens on businesses. So, it's a direct take out of the pockets of householders into the pockets of businesspeople, and it's something that we will not stand for.

When the federal Liberal government introduced the GST, they originally intended it to apply to everything, including fresh food. With the new Liberal government, we see all of the conservatives across the nation lining up to finish the job, and all they want is another ally. All they want is another ally over here. They want to put the GST on everything, including fresh food, and they want to make people pay more tax.

Just this week, we have seen Liberal premiers and treasurers interstate talking about jacking up the GST or broadening the base, and these have not been isolated instances. They

came in response to an invitation by the current federal Treasurer back in July, when he said, 'If you are going to have a discussion about changing the GST, the states have to lead the argument because they are the ones that need the revenue.' So, this is an operation, this is a manoeuvre, getting the conservative states—hoping to have another mate over there—to join the chorus, to soften up the Australian community for an increase in taxation.

Premier O'Farrell responded on cue. He came out suggesting that we should increase the GST. We know that if you want to increase the GST there are only two ways to do it: you either jack up the rate or you take away exemptions. We all know the biggest exemption is on fresh food. So they either want to jack up the rate or extend it to fresh food or have a look at the other exemptions.

The two other big exemptions are health and education services. This Labor government will never support an increase in the rate of the GST or broadening its base. During all of this debate about the GST, the South Australian Liberals have remained mute and very suspiciously quiet, I might say. Make no mistake: if elected, they will roll over and allow the Coalition to—

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order, Mr Speaker. Surely, sir, this is debate now.

The SPEAKER: Yes, it is debate. We will move on to the deputy leader.

NOARLUNGA RAILWAY LINE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:20): My question is to the Minister for Transport Services. Before cutting the express train services from Noarlunga to the city, did the government ask any of the passengers who use the Noarlunga line if they wanted their express services cut?

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts) (15:21): Yes. The answer is yes.

NOARLUNGA RAILWAY LINE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:21): Supplementary question, sir.

The SPEAKER: You want the names and addresses?

Ms CHAPMAN: No, sir. I am happy not to find the one person—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens! If I see the member for West Torrens' lips move, I will name him. The deputy leader.

Ms CHAPMAN: A supplementary again to the Minister for Transport Services. What was the basis then, minister, for your statement yesterday regarding the Noarlunga train line when you said, 'The two previously scheduled express services cannot be accommodated'?

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts) (15:21): They cannot be accommodated in these timetables. I also said yesterday quite frequently that these are temporary timetables. They will be re-examined in February.

NOARLUNGA RAILWAY LINE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:22): A further supplementary: given the minister's statement that there will now be 23 more trains per day on the Noarlunga line, will the minister—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Services—confirm how this affects the traffic on Brighton Road at the Oaklands level crossing?

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts) (15:22): Member for Bragg, first of all, the Oaklands crossing is not on Brighton Road, so there seems to be some local confusion there. Secondly, it is 23 more services, not 23 more trains.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee) (15:22): My question is to the Minister for Disabilities. Can the minister update the house on the progress of the National Disability Insurance Scheme in South Australia?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:23): I thank the member for Lee for this important question. Mr Speaker, 2013 has been a landmark year for people living with a disability, their families and carers. The ongoing rollout of the NDIS in South Australia is improving disability services as well as providing a greater level of control and decision-making for people whose lives are affected by disabilities.

More specifically, the rollout is currently encompassing young children from birth to three years and, from the beginning of 2014, the transition will extend to children up to four years. Progressively, over the next three years, children up to the age of 14 will become eligible for services under the NDIS. The following two years, that is 2016-17 and 2017-18, will see more people transition to the NDIS, and from 2018 the scheme will be available to all eligible people with a disability.

In the immediate time, though, as of 1 July this year, a mum or dad receiving the news that their newborn child has Down syndrome, cerebral palsy or any disability recognised at birth will be able to decide for themselves how to manage their care and support. As I am sure many members are aware, early intervention is critical, particularly when there is strong evidence that it will substantially improve, or arrest a decline in, the function of a child.

In recognising the importance of early intervention, the NDIS will provide for individualised funding and support which will be directly related to addressing the impact of a disability on each individual child's daily life. Again, this will be crucial to young families just starting out and facing the reality of caring for and nurturing a newborn baby with a disability. I am advised that, since 1 July of this year, more than 200 National Disability Insurance Agency plans for young people have been approved, and more than 170 are in progress.

The Weatherill government strives to give every chance to every child, and the reforms we are now witnessing with these first young people transitioning to the NDIS gives depth to that creed. By implementing this reform, we are not only improving the lives of individuals, we are also contributing to the prosperity of every South Australian. When I meet with young people living with a disability almost all of them say that they simply aspire to be like everybody else. They want a career, a house of their own and the ability to make their own way in life.

In providing the best levels of care and the most comprehensive approach to early intervention, we help make the goals of these individuals a reality and, in turn, help them to be fully functioning individuals in our society. The rollout of the NDIS in South Australia has occurred because the Weatherill government has made it happen. We have increased funding to disability more than five times over since the Liberal Party was in government: from \$132 million in 2002 to \$723 million in the current budget forward estimates. We are seeing the new federal Liberal government starting to chip away at the NDIS and softening up the sector for reductions and cuts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The state Liberal Party should clarify what its position is on these proposed cuts to the NDIS.

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: debate.

The SPEAKER: Before we get to that, the member for Morialta will withdraw what he just said about the minister.

Mr GARDNER: I withdraw, sir.

The SPEAKER: Good.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: We will continue to be a government for positive disability reform and a government that will ensure the NDIS brings real change to the lives of people living with a disability and their families.

The SPEAKER: I think the point of order's relevance has now dissipated with the minister finishing his answer.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

RETAIL ENERGY MARKET

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:27): The Australian Energy Regulator today released its report entitled, 'Annual report on the performance of the retail energy market 2012-13', and it is a very sobering read indeed. It highlights a number of issues of grave concern. We need to be focusing our attention more on the costs of living, and in particular the costs of energy, because it is hurting people. It is affecting people's lives on a daily basis, and I am not hearing enough from the government in the way of remedies and solutions.

I get the distinct impression that government members have stopped listening to their constituents on power bills. The energy regulator has explained that power, and I am going to lay it out before members opposite. The report finds that of the 13 retailers who supply energy to small customers, over 80 per cent of those customers are supplied by the three largest retailers. Switching rates are high, but almost 20 per cent of small customers are still on standard contracts, despite market contracts being offered at better value.

Of course, we have heard that those standing contracts (many of them closed offers) have been kept secret, in effect, by the government's decision to remove from the state regulator ESCOSA its powers to access information about closed deals and volume related information, to the effect that when ESCOSA recently reported to its minister it had to acknowledge that its report could not be relied upon. For some mysterious reason, the government has muted and silenced the state regulator and limited its ability to provide openness and accountability.

So, we rely, again, on the Australian Energy Regulator to at least further flesh out some of the problems, and they are considerable. During 2012-13, over 50,000 complaints were made to retailers by SA customers, with billing prices and overcharging the most common cause of complaint. Around a quarter of these complaints went on to the Energy Ombudsman, a matter of great concern.

The report also looked at average energy debt levels in SA, and found that at the end of June 2013 around 40,000 electricity customers (just over 5 per cent) have huge amounts owing to their retailer for 90 days or more, with the average debt being around \$700; in gas, 17,000 customers (4 per cent) had debts, with an average of \$265.

Energy retailers are responding to this by providing customers with assistance; but at the end of June around 3 per cent of electricity customers (that is 20,906) were on payment plans, and an additional 8,500 customers were on hardship programs. The total number of residential electricity and gas disconnections for non-payment was around 14,100 in 2011-12. These are really scary and striking figures, and everyone should be alarmed about them.

I draw the house's attention to today's report from the South Australian Council of Social Service, entitled 'Keeping The Power On—SACOSS Response to Electricity Disconnections', dated November 2013. They go on to explain in almost heartbreaking terms the real effect this is having on mums and dads, small businesses to a lesser extent, but families in particular, with people literally facing dark, cold evenings through their inability to pay, many of them in very unfortunate circumstances. The *Financial Review* has even reported the disconnection of a number of people at home who are on life support systems.

This is just reckless and reprehensible, and it all goes back to the regulatory regime established by this government. It has been 12 years. They have been on the standing council of energy ministers for that time. They have had an opportunity to bring about real regulatory reform, to give us rules that work. They have not. As a result, costs have spiralled by 137 per cent in terms of bill increases, and people simply are not coping.

It is a cold and heartless government that has done very little to effectively deliver concession programs to those most in need. It appears to have simply wanted to shift the blame to anyone—shift the blame to previous governments, shift the blame to privatisation (something now refuted by commentators everywhere), shift the blame to everyone except themselves. They are responsible, sir.

Time expired.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua) (15:32): In my last ever grievance in this place I wish to raise three issues about potential reform of the workings of this parliament that the next parliament might like to consider. They are in the areas of the way question time works, the way the conscience vote system works in this place and, finally, how our Legislative Council works. Firstly, in relation to question time, I think it is clear to all members that question time is a fiction.

In theory it is supposed to be an opportunity for members without political colour to ask questions of ministers and for answers without political colour to be given. In practice, of course, it is the exact opposite to that. It is the place in the parliament—the fulcrum—of debate in the parliament, yet we maintain the fiction that this is a session which is not about debate.

Earlier this year, I attended the Prime Minister's question time in London, and I saw the way their question time works. From whatever background, I am not sure, they now have debate during question time. What I observed was the Leader of the Opposition asking a question of the Prime Minister with debate, with political matter attached to it.

The Prime Minister answered with debate, with political matter, and then the leader of the opposition was able to respond to that and then ask another question. The Prime Minister answered, and so it went on backwards and forwards in a reasonably controlled way so that debate was allowed. What we try to do is suppress debate during question time, and I think that is one of the things that leads to the hostility and tension in the place. If we allowed debate to come to the surface, I think we would manage question time in a much better way.

There are plenty of opportunities for members of parliament to get answers to questions; questions in the *Notice Paper* is one, estimates, FOIs. So they do not need question time because it is not used, really, for getting answers to questions; that is not the purpose from the opposition's point of view. What they are really trying to do is make political points, and the government is doing the same; so I think it would be sensible get rid of the fiction and allow that to occur.

The second matter I wanted to talk about is the issue of conscience votes. In the 16 years that I have been a member of this place, I do not think a single conscience issue of any substance has got up. There have been a couple of minor issues, but the more substantial issues around prostitution law reform, euthanasia and so on have not been able to get up. They have not even got to a place where they could be properly debated.

My observation of it is that it is because it is left completely in the hands of individuals. Because it is a conscience matter, governments and major parties do not take them on. It is unreasonable to expect an individual—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: You get up and have a talk if you like, Vickie. The structure of the place is such that it is impossible, I think, for a conscience matter to be properly thought through. The individual member does not have the background, the skills or the departmental advice to help work out a proper policy. My suggestion to the parliament would be that in the first six months of any new parliament, all the members who have conscience issues should bring them forward. Some government time should be set aside and there should be restricted debate to decide whether or not the parliament wants to deal with the principle. Should there or should there not be reform in the area of X, Y or Z?

If the parliament agrees there should be reform, then set up a select committee of those members who are interested in the reform, go away and do the proper work, with some support, and then come back and have a proper debate over a bill which has been worked out through a sensible process. I think that would lead to resolution of the issues, rather than this ongoing, perpetual bringing forward of the same kind of issues year after year. I think if it were done that way we would be able to advance these issues in a much more thoughtful way, rather than the ad hoc ways that we have at the moment.

The third issue that I wanted to talk about briefly is the reform of the upper house. I know there are reform proposals before the house, which I will not comment on, and I don't not support them, but it seems to me there is another way of reforming the upper house which I think would be beneficial to our community and that would be to reduce its power so it cannot block legislation. It would have powers similar to those of the House of Lords, but more people would be allowed to become members of the upper house. I would have all 22 members elected at the one time, so the quota would be very small, so you would get a broad diversity of opinion being elected to the place.

In fact, I would go one further and double the size of the Legislative Council and not pay them on a full-time basis but, as the House of Lords does, pay them on a sitting fee basis. Ministers could still be chosen from the upper house, but they would be a broad community group, so that we could have a large focus group in our upper house which could properly consider all the measures that come up from this place without having the ability to block them. I think that reform would make a lot of sense.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:37): I may not use my full five minutes today to grieve—

Ms Thompson interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: —which is disappointing for the member for Reynella, I know. I just wanted to place on the record and bring to the house's attention the falseness of the Premier's answer today in question time regarding the meeting tomorrow of treasurers in regard to GST. Anyone listening to the answer would have thought that tomorrow's meeting of the treasurers about a number of matters, including GST, was going to talk about lifting the rate or putting the GST on other services such as food, health or education, because that is what the Premier spent his allocated time answering the question about. It was nothing more than a shabby attempt at a scare campaign about the GST matter.

I invite the media to seek out the treasurers attending tomorrow's meeting and ask them what item regarding the GST is on tomorrow's Treasury meeting. The advice to me is that the only matter on the agenda tomorrow of the treasurers regarding the GST is the question about whether the threshold on overseas sales should be lowered—nothing about food, nothing about health, nothing about education, nothing about increasing the rate.

The Premier has come in here to the house and given, in my view, a false impression about what is going to be debated tomorrow. He ran the line that all these coalition governments were lining up at tomorrow's meeting to push through or advocate some reform which the Premier does not support. The truth of the matter is that the advice to me is that that is not happening and that suggestion is simply untrue. I invite the media to ring the treasurers' offices around Australia—and there are six or seven of them—and ask them what is on the agenda tomorrow in relation to the GST.

Now, what is interesting is that the *Financial Review* today actually reports this, and if anyone goes to page 3 of today's *Financial Review* there is a full article on the matter that is going to be discussed tomorrow by the treasurers at the treasurers' meeting. The headline is 'Pressure grows to expand online GST'. And what does it say? It says in the second paragraph:

Ahead of the meetings of treasurers in Canberra on Wednesday, South Australian Labor Premier and Treasurer, Jay Weatherill, indicated his preparedness to support the move for change which is being led by New South Wales.

What that indicates is that the treasurers are on the same page. The treasurers are on the same page in relation to that GST reform, so I invite the media, if you want to see a shabby scare campaign by a desperate Premier weeks out from a state election, to have a look at his answer today. If you want to prove that his answer is nothing but a scare campaign, ring any treasurer's office in Australia and they will confirm that the reality is the only matter on the agenda tomorrow regarding GST is a matter for which South Australian Treasurer and Mr Premier is going to support.

His whole answer was fabricated around the issue that tomorrow there is a treasurers' meeting and the GST is going to be discussed and there is some conservative or Coalition plan going to be hatched at this meeting. The evidence is that that is untrue and I think the media need to go to the Premier and ask him on what basis did he suggest the rate—the extension of it to food, health and education—was going to be discussed tomorrow when it is not even on the agenda.

VACSWIM

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:42): This morning I was absolutely delighted to have the privilege to launch the 2014 water safety program well known as VACSWIM, an iconic program in this state. I just want to talk about VACSWIM for a short period of time. It really commenced in about 1956 when the then government of the day provided £8,000 for what it described in its estimates program as a swimming campaign. That has evolved into VACSWIM to the extent that in 2013, 13,400 young children undertook VACSWIM classes, and in 2014 we expect that number to increase.

It is really a very big part of South Australian childhood experiences. It is an iconic water safety program, and it is criminal here in Australia, where 90 percent of our population live around the coastal areas, that there are still those people who cannot swim. What VACSWIM does is provide our children here in South Australia with fundamental water safety and survival, and rescue skills and they carry these skills through to their adulthood.

Water safety is a priority and will always be a priority for this government and, I expect, any government. It makes a difference to our communities. It makes a difference to our families. We all know that all Australians, as part of our culture, enjoy recreation and sport, swimming and leisure activity in the water at our beaches, in our rivers and in our pools, and it is, quite simply, central to the Australian and South Australian lifestyle. We want people to enjoy these activities, but we want them to do it safely. Considerable effort has gone into promoting water safety. Unfortunately accidents still do occur and we need to, through VACSWIM, equip as many people as possible to deal with any emergencies that might occur in the water.

It was a pleasure to be there this morning, and of course VACSWIM focuses on young people, 5 to 18, at a key life stage which VACSWIM is designed to address. In recent years, there has only been one drowning, and of course that is one drowning too many, reported for that age group. In 2012-13, there were no deaths reported, so that is a good result, but it is no reason to be complacent and relax. We still need to be very diligent as a community about ensuring that our young people are exposed to all aspects of water safety.

What VACSWIM provides is skills, knowledge, awareness, and potentially—and more than just potentially—a positive and beneficial impact on a person for the rest of their life with respect to water safety. The government has been a major contributor towards achieving basic swimming and water safety skills for both children and ultimately adults, with significant contributions over many years. I want to commend the YMCA, which has managed this program since 2011, and I also want to acknowledge Mr Haydn Robins, who has only been in South Australia for five weeks. He came from Victoria and has been appointed as the chief executive officer of YMCA, and I welcome him here to South Australia.

I also want to acknowledge the key partners in VACSWIM: AUSTSWIM, Surf Life Saving SA, Royal Life Saving Society of South Australia, and of course the sponsors of the program as well. SA Water deserves to be commended for its ongoing sponsorship of this very important program, along with the many other sponsors that help underpin this particular program. While we also know that learning to swim is such a vital life skill, this is really much harder in country areas, where children live in a riskier environment with creeks, dams, water tanks and the like. So, the work of local associations to make the VACSWIM program a success in those areas is incredibly important, and I acknowledge those community groups and associations as well.

I also want to pay tribute to the many qualified instructors who are vital to this program. There will be 600 instructors this year, and they instil those qualities and skills into the people that they will be supervising at over 130 venues across the state. It certainly is a fantastic program, sir, and I know that, like me, your children probably attended VACSWIM at some stage. There have been many thousands of young South Australians who have undertaken this program, which makes the activity that they undertake in the water as children growing up into adults much safer than otherwise would be the case.

ADELAIDE HIGH SCHOOL

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:47): The Weatherill Labor government has had more than a decade to deliver a solution to the serious education concerns of families in Adelaide's inner north, including the Prospect and Walkerville council areas. During this period, Adelaide High School's rezoning and enrolment issues have been consistently ignored by the Weatherill Labor government. In 2009, the Liberal Party released a policy to build a second campus of Adelaide High School that would cater for 1,000 students. Four days prior to the 2010 election, in a cobbled-together plan, the Labor government came out with a press release, and I quote:

By expanding the schools, we can relax the zones—so that students from Prospect or Walkerville, for instance, will be able to attend Adelaide High School.

The press release, again, four days from the 2010 election, went on to state:

Adelaide High School, the state's first free high school, will be expanded to cater for up to 250 more students from 2013 without encroaching on the Parklands.

Well, it is now 2013 and none of this has been realised. The school does encroach on the Parklands, it has not expanded the zone at all, there has been no release of a new zone, and in 2013 not one single extra student is at the school, and in fact only the slab is being poured, so the building is quite far away from being completed.

Just to give this house some idea and understanding of how this government operates, in estimates this year, on Friday 28 June, minister Rankine, when questioned about the promised expansion of the zone to include Walkerville and Prospect, firstly made me read out the quote and relied on the weasel word of 'for example' Prospect and Walkerville as her excuse as to why Walkerville and Prospect were not included and why the zoning was not released.

When questioned on the 'up to 250 extra places' and when they would be realised, the minister relied on the words 'up to' meaning that even one space could mean up to 250. So, when the government came out today with its new planned city high school for 1,000 students in 2019, I must say I find it hard to believe any part of that press release, given we still have not realised any of the 2010 release that was promised.

When looking at even achieving the 250 extra places at Adelaide High School, the building that is allowing for the expansion will not be ready until at least the beginning of 2015. The principal at the school has indicated that only 50 extra students per year would be allowed, starting from year 8, as that would add up to the 250 places over a five-year period. The actual expansion announced four years ago will not be realised until 2019, so there is absolutely no way the residents of Prospect or Walkerville could in any way be fooled into believing that a whole school could be built by this Labor government that is still trying to fulfil its 2010 election promise.

This is another example of the Labor Party copying very good Liberal Party policy and trying to bring out a school idea that is uncostered and there is no site determined. There are no studies, no research and no information at all about this policy, and it is absolutely unbelievable that it will even happen. I can assure everybody, as promised leading up to the 2010 election, that the Liberal Party will deliver a second high school that will cater for the residents of Prospect and Walkerville council areas, and you can rest assured that I will not give up until that school is completely built. I hope that no-one is foolish enough to believe that this Labor government, which has failed to deliver on a long list of promises, has any hope or any intention of delivering on this uncostered policy to try to win the seat of Adelaide.

GILES ELECTORATE

The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (15:52): This is my last grievance in parliament, so it had better be a good one. Last week, I attended two celebrations of 50 years in Whyalla. The first was 50 years of Des's Cabs in Whyalla. The company was started some 50 years ago by brothers Des and Trevor Brougham. I believe it has become one of the most reliable and professional cab services in Australia. It has widened its forefront not just in Whyalla but into Port Augusta and also into Adelaide. I must admit, I always get very homesick when I see a Des's Cab in Adelaide.

It is a great tribute to brothers Chris, Kym and Lee Brougham for their hard work, professionalism and excellent service, and also their brother Brett who sadly passed away at an early age a few years ago. I must say that he has left a wonderful legacy in his son Blake, who has turned into the most beautiful, intelligent and articulate young man, beyond his 10 or 11 years of age.

It was a night of fun and it was really wonderful to see so many drivers, past and present. It was touched by the tragedy of the Whyalla Airlines disaster because, of course, Whyalla Airlines was owned by Des's Cabs. When it was recalled, it left not a dry eye in the place. We all remembered the time and the trauma. My congratulations and best wishes to Des's Cabs on the work and services they have provided in Whyalla and I certainly look forward to another 50 years of Des's Cabs.

I also attended the 50th anniversary of the Whyalla Special School. The Whyalla Special School was established some 50 years ago. They are just about to move into some new premises, which look wonderful from the outside. I have not had a tour yet, but I hope to do so very shortly. Over the years, I have had a lot to do with the Whyalla Special School and I have watched many young people grow from little children into adults who have gone through that school.

What I have seen is the dedication, care and love that has been provided to these children in their time in the school, and also the support for their parents. It is a wonderful school. It is a

major asset for Whyalla, so a big thank you from our community and best wishes for the next 50 years. I have to say that Whyalla Special School is a very special school in Whyalla.

I also want to pay tribute to Constable Dean Walker of Coober Pedy, who was recently awarded the South Australian Local Hero award for his contribution to policing and community building in the state's Far North. I know he has been helping Indigenous offenders to get back on track during his time working there, and he typifies the role that Aboriginal police officers have played in Coober Pedy and the Far North of the state. I know Dean, I have long admired his work, and I am very pleased that he has been recognised. I know his father Robin is very proud of him. Robin has also been a wonderful community worker for the Aboriginal community of Coober Pedy, and it is good to see that Dean has followed in his footsteps.

There have been other Aboriginal police officers who have worked in Coober Pedy, and it is very difficult for them. They often work with family and community, and they have very serious demands put on them, far beyond what other officers may have. Some years ago there was someone called Jack Crombie who was very active, and who was a forerunner for these young officers that are there now. He did some great community work. There was Patrick Larkins, a football hero in Coober Pedy; he has been very involved in the community over the years and has taught me a lot. There is also Zed McKenzie; again, very well respected and a great footballer as well. They have been involved in the Coober Pedy Saints and done some wonderful work with young people. Chris Warrior is another, a great big man who has done some great work.

There have been others, and I apologise if I have omitted any of them, but these officers are particularly known to me and I recognise and acknowledge the role they have played in the Coober Pedy community. It is a unique role; they are not only officers but also pillars of the community.

Finally, I would like to mention the Whyalla Hospital developments that were opened last week by the Minister for Health. We thought we were getting a new cancer service in Whyalla, and we have ended up with a new hospital. It is just amazing. I am so impressed at the work they have done there with the money that was allocated to it; they have managed to stretch that and build us a whole new facade, new accommodation, new theatres, new wards. It has a whole new, light and pleasant atmosphere and Whyalla is so grateful for it.

So I really want to very much thank former minister John Hill for his efforts in starting this process. It was also wonderful to see minister Snelling there, who carried on the process. He made an excellent speech and people were very pleased to meet him and to talk to him. So, we are very impressed with our new hospital. Thank you very much.

MOTOR VEHICLES (DRIVER LICENSING) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

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) (15:57): I will continue with the comments I made prior to lunch. I do not wish to discuss the bill at length—most of the substantive matters were well and truly canvassed in the second reading speech—but I would just like to again acknowledge the role of Judge Peter McCusker, who has been advocating for this measure for some time. As I said, he and former premier John Bannon came to see me several months ago and explained the proposition as they saw it, and the benefits to residents of the APY lands.

I made mention of the fact that the proposition resonated with me, in large part because I had served on the select committee on the juvenile justice system, of which the member for Bragg was also a member. What I took away from that particular inquiry was a recognition that Indigenous youth are significantly overrepresented in the juvenile justice system as well as in the adult prison system.

There are a number of reasons for that overrepresentation, and they come down in large part to poor numeracy and literacy skills, which in turn prevent Indigenous youth from entering the employment mainstream, but also the fact that they get caught up inadvertently in the justice system for transgressions such as driving unlicensed and unregistered. They are apprehended and, in a large number of instances, they fail to pay the fine and the offence compounds itself. From I would not say a minor infraction but a traffic infringement, they find themselves propelled into the juvenile and adult justice system.

The second factor that made the proposition resonate with me was my role as a parliamentary secretary serving as chair of a ministerial task force on Indigenous employment. This was at the time when 'Twiggy' Forrest was launching his Indigenous employment program, and we had representatives from the mining sector come along and address us. The point they made was that the thing that was largely preventing the employment of Indigenous youth in remote areas of Australia was the fact that they did not hold driver's licences, and it was a prerequisite for employment on mining sites that they had to be able to drive a four-wheel drive vehicle.

So, we have two factors at play: firstly, the entry point, if you like, for Indigenous youth into the justice system, in large part, I believe, through a failure to either register their motor vehicle or to gain a driver's licence in the first instance—that is particularly true in the APY lands. Secondly, the fact that they do not have a driver's licence, on the APY lands, precludes them from employment in remote areas of the nation on mining projects.

The third factor was the visit that I made to the APY lands some six months ago with the former deputy prime minister Jenny Macklin. It was a revelation, in that it made me aware of the remoteness of those communities, both from large population centres like Alice Springs and in the distance between each of the townships and the fact that they are linked by extremely poor roads.

One of the issues that the deputy prime minister and I talked about was the provision of administrative services by the South Australian government and the commonwealth government on the lands, and we talked about the possibility of co-linking Service SA functions with those delivered by the commonwealth at each of the locations through the lands. I came away from the visit with not only a very clear understanding of the remoteness of the townships from major population centres like Alice Springs but also the fact that they are separated by reasonable distances and poor roads and the fact that it is very difficult to actually get a service like Service SA operating on the lands on an ongoing basis.

Even with discussions with the commonwealth government to basically employ one individual to perform state government functions such as the registration of motor vehicles, renewal of driver's licences and all of the other functions that are performed by Service SA, and then the commonwealth functions in relation to pensions and the like, we are finding it extremely difficult to get a workable proposition in place on the lands. So, even Indigenous people on the lands with the best intentions would find it well-nigh impossible to get a driver's licence, because the commonwealth and the state government really find it a challenge to get a service in place, to staff that service and to ensure that it operates year-round without any interference and is provided in each of the regional centres, given the distances from each other.

So those were the three factors that drove me to the conclusion, if you like, that I wanted to get behind this proposition and have it dealt with in the life of this parliament. There was a reason that the Hon. Ian Hunter and I joined forces. The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation introduced it in the Legislative Council to fast track it through the parliament.

Members would be aware that we do have an issue on the APY lands in that 17 per cent of eligible Indigenous people on the lands are licensed, as opposed to 90 per cent in the rest of the state. That in itself is a recognition of the fact that we have been unsuccessful for a whole range of reasons in ensuring that Indigenous men and women and young people on the lands drive with a driver's licence and also that their motor vehicles are registered. That in turn makes them susceptible to infringements in relation to driving unlicensed and unregistered.

We are aware that in the Northern Territory they have arrived at a solution which they call DriveSafe NT Remote. In the last 18 months, they have had 894 Indigenous people in remote communities obtain their learners permits and 217 are on their Ps. So we know that there is at least one model in operation in Australia that gives the results that we seek in the lands.

Where we will probably differ—and this probably answers the question asked by the member for Bragg in relation to the 12 individuals who have been nominated—is that, in relation to those individuals, we have yet to complete the identity checks to see whether they are suitable for the course, but, more importantly, we actually have to develop the program. Even though we will look with great interest at the program being run in the Northern Territory—the DriveSafe NT Remote program—we will probably do it a lot differently in that we will actually have a very, very intense program.

What we have to do is actually develop that program, taking on board the views of the community on the lands. It will be a program that will be developed in close consultation with residents living on the lands. One thing that it probably will include is a new Ozroads program that

has been developed for Indigenous learners which recognises the cultural characteristics of those individuals residing in remote Indigenous communities and does not rely on written work. It recognises that English is a second language for most of these individuals and tailors the program around that fact, and it also recognises that their numeracy and particularly their literacy skills are not at a level that would stand up to running the type of test that we run elsewhere in the state.

We have yet to develop that program. It will be developed in close consultation with people on the lands. It will include the Ozroads program because the commonwealth has committed reasonable resources to working up this particular proposition. Once we have arrived at the structure of the program, we will then go out to tender with the intention of securing the services of a reputable and significant South Australian (potentially) driving school that will deliver the program on the lands, supply the vehicles, supply the instructors and deliver what will be a shorter course but a very intense course, probably recognising in large part that a large number of the individuals who will actually be taking the lessons have been driving for a number of years on the lands.

Just in relation to the comments that have been made by the opposition in relation to the graduated licensing scheme changes that we have made, the fact of the matter is that what we are proposing will not only give better employment outcomes for people on the lands, it will deal with this issue of the failure to obtain a drivers licence or to register their motor vehicles as an entree into the criminal justice system. It will not only address those two particular issues, it will also deal with the issue of road safety, because Indigenous people are over-represented in the casualty and serious injury statistics.

Having a regime like this on the land where rather than having the 17 per cent of eligible Aboriginal people with a licence, as opposed to 90 per cent elsewhere in the state, we will bring them into the system and oblige them to comply with all of the requirements that currently apply and will apply later in the year in relation to P1 and, to a lesser extent, P2 licence requirements.

So, that, in essence, is what we are seeking to achieve with the program. I think it is a great outcome for the APY lands communities. I have been extremely welcoming of the fact that the opposition is highly supportive. It has a thorough understanding of the issues confronting people on the lands. We have not had to run with the argument of there being one set of rules for Indigenous people on the lands and another set of rules for individuals residing elsewhere in the state. There has been a recognition that this is a unique set of circumstances that has to be addressed with a unique set of solutions.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Ms CHAPMAN: In respect of the proposed regime for exemption, could you explain: of the 12 people who have been identified as being, apparently, fit for consideration, has there been any criteria set out as to whom that should apply to, other than as proposed here, which requires that the person be an Aboriginal person who ordinarily resides in the remote area as defined and apparently for the purpose of enabling that person to obtain a licence? They seem to be the requisites under subclause (2) as proposed. Is there any other criteria?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: The eligibility criteria is that they be 20 years of age or over, provide proof of residence in the APY lands, have community endorsement to undertake the course, not be subject to a current driver's licence disqualification or suspension that is in place or pending, including a licence issued in another jurisdiction that is subject to such conditions, and not be subject to a mandatory alcohol interlock scheme condition.

Ms CHAPMAN: Where do we find those criteria?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: It will be a ministerial policy that will obviously be under the name of the minister for road safety at the time; so it will be a ministerial policy which will be accessible.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am assuming that the 12 people, that we understand have been identified as being suitable for consideration, are yet to go through this process of meeting the criteria?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: That's correct. We have just commenced the vetting process.

Ms CHAPMAN: Assuming that one or more of the 12 meet the criteria that you have set under this new policy, is it proposed that before you consider granting an exemption the applicants will undertake some form of driving training?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes. After being selected they would be run through this intense course which, as I mentioned, will be developed over coming months. Once the course is developed to the satisfaction of the registrar and the minister of the day, it will then be put out to public tender.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it intended that the applicants will also, at the conclusion of whatever the program is to be in driver training, undertake some form of assessment on their competency to drive?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Member for Bragg, yes, that is an integral part. Where we probably will differ considerably from the program run in the Northern Territory is on the structure of the course. I think ours is going to be a lot more—how can I put this without offending our cousins in the Northern Territory?—structured and have a more stringent assessment process attached to it.

Ms CHAPMAN: I thank the minister for that because it is very encouraging to hear that indication. Perhaps in the lifetime of his ministry that high standard will be maintained. I think the parliament can see, minister, that without any of the criteria being in either a proposed regulation or in the bill, and without any indication of what conditions would apply in the standards that you have set in the bill, it could be that the circumstances that I put to the parliament in the second reading would prevail; that is, the minister might like to just push a few through the gate, sign off the form, no requisite competency training or testing. That would be of great concern, especially given the environment of, I think, across-the-board public safety and road safety commitment that each of our major parties has given.

Just on the Northern Territory program, that is a program about which I have had occasion to speak to the minister for transport in the Northern Territory. It is noted, and I think I mentioned this in the previous debate on the second reading, that the opportunities for fast-tracking driver qualification processes there are offered in areas where there is opportunity for employment—obviously, particularly on the coast, where there is transport opportunity—and that is quite distinct from the programs that you proposed. Was there some reason why you moved from what I think is more consistent with the Northern Territory model and what was previously flagged in the considerations, namely, to have this opportunity in the northern suburbs and at Port Augusta transferred to the remote lands?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: The reason that we have structured it in the way that we have and confined it specifically to the APY lands is that there is a set of conditions that prevail in the APY lands that do not prevail in Port Augusta or in the northern suburbs. A resident of Port Augusta or the northern suburbs is in a position to avail himself or herself of a qualified supervising driver for the sake of undertaking the learner phase of their licence, whereas in the lands, as I said, I think the percentage of people who actually hold a driver's licence is extremely low; it is 17 per cent.

The situation on the lands is that, with probably the best intent in the world, to comply with all of the conditions that apply elsewhere in the state in relation to doing the requisite number of supervised hours on an L-plate and then progressing to the P is very difficult to do on the lands, because only 17 per cent of those who are eligible to hold a driver's licence hold one. I do not think that that situation would prevail in Port Augusta or the northern suburbs of Adelaide.

We have other issues on the APY lands, and I know that the member for Bragg has made numerous comments in relation to the amendments that we were successful in getting through the parliament in relation to provisional driving licences. The member for Bragg made a number of references to bus services. One of the issues on the lands is that, if you want to go to Alice Springs for medical treatment, you do not have any option; you actually have to drive.

That is why there is a large number of individuals on the lands who drive unregistered motor vehicles and drive unlicensed, because it very difficult for them to get a driver's licence. It is difficult for them to register a motor vehicle, because as I said we find it very difficult to get a permanent Service SA system operating on the lands, whereas in Port Augusta or in the northern suburbs of Adelaide those issues, such as having to travel considerable distances to seek advanced medical attention in a place like Alice Springs, do not apply.

We also were much of the view that it would be an unpalatable proposition for the parliament if I were to bring into this parliament an exemption process that applied to Indigenous youth in areas like Port Lincoln, Port Augusta and the northern suburbs. That is why we have run with this model. I think it is the most appropriate.

Ms CHAPMAN: Once you have selected a suitable driver school party to undertake the job, is it proposed that they will have a facility or provide this service at one of the towns? If so, is it going to be in the trade centre, or where is it going to operate from? I think I heard you say earlier that they are going to be taking vehicles with them. Are they only going to be teaching them in cars, or are they going to be learning in trucks as well?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: The thinking at the moment is that we would base the training out of the trade training centre, but that decision will be further refined, if you like, by discussion with the community. At the moment the community thinks it is a good idea. The attraction for the community is that the 12 individuals can come from anywhere on the lands and be billeted while they are undertaking the training.

We will commence with light motor vehicles, but with a view to move to heavier vehicles because it has been put to me that one of the employment opportunities on the land is driving the trucks that go to and from Alice Springs with foodstuffs and also the school buses and the like, so in due course we are going to have to elevate the training so that they can get medium to heavy vehicle licences so they can actually avail themselves of the employment opportunities.

Ms CHAPMAN: Just on the residency requirement, I think you mentioned that under the policy regime there is going to be a proof of residence. Is there some qualifying period that this over 20-year-old applicant has to be living either in APY lands, or the MT lands which I think is also included in this bill? Is there some qualifying period or how does that work?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: That would have to be determined because, member for Bragg, you are probably aware of the transitory nature of Indigenous people living in remote communities where, come summer, a large number migrate, for lack of a better word, to Port Augusta to be by the coast during the heat of summer and then return to the lands.

I imagine that we would be informed by school records and information held by the various agencies as to where the bulk of time was spent. My understanding is that the period that is spent in Port Augusta is only a couple of months a year and that the bulk of the time is spent in the lands, but you have correctly identified an issue that we are going to have to work through.

Ms CHAPMAN: The applicants have to be over 20 years under your policy. One assumes that they will have to be registered somewhere on an electoral roll and that, in itself, may be a necessary prerequisite to establish that. Otherwise, I think you would agree, minister, that anyone who is over 20 who wants to get their licence and skip through the whole three, now four-year, process that it is going to be under the graduated licensing scheme could simply go up to the trade training centre and register their Aunt Mary's address on the lands and then get the short system and get it cheaper and quicker.

I would have thought that, given you have identified that it is to be over 20, you are clearly going to be dealing with those who are able to register for voting, and that may be one way of doing it. It also provides under the bill for an extra area of remoteness which is to be lands prescribed by regulation. Are there any other proposed areas that are intended at present to be included?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Not at this stage, member for Bragg. We want to get this up and working and iron out any imperfections such as those relating to proof of identify. Once we have bedded that down we will consider other sites. I would like to make the point that in relation to Ps it may well be that we do not grant wholesale exemptions to Ps. It is about getting people through the L phase where they are obliged to do a large number of supervised hours and do the theory test.

My inclination at least would be to see them serve out the full term on P1 and P2 because, among other things, the prohibition on use of alcohol while driving applies over both the P1 and the P2. I would be loath to see that truncated, because I do not think that is an imposition for anybody, particularly individuals on the land, to lay off the drink when they are driving, but the emphasis will be very much on the L phase. That is the thinking of the government.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it proposed that if the applicant does not have any experience in driving, for example, in metropolitan areas—that is, if one of these applicants has clearly been driving, but in the lands, on the desert, between Fregon and Umuwa or out to a campsite, and has not really dealt with the challenges of metropolitan driving, including managing stop lights and

giving way to the right, etc—that you will have a licence condition which may limit to the lands or limit it to a certain region? That is, will it be only on the APY lands that driving is allowed or only to or from certain areas, or is it proposed that, when you do grant these licences, it will be for driving anywhere?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: That was discussed as a potential option, but it was felt that it was probably unworkable in that it would be difficult to police and probably work against several of the elements that we are trying to drive with the bill, and one of those is increased access to employment opportunities elsewhere in the nation. The other is the ability to drive, both licensed and in a registered vehicle, to places like Alice Springs to seek medical attention.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it proposed that there be any restriction on the hours the licence would be available? For example, if they did get a job running camels across to Peterborough and bringing trucks back eventually, or driving to a certain area of the town to help round up the camels, would there be a condition on their licence that they would only have it, say, during the day time? Is that also considered, that they would have their own restriction?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: The intention at this point in time is to focus on the L-phase and to obligate drivers on the lands to comply with all of the requirements in the P-phase, so the night curfew would apply.

Ms CHAPMAN: How much has been allocated in this year's budget for the commencement of the implementation of this program between now and June 2014? I should say that during the briefing it was indicated that it was hoped that the program would be up and running for the commencement of July 2014, but I am assuming, in being advised, that the \$120,000 that we understand has been allocated would be used to do the preliminary invitations to tender selections and the like. Could you perhaps clarify what the budget is and what it is expected to do for this financial year?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: We have a small Aboriginal licensing unit operating on the lands who are engaged in working out this program, and they will be assisted by the staff of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. That will be funded with existing resources, and the program will not commence until the next financial year. The funding for the implementation of the program will be included in the next budget.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (16:35): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WATERLOO WIND FARM

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (16:35): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Waterloo wind farm noise study made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Ian Hunter.

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

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ELECTRICITY AND GAS LAWS—LIMITED MERITS REVIEW) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

PUBLIC CORPORATIONS (SUBSIDIARIES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ELECTRONIC MONITORING) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION (NOTIFICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

NATIVE VEGETATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 14 November 2013.)

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I just want to make some general comments. This bill I think has had quite a long gestation. As I understand it, the government was reluctant to pursue this because it was concerned that the intent might get changed and might result in something that is not best practice when it comes to managing native vegetation. I think as a state and as a community we have come a long way since the days when anything that stood was chopped down and anything that moved was shot. There is a bit of that that still goes on, but I think we have moved a long way from those early days.

This bill provides for some flexibility in regard to managing native vegetation and it also provides additional offset arrangements, and I think that is important, because, as we know, agriculture has changed. We have centre pivots and all sorts of fancy forms of irrigation and so on that require some changes in respect of native vegetation.

I think it is important that members focus on the history of clearance of vegetation in South Australia, and I believe that anyone looking at it objectively would have to say that our record is not all that good. Prior to the 1980s there were federal taxation incentives to clear land; indeed, I understand that prior to the 1980s it was a requirement of soldier settlers and others that they had to clear most, if not all, of the vegetation on the land they were allocated.

In the 1980s the commonwealth taxation incentives were removed, and in South Australia in 1985 we had the introduction of the Native Vegetation Act, which offered financial assistance to landowners prepared to protect remnant native vegetation. Then, in 1991, the Native Vegetation Act was amended to protect native vegetation and put an end to broadscale clearing in South Australia.

I have a lot of relatives who are farmers, graziers and horticulturists, and I have to say that there has been a significant change in attitude from (as I mentioned at the start) the 'chop it down, shoot it' mentality. There are still some things we have to shoot, but I think the younger generation, if you like, and the wiser of the older generation of farmers now appreciate the value of protecting and keeping remnant vegetation. We do not have that much left in South Australia, in the context of woodland type areas.

I will just give some figures on clearing in South Australia. Between 1970 and 1990, in the South-West—that is Eyre and Yorke Peninsula—the rate of clearance of the blocks (as they are referred to) was more than 10,000 hectares a year; in the Eastern Ranges, the Flinders and Murray-Darling area, the rate of clearing was between 10,000 to 100,000 hectares per year; in the western area, the Great Victorian Desert and the Nullabor, the rate of clearance was more than 10,000 per year; and in the South-East, which includes the Mount Lofty block, Kangaroo Island and the Naracoorte coastal plain, the rate of clearance was more than 10,000 hectares per year. The type of vegetation that was primarily cleared was what is described as woodland.

So what we have today is only about 15 per cent of native vegetation remaining in the Mount Lofty Ranges, and much of that has been degraded—and is still degraded—as a result of weed infestation. So it is 15 per cent that is often in a degraded state; anything but pristine. In the South-East about 13 per cent of native vegetation remains, and in the metropolitan area it is less than 4 per cent.

Since European settlers arrived in South Australia at least 23 mammals, two birds and 26 plants have become extinct. That is not a very good record. Today in South Australia about one-quarter, or over 1,000 species, of all terrestrial plants and vertebrate animals are considered to be threatened; as well, 63 per cent of the state's mammals and 22 per cent of the state's vascular

plants (plants that have the ability to move sap) are formally listed as threatened at a state level. There are other species and communities that are declining at rapid rates but do not yet meet state or national criteria for being listed as threatened.

So it is important that we protect native vegetation. In fact, the Victorian country newspaper the *Weekly Times* often showcases properties where enlightened farmers have either protected remnant native vegetation or planted some replacement native vegetation and have seen the benefits in regard to the profitability of their farming enterprise. I will not go into all the reasons for that, such as windbreaks and so on, but, as I say, there are a lot of farmers now who are amongst the best practice managers of the natural environment.

We often hear people say that you need a balance. The trouble with the concept of a balance is that it often means that the natural environment misses out. The natural environment will never be 'saved'—we sometimes hear that term—because it will always be under threat from some people who have little or no regard for the natural environment. I remind members that the words 'ecology' and 'economics' both come from the same Greek origin 'oikos', which means housekeeping. The two are intertwined and should be seen as two sides of the one coin.

What we have in this amendment bill, as I say, was a long time coming. There were some members in another place who sought to weaken this legislation, but I commend not only the government but the Liberal opposition for holding firm, because I do not believe we can afford to allow the undermining of the protection of what little remnant vegetation there is. So, I commend the minister in another place (the Hon. Ian Hunter) and the Liberal members in the upper house for adopting a progressive attitude which will enable some adjustment in relation to native vegetation to accommodate changes in agricultural practice but still retain the essential areas so that we can ensure that native plants and animals can survive and remain in this state.

I think we have an incredible obligation to do that, so I commend this bill. I think it has sensible recommendations and changes, and I believe it goes a long way to ensuring that we can retain remnant vegetation but still allow agriculture and horticulture to prosper in this state. We need to eat, we need to farm, but we also need to protect the natural estate. So, I support the amendments and I commend both the government and the opposition for being progressive in their support for this measure.

Ms CHAPMAN: I indicate that the opposition welcomes the return of this bill with the amendments as identified. The Hon. Michelle Lensink, member of another place, has given considered and consistent advice to our side of politics on this matter, and I thank her particularly for her efforts in negotiating the resolution of this matter in another place. We are willing, of course, to accept what has occurred.

It is fair to say that, in addition to amendments that the Liberal Party presented, most of which appear to have been either accepted in a modified form or negotiated through, this type of legislation, unsurprisingly to most members, attracts amendments from all sorts of people in the other place. Whenever, it seems, the Native Vegetation Act is opened, there is a plethora of people rushing to put in amendments, so it did attract a fair bit of attention, which only added to the task of members in another place in navigating through some resolution.

I would like to comment on one aspect on which we are very keen, which has been accepted by the minister and, therefore, ultimately the other place at our request, which was to seek some absolute clarity on the inconsistency between the Native Vegetation Act and the Fire and Emergency Services Act and, in this instance, to ensure that, when in conflict, the Fire and Emergency Services Act is to prevail.

This simply means that, whilst the parliament reaffirms, in maintaining the legislation for native vegetation protection, that we consider this to be a very high priority, we do, however, consider that the safety of human life must take precedence. This has been recognised in the amendments, and we are pleased that that has been achieved.

The second area we were unsuccessful in related to providing exemptions to native vegetation rules on pastoralists being allowed to have extra watering points for their stock. The issue of not bringing pastoral lands into consideration has been under the act if they had not been subject to cropping for up to 15 years and that rural councils are to undertake the construction of firebreaks and tracks and conduct cold burns and reduce fuel loads outside of the fire season with the authority of the CFS chief. In this area, we understand that the amended bill comes back with an acceptance that guidelines will be developed for cold burns, and we appreciate that.

There is also the issue of establishing conditions under which credit for environment benefits and third-party offsets may be approved. Obviously, in the development of the transferability of these credits, it was under consideration in this bill. To enable organisations such as Nature Foundation SA to obtain funding for conservation parks, it was considered necessary to have amendments so that funding could be provided. One example is a mining company that may need some land that would need to be cleared for the purposes of their venture. This would enable there to be some negotiation of what the arrangements are going to be for the mutual benefit of all parties, if I could summarise it as broadly as that.

The position, as I understand it, is that after negotiations the amendments have morphed, I suppose, into some resolution. There is a provision for our side of politics to have their rules in this regard determined by regulation rather than in the act, but that was conceded.

In the fourth area, which was to provide that there be some representation from the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy on the Native Vegetation Council, the compromise reached, as I understand it, is that there be representation from the development, planning or mining person, not an extra member on the board.

There was also provision in respect of authorised officers taking reasonable steps in informing landholders about actions that they would take on their property. That was accepted, and we thank the government for that. As to the others, it appears that they largely failed, although there was one amendment of the Hon. Mr Brokenshire.

There are a number of other areas that are left unresolved. This legislation has not addressed, in my view, questions such as the management of roadside vegetation; the accessibility to gravel for use in road building, in roadside strips. It has not dealt with accessibility for people who have adjacent property, where they need access for the general undertaking of works on their property, or bushfire management and the like. These are things that just never seem to get fixed when we are dealing with them. We have had reports on them. We have had inquiries. We have had select committees. In fact, I think I remember the now Attorney-General as the chair of a committee—probably the Natural Resources Committee; I cannot remember specifically which one at the time—and as chair he looked into this question of gravel pits and the access to councils to take up the gravel from roadsides.

Obviously, once they have secured access to that for road building and the like that could be restored for native vegetation growth and they could move to another spot. This is logical, it is sensible and it is cost effective. Councils are not having to pay to get gravel from areas that are not under native vegetation along road strips and, of course, there is a much bigger cost saving to the ratepayer. So, these are the sorts of issues which I am very disappointed continue to be unresolved. In any event, it has had some considered attention in the other place and I am pleased with what they have dealt with.

I will conclude by saying that just today the Natural Resources Committee tabled its bushfire preparedness of properties in bushfire risk areas report, and if we have the opportunity in this parliament in the next few days to consider that I propose to speak on it. But, relevant to this bill, I make the point that the consideration by this committee included taking evidence from the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources in looking at what the prescribed burn program was for April of this year.

I have not yet seen what their program has achieved for what we call the autumn prescribed burning period. I am still waiting on that material from the department and a briefing on it. I will be very interested to see that because, in fact, this committee goes on to put a number of recommendations as to what the obligations should be of private landowners when they acquire property, during the period which they own it and what responsibilities they would have. That includes the responsible management of vegetation that is on it, not just for bushfire preparedness but obviously to deal with pest management.

The member for Fisher has already outlined, consistent with an alarming report from the Environment Protection Authority this year just recently tabled in the parliament, two areas in which we are seriously failing our environment in South Australia. One is the management of pests, that is invasive pests, whether they are on legs and breathe or whether they are plants and germs and worms and everything else. The second is—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Rats and bats and everything else. I could speak all day on that, but I will not, you will be pleased to know. What I will say is that the second area is the loss of species in our natural environment, which we need to protect. We on this side of the house recognise the importance of native vegetation, but we also recognise how dangerous and perilous the situation can be for people and for the protection of property if it is not properly and responsibly managed, and it is only us who can take responsibility, whether that is as a private owner or as a government responsible for the property under its jurisdiction. With those few words, I welcome the return of the bill to the house and look forward to its passage and implementation.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: On behalf of the government and minister, I thank all members for their contributions and I thank those members of the upper house for their negotiations and eventual resolution. I commend the bill to the house.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Small Business) (17:00): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable private members' business, committees and subordinate legislation, notices of motion Nos. 3 and 4 set down for tomorrow to be taken into consideration forthwith.

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.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION: ANNUAL REPORT 2012-13

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (17:02): I move:

That the 15th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2012-13, be noted.

One of the functions of the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation is to keep the administration and operation of legislation affecting occupational safety, rehabilitation and compensation under constant review. The committee also has a function to examine and recommend to the executive and parliament about proposed regulations, particularly in relation to statutory bodies such as WorkCover.

The committee can also inquire into health and safety and workers rehabilitation and compensation matters on its own resolution or by referral from either house of parliament. To this end, on 12 May 2012, the committee resolved to inquire into occupational health and safety responsibilities of SafeWork SA and the effectiveness and efficiency of the agency. On 1 January 2013, the new model of the Work Health and Safety Act and regulations came into effect in South Australia, and this has provided the committee with a further incentive to undertake the inquiry.

Historically, there have been several different structural models of occupational health, safety and welfare—now known as 'work health and safety' in South Australia. Following the Stanley review in 2003, all occupational health and safety functions were merged into a new entity—SafeWork SA. This is the first inquiry into the state's health and safety system since the Stanley review. Mr Deputy Speaker, I know you will remember this very well because I think you were minister at the time.

SafeWork SA has a responsibility to deliver proactive education and enforcement and health and safety programs to all citizens within South Australia, regardless of their relationship to WorkCover. This requires SafeWork SA to deliver information, training and education to the community; to students who are getting ready to enter the workforce; to small businesses, which are diverse; to volunteers; and to many other stakeholder groups.

The Work Health and Safety Act is new legislation with new terminology, new enforcement provisions and many new codes of practice which need to be understood. SafeWork SA must communicate and consult with businesses and other effective groups regarding implementation, monitoring, enforcement and management accountability.

In addition to the challenges of implementing new legislation in the past 10 or 20 years, there have been many changes to the way people work. There is now much more contracting, as well as temporary labour hire arrangements, franchising and small businesses that operate from home. These business arrangements are varied and complex, and when a small business tenders for work with larger organisations it is required to show evidence of an effective safety management system. This is not always easy for small business, which is a major contributor to the state's economy.

South Australia achieved a 43.7 per cent improvement in the rate of serious injuries per 1,000 employees between 2008-09 and 2011-12, in comparison to the national average of 27.7 per cent for the same period. While this is a significant achievement, South Australia's record of 10.3 serious injuries per thousand workers is slightly below the national average of 10.7. SafeWork still has a lot of work ahead of it to continue to drive down injury rates in this state.

The committee received a variety of submissions from both employer and employee organisations and appreciated the opportunity to hear from a wide range of witnesses. A number of consistent themes emerged from the evidence. In particular, the lack of medium to long-term strategic planning and resource constraints were identified as issues that prevent SafeWork from effectively delivering prevention programs to citizens of South Australia.

The committee noted the lack of resources can be easily claimed as a reason for not undertaking certain activities, but there needs to be a focus on reviewing operational demands to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of core business programs. The funding arrangements to SafeWork from WorkCover appear to be arbitrary and at the discretion of WorkCover, with no appeal rights by SafeWork SA.

On occasions, WorkCover has delayed decisions about funding for SafeWork SA programs, and this has adversely affected SafeWork's ability to implement planned prevention programs. There is a need to review the funding arrangements to ensure that a more effective, efficient and responsive regulatory and prevention scheme is delivered to South Australia's businesses and the community.

A large challenge for all regulators is how they communicate health and safety messages to small businesses, which are both time and resource poor. There needs to be a proactive collaboration between SafeWork and larger organisations that have a vested interest in improving safety performance. New technologies will also play an important role in the communication of key initiatives.

There is a large network of independent work health and safety practitioners and businesses, including self-insured employers, who have previously been recognised in this place for their good safety performance. This network provides valuable resources in the education and capacity building of small to medium businesses. SafeWork has a responsibility to merge with this network to ensure a consistent approach in the delivery of work health and safety information, education and training.

Another challenge for SafeWork is a great demand for inspectors in the private sector, where salaries are higher. It is important that all inspectors are competent and at the top of their game, which requires training, development and succession planning. The benefit of being an inspector should be promoted. I note there is a very good short video on this very issue available on SafeWork SA's website. The video promotes the benefits and diversity of inspection work.

Many witnesses were critical about the lack of inspectorate expertise in high occupations and the failure of SafeWork SA to effectively investigate complex serious incidents, such as the Spin Dragon, which occurred some years before. Many of us will remember that terrible incident. SafeWork SA needs to develop a strategy for dealing with these types of incidents, such as using other public sector experts, cross-jurisdictional share of expertise or the use of consultants at a cost.

Witnesses did not support the merging of SafeWork SA's responsibilities with WorkCover because of the potential conflict of interest. Many also thought that WorkCover had its own problems with the unfunded liability, which is reported to be \$1.366 million, which is 67.7 per cent of the funding ratio for the 2012-13 financial year.

In view of these factors, the committee formed the view that the current arrangements should remain. The committee has also made a number of recommendations that aim to address the issues raised in the inquiry.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of those who have made submissions to our committee, and particularly thank members of the committee: the member for Mitchell, the member for Schubert, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the Hon. John Darley, and the Hon. Rob Lucas, for their contributions and deliberations. I would also like to mention the Hon. Russell Wortley who has been part of this committee as well. I also want to thank the committee staff, particularly Sue Sedivy, who have contributed to the preparation of this report.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE: STOLEN GENERATIONS REPARATIONS TRIBUNAL BILL INQUIRY

The Hon. L.R. BREUER (Giles) (17:12): I move:

That the report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into the Stolen Generations Reparations Tribunal Bill 2010, be noted.

The Stolen Generations Reparations Tribunal Bill was introduced in the Legislative Council by the Hon. Tammy Franks in July 2010. On 9 June 2011 the Stolen Generations Reparations Tribunal Bill 2010 was withdrawn and referred to the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee for inquiry and report.

The bill offers reparations to Aboriginal people who have been removed or, in essence, stolen from their families under state government policy practices that were in place until the 1970s, and, by offering reparation, the state is also acknowledging that the practices of the past caused emotional, physical and cultural harm to Aboriginal people.

To offer some historical perspective on this proposed legislation, this bill is the result of the recommendations of the report of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity's 'National Inquiry Into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children From Their Families', or, as it is more commonly known, the Bringing Them Home report, which for the first time identified the scope and depth of the issue of the forced removal of Indigenous children from their families and the term 'stolen generations' was coined.

The report concluded that an estimated 10 to 33 per cent of all Indigenous children were removed from their families under government policy practices up until the 1970s. The Bringing Them Home report made 54 recommendations, and to date a number of the recommendations have been implemented at the commonwealth and state levels, including the acknowledgment of the stolen generations issue which led to the formal apologies by the then prime minister Rudd on behalf of the Australian government, as well as the formal apologies by the states and territories, including the Hon. Dean Brown on the 28 May 1997, who was at the time the minister for aboriginal affairs. South Australia was the second state to make a formal apology to the stolen generations.

A further response called for in the Bringing them Home report was the establishment of the reparations tribunal to deal with reparations for stolen generations individuals. Successive governments have rejected the idea of reparations and then have had to deal with a number of civil cases brought by the stolen generations individuals through the courts. One case, defended by the Australian government, had legal costs of over \$10 million. The only successful civil case for compensation was the South Australian Supreme Court's award of \$525,000 to a now deceased Ngarrindjeri man who was moved from his family at age 13 months. The legal cost of that case was nearly \$2 million.

While both commonwealth and state governments have made formal apologies, Tasmania is the only jurisdiction to offer reparations to the stolen generations. To be fair, the commonwealth and states have provided significant financial resources to address the inequality gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians. While closing the gap initiatives have been shown to improve the lives of Aboriginal Australians, those programs do not address the stolen generations issues specifically.

Some other states and territories have, in the past, provided recompense for wages that were withheld, also referred to as stolen wages. Between 1900 and into the 1980s, wages were taken from Aboriginal people by state governments, often without their knowledge, and placed in state-controlled trust accounts to be paid at a later date, but then never paid. Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania have also introduced legislation for redress schemes, offering ex gratia payments for Aboriginal children as well as non-Aboriginal children who were found to have suffered physical, sexual, emotional or psychological abuse in state care.

There are a number of benefits for establishing a stolen generations reparations tribunal to provide reparations to members of the stolen generations. This proposed legislation would allow those Aboriginal people that are of the stolen generations to receive reparation and recognition for the emotional, physical and cultural harms that they were subjected to as a result of policies and practices of past state governments. The proposed assessment process would be quick, with a suggested time limit of months for applicants to make application and a suggested assessment period of not more than one year.

The committee heard during the inquiry that although the receiving of reparations in the form of an ex gratia payment would not preclude the recipient from pursuing compensation through courts, a satisfactory resolution through a tribunal process would likely limit the number of cases pursued through the court, particularly in cases where the liability for harm that might have been caused by the removal would be difficult to establish. This has also been the evidence in Tasmania, the only jurisdiction to make the reparations to stolen generations to date.

The operation of a tribunal would also reduce the cost to both the state and members of the stolen generations and would be cost-efficient compared with the state defending against litigation that could be taken by individuals through the courts. A tribunal process would also reduce the trauma experienced by members of the stolen generations, given that the process is not adversarial, unlike court proceedings.

Although not legally binding on countries, the United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law (commonly referred to as the van Boven principles) is considered the agreed framework for offering redress to victims of violations of law through the concept of reparation, which has been reflected in the bill. By applying the van Boven principles through a stolen generations tribunal, the state would be acknowledging the practices of the past and laying the foundations for reparation in an internationally recognised framework.

During the course of the inquiry, the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee held 10 hearings, received evidence from 16 witnesses and received 11 formal submissions. As a result of the inquiry, the committee agreed that it supported the intent of the bill; however, it recommended it be simplified from its original form to only provide reparations in the form of ex gratia payments to South Australian Aboriginal people who were removed or stolen from their families as children, using the Tasmanian Stolen Generations of Aboriginal Children Act 2006 and their assessment and tribunal process as the framework for South Australian legislation. This will reduce the administration costs and the time to complete the assessment process, as well as remove the need to prove abuse and neglect in order to qualify for an ex gratia payment, as was proposed in the initial bill.

The Tasmanian Stolen Generations of Aboriginal Children Act 2006 provides a proven framework for the Stolen Generations Reparations Bill. The Tasmanian government made provision for a \$5 million fund and provided for the appointment of an independent assessor to assess the eligibility of applicants. A total of 151 claims were received. Of the 151 claims, 106 were found to be eligible for payment, which comprised 84 people who were of the stolen generations and 22 who were the children of stolen generations victims who had died. Forty-five claims were rejected. The 22 children of stolen generations victims shared \$100,000 and the remaining \$4.9 million was split equally among the 84 living applicants who were removed, giving them approximately \$58,000 each.

Even though not all the claims were successful, the eligibility assessment process was considered fair and reasonable. Similarly, the payment amounts were considered appropriate. In South Australia, it is estimated that up to 300 Aboriginal people could receive an ex gratia payment in accordance with the proposed eligibility criteria. The amount provided to each person would be dependent on the number of applicants found to be eligible and the size of the fund made available.

The cost to the state of providing a stolen generations fund to make ex gratia payments must be compared to the cost to the state of individual stolen generations cases pursued throughout the South Australian courts. One such case resulted in a compensation payment of \$525,000 and legal costs of nearly \$2 million. In conclusion, the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee supports the Stolen Generations Reparations Tribunal Bill and recommends:

1. That the Stolen Generations Reparations Tribunal Bill 2010 be redrafted to provide a simplified framework to make ex gratia payments to South Australian Aboriginal people who were removed (stolen) from their families as children, based on the Stolen Generations of Aboriginal Children Act 2006 (Tasmania).

2. That the redrafted Stolen Generations Reparation Tribunal Bill 2010 be reintroduced to the Legislative Council for consideration at another time.

I thank all members of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, past and present, for their dedication and support to deliver this inquiry report to this place. I particularly thank the presiding member, the Hon. Ian Hunter, as well as previous presiding member, the Hon. Paul Caica, and previous members Ms Zoe Bettison, Dr Susan Close, the Hon. Kyam Maher, our President the Hon. John Gazzola, Ms Frances Bedford and the Leader of the Opposition Mr Steven Marshall for their contribution to the committee.

I also acknowledge the current members of the committee for their ongoing efforts: the Hon. Russell Wortley, the Hon. Tammy Franks, Ms Gay Thompson, Dr Duncan McFetridge and the Hon. Terry Stephens. I also thank Jason Caire, the executive research officer for this committee, who spends many hours contacting us, chasing us, sending us emails, putting together information for us and keeping us in order, which is no small task when you are managing a number of MPs. I am sure it would be worse than a class of children.

Finally, I thank all the Aboriginal people and the support organisations for their input and support to the inquiry and their willingness to share their personal stories and knowledge with the committee. Some of those stories were confronting and heartbreaking. Anybody who has sat down with Aboriginal people and listened to their stories will know exactly what I am talking about. A big thank you to all.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (17:24): I rise to support the report of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee into the Stolen Generations Reparations Tribunal Bill 2010. I commend the speech of the member for Giles to all members in this place, the other place and to all members of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities in South Australia. This report is yet another example of how this particular committee has been working in a bipartisan way for many, many years now. I will not go over all the things that the member for Giles has said, other than to say that her summation of the deliberations and recommendations of the committee into this particular issue was as we would all expect it to be.

As a committee member who has served on the committee over many years now (with a short period off the committee), I can say that the member for Giles has been one of those members who has been very passionate and very dedicated. She has been on as many trips as possible and has been to as many committee meetings as possible. The APY lands are part of her electorate, which she has served very well.

As a member of this place she has served her constituents very well, not only at Whyalla and the rest of Giles but in particular the members of the Aboriginal community in South Australia. The member for Giles is one of those rare creatures who has put her constituents above herself. In this particular circumstance, as a member of the committee Lyn Breuer has done a wonderful job. So I thank you, Lyn, personally and on behalf of this parliament, for what you have done. Certainly the constituents of Giles have been well served by you, and I am sure you will continue in public life.

I think this legislation is part of the legacy you have left to this parliament and I, for one, count you as a friend. You do not get many friends in this place, but I count you as one. We have always been very honest with each other. I have had your frank opinions expressed towards me sometimes, and I have appreciated that. That is what you appreciate in this place, the honesty of people like the member for Giles.

The sad fact is that all of us in this place eventually move on. We will be replaced—I hope that in Giles it will be a Liberal member coming up—but Lyn Breuer, I take off my hat to you. I thank you for your contribution today and over the many, many years as a member of this particular committee. Aboriginal people in South Australia are better off for people like you, and you have expressed your passion again today in this report.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (17:27): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business, Committees and Subordinate Legislation, Notices of Motion No. 2, set down for tomorrow, be taken into consideration forthwith.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: URBAN DENSITY

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (17:30): I move:

That the 73rd report of the committee, entitled Urban Density, be noted.

On 2 December 2010, the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, on its own motion, sought to inquire into the effects of increasing urban density in South Australia. At this time, it was evident to the committee that there were concerns in some sections of the community about increasing urban density as a way to tackle urban sprawl. We felt it appropriate, given the functions of this committee, that we examine this issue in more detail.

In order to garner views from an extensive array of stakeholders, the committee invited a number of witnesses to appear before it and also sought out submissions and other sources of information. The inquiry was advertised on 23 June 2010 through print and social media, and submissions were requested by August; however, the committee continued to hear submissions from people made after that date.

The broad terms of reference for the inquiry were for the committee to inquire into and report on desirable social, health, environmental and economic outcomes of increased-density sustainable living in South Australia and appropriate strategies for achieving these outcomes. While these terms offered a broad field of examination, the committee was keen to ensure that its investigation was able to explore more deeply the effects of increasing urban density; therefore, in addition to the terms of reference, the committee included a comprehensive list of issues of interest that allowed the evidence to speak in detail to a wide array of topics.

In total, the committee finalised 15 separate issues of interest which are, of course listed in the report. In the interests of expediency, I will not go through them now, but the list included the interplay between increasing urban density and other social issues such as demographic changes; health and lifestyle needs; public, community and affordable housing; and community engagement in the planning process, as well as covering elements relating to the impact of increasing urban density on the environment and implications for infrastructure planning.

The evidence obtained from the 23 submissions and additional 23 witnesses provided the committee with a wealth of information so that every issue of interest was sufficiently explored. This evidence, in addition to the committee's site visits, both local and interstate, and its external research, ensures that the report laid on the table today provides a comprehensive overview of urban density in South Australia.

The evidence and research considered in this report was diverse; however, there was a shared and resolute consensus: South Australia needs to increase urban density in order to protect the lifestyle, environmental and productive assets of the state. The committee understands that South Australia's changing urban landscape is an issue close to the hearts of many in this state, and that there are some who disagree with the premise of increasing South Australia's urban density.

The committee welcomed these opinions throughout its inquiry. However, as the report explains, the evidence clearly shows that increasing urban density in the state is vital if we are to ensure vibrant, sustainable and affordable housing and livability options for the people of South Australia. These options are, of course, associated with relevant services that are readily accessible to people, entertainment activities and sporting activities, which are sufficiently dense to be sustained by the surrounding community.

Urban sprawl was consistently identified in the evidence as highly problematic and as perpetuating a range of problems, from obesity and traffic congestion to housing affordability and poor utilisation of resources. Increasing urban density, meanwhile, was acknowledged as a solution to many of these problems, but the committee heard that there are still misconceptions and apprehension in the community regarding this approach. To address this, a key recommendation stemming from the inquiry is for the government to engage in a widespread educational campaign to inform the community of the adverse effects of urban sprawl and the benefits of increasing urban density.

The committee came to realise that, unless the community is convinced that there is a problem, they are unlikely to want to put their back behind solving it, and there are many members of our community who do not yet have access to the information provided to the committee, which shows very clearly that the sprawl of the current population expansion is impossible to continue. Population is not the problem: the sprawl is the problem.

The committee was keen to hear evidence on ways to facilitate more community engagement in the planning process, and a range of ideas and principles were presented to the inquiry. Two practical approaches that resonated with the committee and have formed part of our recommendations were for the government to consider the use of development notices on sites to inform local residents of forthcoming changes, and for the government to engage in a public consultation process to identify vistas and sightlines that are considered valuable by the community so that a planning strategy to protect them can be implemented. The committee was informed that this has been a successful process in London, Montréal and Vancouver.

Another key recommendation is that the government drafts a set of design principles based on best practice models, which can be used as archetypal benchmarks to guide and assess positive examples of increased urban density. It became clear to the committee that these principles need to encapsulate the essence of good design and allow for flexibility so that they do not operate as a set of prescriptive and unyielding criteria. At the same time, people need to understand that increasing urban density does not yield vistas similar to what we see in *The Bill* on television, which appears to be what comes to mind to many people when they hear of increased density. They do not think of North Adelaide and the vibrancy of North Adelaide; they think of the horror of *The Bill* and the Housing Commission in Melbourne.

With increasing urban density, apartment living is likely to become more common in Adelaide and, as such, the committee was keen to ensure that a range of lifestyle and livability needs are catered for. To facilitate this, the committee has recommended that the government reviews the strata management system, examining ways to streamline the current legislation, and consider establishing a conflict resolution agency specialising in property management. The committee has also recommended that current restrictions, such as drying washing on balconies and pet ownership, be re-examined so that they do not become deterrents to strata living.

The committee was pleased to have heard from a broad spectrum of the community, from individuals and group representatives to academics, business people and planning experts, and we offer our thanks to those who provided their time and particularly their expertise to participate. They contributed crucial information and guidance to the committee and we are especially appreciative.

Unfortunately, the committee also heard evidence from a range of people indicating that the inconsistency—usually inexplicable—in the requirements of different local government bodies is a persistent barrier to efficient and effective changes to density. This often adds to the costs for people wanting to change their accommodation to adapt to different stages in their lives. Local government has an important role to play in developing a vibrant community, not just in the city but throughout the suburbs.

Thanks to the quality of the information provided, the committee was able to draw informed conclusions, and we are confident that the final 24 recommendations reflect the issues that arose in the evidence while balancing the diverse needs of the wider community.

I would also like to extend my thanks to my fellow committee members for their contribution to this inquiry. I will not take up extra time by listing them, there have been many and they are, of course, included in the report. Thanks also to the committee staff: Phil Frensham, Debbie Bletsas, Susie Barber and Leah Skrzypiec, for their assistance.

In conclusion, I urge members of this place and members of the community to regard this document and its supporting evidence as a resource to enhance the development of a viable, effective, healthy and well resourced community for the future. I believe this final report will make a

very positive contribution to the ongoing debate about South Australia's urban future and I look forward to the minister's response. I commend this report to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

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

No. 1. New clause, page 6, after line 23—After clause 9 insert:

9A—Amendment of section 56—Permits for research etc

Section 56(1)—delete 'poison, controlled drug, controlled precursor, controlled plant, medicine' and substitute 'substance'

No. 2. Clause 10, page 6, line 25—Delete 'or medical device'

No. 3. Clause 10, page 6, line 27—Delete 'or device'

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I move:

That the Legislative Council amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

At 17:42 the house adjourned until Wednesday 27 November 2013 at 11:00.