

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5 August 2014

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.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2014

Estimates Committees

Adjourned debate on motion:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

(Continued from 24 July 2014.)

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (11:01): When we last met, I was partway through my response and to continue would be greatly appreciated. I thank you very much for that. We were talking about estimates and the experience that was estimates. I mentioned those opposite and those we questioned and spoke with, and what an experience it was to get responses, some more in depth than others, and we will follow up with some more of those questions as we go through.

We talked about the Motor Accident Commission with the Minister for Road Safety. He was a bit loath to talk about the Motor Accident Commission, which was somewhat disappointing, because we had some questions. We wanted to know about future funding, given the sale, closure or shut down of the Motor Accident Commission. There were a number of key issues that we would have liked addressed as far as funding for the long-term future of some projects. We talked about Schoolies and about a number of other community grants that are made through the Motor Accident Commission, so hopefully we will be able to find out a bit more about that in time.

Another program we discussed was the greenways cycle paths, this time with the Minister for Transport, and we did not quite get it nailed down. Whilst the suggestion was that the Greenway cycling program was complete and no more money would be spent on that, speaking with a lot of people in and around that program, the suggestion is that there are still a number of sections, corridors and intersections that need to be fixed up as far as the Greenway cycleways are concerned. Hopefully again in time we will get a bit more information about that.

Other factors that come to the fore out of estimates are things like fines, penalties and fees that come from travelling on public transport. I know fare evasion is being looked at very much in depth as far as the budget is concerned. We talked about that and we were wanted to know more about how these fines, fees and penalties are implemented and, as far as fare evasion goes, how much money has actually come from any fines and fees that have been imposed on fare evaders. That is one of the big things.

We also talked about road maintenance, and we know that in South Australia—and this ties in transport and road safety—road maintenance has been massively underfunded and there is a huge backlog. We did not get an exact figure on what the backlog was; suggestions are \$400 million is the figure for backlog on road maintenance. We know what a big part this plays in road safety, as well. A lot of country and regional people are not overly happy with the push to lower the speed limits. I can understand why: because there is a feeling that lowering the speed limit is a bit of an excuse for not maintaining the roads as they should be.

When speaking with some people in the department, I was given an interesting diagram with four pictures on it outlining different roads across the state and which ones were better than others. All of them had the same speed limit. It is quite incongruous that you can have a double-lane freeway with a big barrier down the middle—which would be arguably the safest road—which has the same

speed limit as a road that only fits pretty much a car and a half which has no shoulders on the road and is in quite a state of disrepair.

I think a push to eventually assess all those roads and work out where they sit and which ones are safe enough to have the maximum speed limit and which ones need to be looked at is really important. Road maintenance across the state, both in the metropolitan and country areas, is very important and it is something that we are really keen to explore further. We did not get the full opportunity during estimates to do that, and that was somewhat disappointing.

Upon speaking with the Minister for Road Safety there were a number of issues that we brought to a head and a couple of things that perhaps were not dealt with as well as they could have been. He was questioned at times and got a little bit upset with me, but I think that is the point of estimates: to ask questions and find out exactly what is going on.

We talked about cost recovery for special events and are still waiting to find out which events will be hit with the fun tax. There was a fair conversation with the minister about whether it was a tax or a levy or whether, in fact, public transport was free. He did go on to say that event organisers would be charged \$2.5 million for these events across the way—so the charge is going on and someone is going to have pay that charge. On the one hand he was saying it was free and on the other hand he was saying that there is a substantial cost that is going with that, which I found to be quite interesting.

I read in *The Advertiser* yesterday that it appears the Stadium Management Authority is being made a scapegoat or the bad guy in this scene, and it will have to impose that fee on the people who hold events. Clearly we can see that it is being passed down the line, and I think people just want to know and to be told up-front, 'This is what we are doing; this is how we are going to get the money back; and this is will be the process: a tax/levy.' It does not matter if you have to recoup the money. I know that public transport certainly will not be free for those events anymore and it will be passed on to the people.

We had a look at a couple of other things as well and we did not quite get a full answer on the cost of the bus strikes in the lead-up to the last election in February 2014 when the SouthLink company and bus drivers walked off the job. We are trying to establish how much that cost and who foot the bill for that too. So we will inquire about that a little more and try and get some information.

Still on the public transport side of things, we were keen to look at the rail revitalisation, and I know a number of electric trains have been ordered. There is a bit of a backlog and a delay in the delivery of those, so hopefully we can find out a little more information about when they are coming through. Of course, with the Gawler line not being electrified, it is still one that intrigues me and the people of Gawler.

The minister recently put out some figures on increased patronage on the trains and was spruiking quite a high number. An interesting fact was that on the electrified Seaford line—the main electrified line, if you like—in the last six years there has been a 35,000 person increase on that line. There was an increase in patronage on the Gawler line to the tune of 100,000 and that was the one that was ignored. It got the gantries and the poles for electrification, but no more.

It has been shelved at the back end of forward estimates and I know the people of Gawler are very keen to find out why that was on-again off-again, on-again off-again. There has been a lot of rhetoric about that one, but we still have not found out why. With the proposed electrification of the whole network the trains were ordered accordingly but, of course, we probably do not need quite as many electric trains now so we are just trying to find out what the expenditure of that money is going forward.

We have also talked about the Millswood station, and we are trying to find out a bit more information on the cost of the upgrade. It has since come to my attention that the cost of that upgrade is going to be upwards of \$400,000. That is what I am led to believe. Again, I am just seeking clarification on that from the minister himself. It is a fair bit of money to spend on a trial operation for the Millswood station when it may not go ahead full-time into the future, which will be interesting to see.

Equal to that, we had quite a bit of money spent on the Wayville station. I think it was upwards of \$16 million. We are just waiting to see how effective that will be, having the Millswood station. With the Millswood station, I have read that only certain trains are going to stop there. It is perhaps not overly clear to the local residents, who are going to get this trial, which trains are going to be stopping there and how that is going to work. So let's hope we get an effective trial for the cost of that project.

The other matter is the bus fleet. A number of people have come to talk to me about buses in recent times. Again, hopefully I will be able to put a couple of questions to the minister in time as we find out about the bus fleet and just how it is working for disabled people. A lot of people who are looking for disability access are coming to me with a few questions wanting to know how we can get some regularity in the disabled buses that are coming, when they are coming.

I know a lot of it now goes through the metro website, but I am hearing from a lot of people that it is not 100 per cent clear as to which buses are rocking up when and whether buses with disability access are coming at the time they are supposed to come and, equally, when they are not scheduled to come, one will rock up. It makes it very hard for people with disabilities to access the public transport system, so hopefully we can do a bit more work on that. That would be fantastic.

There are a couple of other things that I had briefings on. I am still waiting for some clarification on this but, on the trains again, the new train horns are quite distressing to a lot of people along the Seaford line. There has been a change in the pitch and tone of the horns on the new trains coming through. That was something that was going to be addressed, but we just did not get a chance during the estimates to ask a few more questions about that and to find out exactly when they will be changed. I note that the trains actually get shipped back to Melbourne for their first service, I think, and there was a suggestion that the changing of the pitch and tone of the horns would be implemented at the same time.

I talked before about the Adelaide Metro website. When it is up and operational it is absolutely ideal. Some people have said to me that at times it is not fully functioning and at times it does go down. That is always unfortunate, so trying to streamline that would be fantastic for users of public transport.

The other thing that came to my attention—and I put the question to the minister and we will see whether we can get a response on this one—is that, in the budget, there was a line talking about metropolitan public passenger services and the response times for the Adelaide Metro Infoline. Interestingly, there was a change in the call-answering rate. It was set at 30 seconds—that was the target set for people taking calls for public transport services on the Adelaide Metro Infoline—but it has now been moved back to a 30-second ring before the call is answered. Now it is a 120-second ring. I am just not sure why people are expected to wait on the line for two minutes before their call is dealt with. We will try to find out the reason for the change in that standard and why it has dropped from 30 seconds to two minutes. That seems quite interesting as well.

There are a couple of things as I finish up. As we have talked about, the estimates process is an interesting one. It was great to be able to speak with the ministers and ask them questions. I did mention when I began this speech the other week that some of the ministers notably were fantastic and only took questions from our side, and I commend them for that. The Minister for Road Safety did take a number of questions from his side for which, it appeared, he had prepared answers. I know it is part of the process but it could perhaps be deemed to be a bit of a waste of time when we could have got to a few other questions.

The Minister for Transport did a very good job of answering questions. He was very forthright—perhaps not forthright, more so in lengthy in his answers; that is probably a better way of putting it. He had a fair bit to say about his answers and perhaps did not drill down on the specifics of the questions. I will follow those up with him, and I am sure he will get me more detail in time—well, at least I hope he will. Again, some of the key points, as far as the 'fun tax' is concerned, are: which events will be hit with that tax or that levy, which events will have to pay the extra funding? As we know, it will be events over 5,000 people in the city, and a couple of other stipulations go with that, but getting the detail would be absolutely outstanding.

With a bit of time wasted, we did not get to ask about pedestrian rail crossing access, and we would be happy and very keen to follow that up. We know there has been a little bit in the press

recently about pedestrian crossings and also car and bus crossings. A bus was just recently caught at the intersection of a railway crossing, and in fact the bus driver got out and tried to wave down the train while people were still on the bus. We are keen to find out a bit more information about that, how that situation can arise and how we can prevent it in the future.

It is the same issue for people crossing intersections. I know there was an incident at the Woodlands Railway Station recently, where someone was hit because they mistakenly thought the path was clear; we would like to find out a bit more about that. The double-decker bus experiment is another matter I was keen to ask about because there is still talk about the double-decker bus running through, potentially, the Adelaide Hills. We just want to make sure that that is the best location for the bus, and we also want to know how much it will cost to run it through there and make sure all the preps have been done. Whilst estimates was a great experience from my perspective, and it was a good chance to ask questions, it would have been good to ask a few more, but we will use the house to do that in time.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (11:16): This government has a major credibility problem on its hands. In recent times, it has handed down its budget, and I would assert that this is the worst budget in this state's history. It is the worst budget on a number of fronts. First of all, it is, of course, the largest deficit in the state's history: \$1.2 billion was the final estimated result for the last financial year. That is the worst result in the history of our state. Interestingly, three years ago the government was promising that they would return the budget to surplus in the last financial year. That was the promise they made to the people of South Australia, that was the promise they made here in this parliament. Of course, it did not come true. Far from returning to surplus, they gave us the largest deficit in this state's history.

Again, this year's budget is a very damning indictment on the economic mismanagement presided over by the Labor Party in South Australia for the past 12 years. It seems to me that this government has learnt absolutely nothing from the debacle they have presided over economically in the state for the last 12 years because here we go again. The new budget they have presented to us is filled with these heroic assumptions in terms of growth, these fantastic assumptions in terms of improvement in productivity, these completely incredible assumptions in how much they are going to reduce their expenses, and we are meant to just lap it up and say, 'Guess what? I think everything's going to be rosy in two years' time.' Well, it is not going to happen.

So we go through this annual exercise, which we refer to as budget estimates. I think it is more like a game of hide-and-seek, or maybe 'seek and hide': we seek to find out some answers to what is going on in the state and the government does everything it can to hide the answers from the people of South Australia. Quite frankly, I think the people of South Australia deserve a lot more. We were able to get some answers from the government, and they were pretty unsatisfactory, it has to be said—they were pretty unsatisfactory.

It is fair to say that this budget is possibly the most politically charged budget that has been handed down, and I think that is what we are in store for in South Australia. We are in store for a lot more political rhetoric from a government which is constantly on the back foot because of its own economic incompetence. In this case, the Treasurer went out attacking the federal government. He went to great lengths to say that all the problems that are associated with his horrible budget were to do with the federal government. It is just completely and utterly untrue, and if you delve into the pages of the budget you can prove this for yourself.

The government went to a huge effort, on page 6 of Budget Paper 3, to outline \$885 million of what they refer to as federal government cuts. What the Treasurer failed to do is provide a corresponding table of the federal government increases in revenue to the state. Just going through and adding up all the things that might have been cut only gives part of the picture, because the government failed to go through and add up all the increases in revenue being paid to this state, and net them off against each other, so that the people of South Australia have a clear picture of what our budget is all about, and who is actually to blame for the circumstances in which we find ourselves in South Australia, with the largest deficit in this state's history.

We already know that the federal government has written up GST revenue to the state by a significantly large amount. I refer members to page 55 of Budget Paper 3, where it clearly shows that in each and every year of the forward estimates GST revenue to this state from the commonwealth

is significantly increasing. Anybody would think, with the rhetoric that has been put forward by this government, by this Treasurer—this L-plate Treasurer—that somehow the federal government is ripping this money out of South Australia. Let me tell you what is happening.

Last year the estimated result of revenue from GST was \$7.85 billion from the commonwealth. This year it will go up by \$415 million in a single year. Next year it will go up by a staggering \$794 million, and the year later by \$557 million. Each and every year our GST revenue from the commonwealth is increasing. Some might say, 'Well, it's always going to go up.' I point members to the statistics also provided within the government's budget document, which look at the percentage increase in GST that we are receiving.

This next year we plan to have an increase of 7.3 per cent. Give me a break! You have the government out there saying that the federal government is ripping GST money from the state; it is actually increasing it by 7.3 per cent. Correct me if I am wrong: 7.3 per cent is actually above the inflation figure in Australia at the moment.

Mr Williams: More than double.

Mr MARSHALL: More than double, as the member for MacKillop points out—probably more than triple the inflation rate in Australia—is the increase in GST revenue that we as a state will receive here in South Australia. But those opposite often accuse me of choosing just one isolated piece of information.

Let us look at what it goes up by the next year: the next year 7.2 per cent and the year after 9.4 per cent. So this is the sequence: 7.3 per cent, 7.2 per cent, 9.4 per cent increase in GST revenue. The Treasurer has been wildly running around South Australia saying to people that the federal government is ripping out all this money out: well, it is just not the case. They are increasing the GST distribution to this state many times over the inflation rate each and every year of the forward estimates. That is the true picture we have here in South Australia. The responsibility for the complete and utter financial ineptitude of this government rests firmly with Labor, which has had its hands in the treasury for an extended period of time, and they have done absolutely nothing with it.

The government, as I said, did go to some lengths to identify federal government cuts over the forward estimates to specific programs. I then said to the government, 'Well, can you tell me what your cuts are going to be over the forward estimates?' That is, state government cuts independent of the federal government cuts, and I have to say that they were not very forthcoming with the answer. So, I did my own reconciliation. Budget Paper 3, page 28. Table 2.6 is an interesting table, because it refers to what the government titles 'operating savings' from 2008-09 right through to the 2017-18 year—'operating savings'!

So I thought to myself 'What are operating savings? I reckon they are cuts.' Anyway, I took a look at the cuts that the government had pushed through in the 2013-14 year, and it was \$282 million worth of cuts, so I said to the Treasurer, 'In this table where it says operating savings to commence in 2014-15, and it has \$276 million, are these in addition to the \$282 in 2013-14?' He said yes. I said, 'Alright, so in other words in the 2014-15 year we are going to have \$276 million worth of cuts in that year on top of the \$282 from the previous year?' He said yes.

I said, 'Alright, so if we go along with that in 2015-16, when we are going to have \$313 million worth of cuts that year we will have the \$313 million worth of new cuts, plus the \$276 from the previous year, plus the \$282 from the year before?' and he said yes. Well, I did the arithmetic and over the forward estimates the cuts to the state budget are going to add up to—are you ready for this Deputy Speaker?—\$4.2 billion.

So, again, I make this point: the government goes to a great extent to say that there is—and I am just going to get the exact figure for you because I do not want to mislead you on it—\$885 million worth of federal cuts, but that is \$885 million worth of federal cuts out of a total cut package in this state of \$4.2 billion. So, again, I am asking myself, 'Why is the Treasurer running around saying we are in this perilous situation, and we are going to have to close hospitals because of federal government cuts, when by far the larger cut is coming from the state here in South Australia?' He should turn that same rhetoric back on himself.

I must say that I think it is a complete and utter misuse of finite state government funds to spend \$1.1 million on what is pure political advertising. We can ill afford to waste money like that. It is shameful, and I know that the member for Florey would be aghast if they ended up closing the Modbury Hospital as they have been threatening, and instead of operating the Modbury Hospital spent \$1.1 million on political advertising. That would be a shame, and I know that she would personally be absolutely aghast at that concept.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: More than aghast.

Mr MARSHALL: More than aghast. It is a terrible budget, Deputy Speaker, and I tell you one thing that I have been trying to get a handle on, and that is the Public Service numbers here in South Australia. I would have thought that this was a pretty easy exercise, quite frankly. Every year the opposition comes along and we usually ask a pretty simple question: 'How many public servants do you have?' I would be pretty prepared for it if I was on that side of the house. I think it is fair to say that they have no idea. I find it incredible, but it is a crazy situation.

At the end of the 2013 financial year they brought down their budget in June 2013, and they said that they had 81,724 public servants. It is pretty exact, considering it is completely inaccurate. I mean, 81,724 full-time equivalents in the Public Service and then they set themselves a goal at exactly the same time to reduce the Public Service down to 79,484 FTEs so, doing the arithmetic this is a reduction of 2,240 full-time equivalents in our Public Service. That is what they predicted in June 2013.

Now, the great thing about the calendar is that it marches on and you get a chance to go back and see how people went relative to their promises. We did that, and in 2014 we checked out the number of full-time equivalents in the Public Service, remembering that they had promised to reduce it to 79,484. Actually, it was 81,516. Now, that is a small error! Some people would call it a rounding error; I think it is pretty substantial. They said that they wanted to reduce the size of the Public Service by 2,240 and they actually reduced it by 208. I mean, they fell short. I do not want to state the bleeding obvious, but they fell short.

So, I think it was reasonable for us to ask, 'Well, given the fact that you fell so short in your estimate, why did we have such an incredible number that was provided for increased payments in terms of TVSPs?' Now, TVSP stands for targeted voluntary separation packages, and I can tell you that I was aghast when I read on page 30 of Budget Paper 3 that there was a variance in terms of expenses in the budget which related to increased payments of TVSPs. The government paid \$94 million over and above its original budget for TVSPs.

I could not understand that because if we had a target to reduce the Public Service by 2,240 and we reduced it by less than 9 per cent of what we targeted, I would have thought there would have been a positive variance, that we did not spend as much on our targeted voluntary separation packages; I would have thought we would have spent less. We spent \$94 million more than we provided for to completely and utterly fail.

So, I thought I will ask this question of the Treasurer: 'Can you explain to me, sir, how this works?' And he said, 'It's not my area.' I said, 'That's fine. Whose area is it?' He said, 'It's the member for Port Adelaide, the Minister for the Public Sector.' So, I thought, alright, fair enough, I will ask the minister. So, I went to estimates when the minister was appearing and I went through exactly the same numbers. I said, 'Minister, I find it incredible: 2,240 was your goal, 208 was your result; a \$94 million increase in the provision of TVSPs. Can you explain it to me?' She said, 'It's not my area.' I said, 'Really? Whose area is it?' She said, 'It's the Treasurer's.'

It was like an episode of *Yes, Minister*. I thought the cameras must have been on me and Jim Hacker was about to walk in. It was really one of those Nigel Hawthorne moments when it was proven comprehensively that this government has no idea of what it is doing—no idea of what it is doing—and the Treasurer has still not given any explanation whatsoever to the parliament of why there is such a massive increase in the provision for TVSPs, even though they have failed comprehensively to achieve what they would like to achieve in terms of the number of people in the Public Service.

Of course, we are now confronted with a new set of numbers in this budget. The government says that we are going to return to a surplus. Now, call me sceptical, but I do not believe that for one

second. They say that within two years this government will return to surplus. They are promising a \$406 million surplus in the 2015-16 financial year, which begins in under 11 months. I mean, it is completely implausible. Let us just say that if the government were to have a chance of that, they would need to reduce the size of the Public Service, which hitherto they have been unable to effect. This year, they say they are going to decrease the size of the Public Service from 81,516 down to 80,000, so they think they are going to reduce the size of the Public Service by 1,490. Well, this government has proven itself to be completely incapable of doing that in the past.

I was also fortunate enough to sit in on estimates for the health minister. He was the previous treasurer (two treasurers ago). We have had three treasurers in the last 18 months, none of them have been much chop, but I thought I would go and have a look at this issue of Public Service numbers with the health minister (the former treasurer). So, I asked him the question: what was going on in his area, because he has the most employees so he would probably have a pretty good idea. When we go back to the original June 2013 number in the health department, they told us that they had 30,330 full-time equivalents in the health department and they set themselves a goal for that year (the last financial year) to reduce that to 29,372. They wanted to reduce the size of the Public Service in the health department by 958 employees.

Of course, this is the evidence that everybody needs to know. It is not the federal government cuts that are driving the problems in the health department, or the cuts in the health department. They are there for all to see. They are in the budget from the previous year, Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 49. This is the 2013-14 budget which came out before there was even a Coalition government in Canberra, and they said they wanted to reduce the size of the health department by 958. Let us see how they went.

They said they would have the number of health sector employees down to 29,372. How many did they have a year later? They had increased the size of the Public Service in that area. At the end of last financial year, a few weeks ago, they had 30,690. Let us not beat around the bush. They started that financial year with 300 people fewer, so they increased the size of the health department by 300 whilst trying to reduce it by 958. They got it monumentally wrong.

When I asked the health minister about this, he said there were, as he refers to it, 'statistical anomalies'. I said, 'What are you talking about?' He said, 'Well, there were some statistical anomalies in that area.' I said, 'What sort of statistical anomalies? Minister, did you find people in your department that you didn't know were there?' That is exactly what happened. The health department at the end of the 2012-13 year, just over a year ago in June 2013, had no idea how many employees they had in their department. This just goes to the complete ineptitude of a government that has been in place after 12 years.

I am not going to talk for too long today but I think it is important that I do canvass a couple of other points and, in particular, I would like to spend a couple of minutes talking about the Motor Accident Commission, because credibility is extraordinarily important in politics and the government went to extraordinary lengths before the election to say that there would be no significant privatisation of state government assets if Labor were returned. Imagine my astonishment when we heard in the budget that the Motor Accident Commission is essentially going to be privatised. The Treasurer himself used the word 'privatised'. He confirmed this was essentially privatisation. It is a broken promise. This is typical of this government. After 12 years they have become arrogant and they think they can get away with saying one thing before an election and a completely different thing after the election.

The Treasurer wanted to try and nuance the entire debate and he said, 'What I really meant was we wouldn't privatise any essential services.' That is not what they said. Before the election they said, 'We won't privatise any significant assets.' They put a caveat on it and we were happy with that. If a building is sold it is fair enough because buildings and assets are bought and sold: that is what happens. But no significant asset would be privatised by this government.

I cannot think of a more significant asset on the state government's balance sheet than the Motor Accident Commission. You are hard pressed to find much of value on that balance sheet, to be quite honest, and the fact that they have chosen to privatise MAC, and announced this within months of being returned, is absolutely shameful. What worries me the most about this is whether or

not taxpayers in South Australia are getting a good deal and the changing narrative which has ensued.

First, we are told that as of 30 June 2016 the government will no longer be writing any CTP insurance, so they will basically close the doors to new business as of 1 July 2016. Well, okay, what is going to be left for South Australia out of this? If you look at the forward estimates, they have provided for \$500 million coming into the state government's coffers. The way they have come up with this number is that they say that there is a provision for payouts to people, which is on the balance sheet and, in fact, at the moment, it is 29 per cent over-provided for. That money, once it is wound up, will essentially be about \$500 million worth of assets over the ongoing continuing liabilities, and that money will be returned to Treasury.

We thought, 'That \$500 million doesn't really seem to be enough compared to this 29 per cent over-provision. What does this 29 per cent over-provision actually represent?' It turns out that the over-provision is well in excess of \$1.2 billion. People on this side of the house are saying, 'If you have an entity and it is over-provided for, the government, from our point of view, has two alternatives: one is to reduce down CTP charges to motorists in South Australia, which is not a bad option at all for a state that is really struggling with the cost of living; or the other one is to return some money to the government, which has essentially underwritten the Motor Accident Commission for an extended period of time.'

The government said, 'No, we're not going to do either of those things, we're just going to close it down.' This is one of the few things in this government which actually works and they want to close it down! We said, 'Did you give any consideration perhaps to having it as a continuing operation, like they have with the TAC in Victoria?' 'Oh, no, we don't want to do that, it increases our liability.' Well, the TAC has operated very successfully for an extended period of time and has returned, with very competitive rates to motorists, significant sums to the government. No, they do not want to do that. 'Well, have you considered selling it?'

Do not forget that, when the budget was brought down, there was no mention of selling it. I presume that the Premier was so worried about this massive backflip, saying that he would never privatise it, so it was going to be closed. But then the Treasurer let the cat out of the bag. He said, 'Yes, we may consider it.' I said, 'Why? We've never heard you say that before.' 'Well, I might have said it in the lockup.' It had never been reported by anybody before. So, the government is now considering selling the MAC.

What we on this side of the house would like to see is: what are the implications of moving to a commercial arrangement, open-market for CTP insurance premiums for motorists here in South Australia? I am not satisfied that they are not going to jump through the roof. In fact, when I look at other states that have gone down this track, most notably New South Wales, they have the most unaffordable, I think the term is, highest-cost CTP insurance in the nation.

It is not true to say that opening this up to the market will drive down costs. It will not, and I will tell you the reason why: the government provides a government guarantee to this scheme which is significantly lower cost than the prudential financial regulations which would be wrapped around it if it was a private-sector organisation. For that reason, when we look at states which have moved down this track, CTP charges have gone through the roof. I am not convinced that this is good for motorists but, on the other hand, I am not convinced that this is good for the taxpayers of South Australia. If it is making a return, why don't we keep it operating, or why don't we look at selling it as a going concern? Why would we want to close the doors?

I asked the Treasurer this question during estimates: does this decision of government require legislation? He said that he was not sure. Well, let me tell you: if it requires one skerrick of legislation, the opposition will require a complete, fully-costed cost-benefit analysis on the various options for this very significant asset. This government has made a mess, quite frankly, of selling assets in the past. Look at what they have done with the forests, look at what they have done with SA Lotteries—and it just goes on and on. The incompetence of this government is legendary; it is a case study for students at university now. We do not want to be any part of the continuing financial ineptitude that this government is delivering here in South Australia.

I will conclude my remarks now, because we would like to progress to other matters today. Suffice it to say that South Australia is not in a good shape, it is not in a good place. Our budget is in crisis, and various government departments here in South Australia are simultaneously in crisis. The environment department is in crisis, and there is a crisis of confidence in the other place in the minister's handling of events. Families SA is in crisis; the last two weeks have been, as the Premier himself described it, 'catastrophic'. The people of South Australia have completely lost confidence in the minister and in this government in terms of handling child protection.

Our prisons are overfull, and the union itself is raising grave concerns about the government's handling of matters in that area. We are now hearing reports that the Royal Adelaide Hospital is heading towards being more than a year over time. That will end up costing us plenty; the government may say 'Well, we have a fixed price,' but, let me tell the house, if we fail to move out of the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital site as promised this will cost us money. Not only that, it will be another broken promise in terms of education in the CBD.

Estimates is a process which, as I said, is like a game, a game of hide and seek. We have been out there seeking as much information as we can get. Hopefully, down the track we would like to work as a parliament to reform this process and have a more reliable methodology for providing scrutiny of the government of the day. With those final sentences I conclude my remarks.

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (11:47): I have a sense of déjà vu whenever I get up to give this address, at the point where we have been through the estimates process yet again. Having spent my entire parliamentary career, except for the first couple of hours, on the benches on this side, I think what is possibly not understood by those who sit on the benches on the other side—including yourself, Madam Deputy Speaker, although you have been here long enough to have been in opposition; there are a number of people on the government benches who have never experienced it—is the frustration of estimates, as seen from the opposition side.

It is not just frustration as a member of the opposition, it is frustration with the whole process. Every year I have raised my same concerns about the process, every year I have made it clear that I do not in any way challenge the government's right to set its budget, but the role of the opposition is to question and to challenge. In fact, that enhances our likelihood of having good government in this state. So the government can bring down its budget and, in theory, the estimates process—which is the committee stage of the budget bill, in essence—is our chance to go into the detail of it.

We are all familiar with the process on most bills, where we give a second reading and we then go into the committee stage where each member has the right to ask up to three questions on each clause to try to get clarification and perhaps suggest some changes that might make things better. That is really the process we are going through with estimates, except that in estimates it is such a big document—I still remember getting my first budget papers and thinking 'Where do I begin?'—that it is entirely appropriate to divide it into the various ministries and then look into detail on a minister by minister basis.

I suggest that it would be smarter simply to have the minister and maybe the chief executive, and if there is something to which they do not know the answer, they could simply say what they say anyway; and that is, 'I will have to take that on notice and bring back an answer.' That would be far more efficient in terms of the money and time that is spent in the process that we currently have.

I know from work that I did prior to coming into this place that not only is all that time spent during the two weeks that we have the estimates going, but in the weeks leading up to estimates from, indeed, before the budget comes down, some senior executives have to focus their entire attention on preparing for estimates.

Mr Speirs interjecting:

Ms REDMOND: Someone who might know, the member for Bright, is acknowledging the correctness of this. I know from previous experiences that I have had with various boards, committees, departments and so on, that an inordinate amount of time is spent by all those people preparing for estimates, lest we ask a question to which the answer cannot be given.

I suggest that, given the parlous financial state of the economy in this state, it would be far more productive to simply have the minister and the chief executive, maybe on a less formal basis,

rather than taking up time in here and all the recording and so on that goes on with *Hansard*, to simply have an informal briefing and a promise to get answers. It can work, I am sure. I have had informal briefings with ministers over the years where they have promised to give me answers to things and we have, indeed, received answers to things.

We have the documents in front of us, we are entitled to ask questions and to expect answers to the questions that we ask about the budget—given, as I said, that I acknowledge the government's right to set its budget. My suggestion, for what it is worth, is that we would be far better off as a state if we abolished the current process and looked at what this process is meant to achieve and how best to achieve it.

The same applies, Madam Deputy Speaker, to omnibus questions: you must have heard those omnibus questions in the course of estimates dozens of times. Since they are the same for every minister why do they have to be read at every separate ministerial hearing? Why not simply say, 'Here are the omnibus questions.' That would save time. I just do not understand how we have come to this point.

One of the other bugbears that I have about the whole estimates process is that it does not matter whether a minister is actually a minister appointed from the House of Assembly or from the Legislative Council, the minister can come into the chamber to answer questions as the minister. However, if we have a shadow minister who is appointed in the Legislative Council, that shadow minister cannot come in here to ask questions.

Historically, there is no reason why that should be the case. In the federal parliament, it is the Senate that does the estimates. Senate estimates go on for weeks and weeks and can be very expensive and time consuming, as well, but there is absolutely no reason, from any historical or practical perspective, why we should not allow the shadow minister responsible for a portfolio to be the person charged with and allowed to ask questions about the budget itself. I think of all those things whenever I come to the estimates process.

I heard the story that the leader told about the Treasurer, that the Treasurer, in answer to a question, said, 'That's not my area.' So the leader then asked the relevant minister for the Public Service the question—because that is who he was told was responsible—and that minister said, 'That's not my area, it's actually the Treasurer,' by which time, of course, the opportunity to ask the Treasurer the question had gone because that particular line of the budget had been closed. It just makes a nonsense of the process. We are so tied up in the processes involved here that we have forgotten what the point of it is, and if we are not able to achieve the point of it, why are we continuing to go through this process year upon year?

I have a number of comments that I fear I will not have time to make about the state of our economy, but I do want to talk briefly about the last issue raised by the leader in his speech, that is, the closure of the Motor Accident Commission. That is something of concern to me. I have had a lot of dealings with the commission over a number of years in a number of different capacities. I was a member of the Road Safety Advisory Council for many years before coming into this place, and I had contact with it through that. I practised as a lawyer and, although I was a general practitioner in the law, if I specialised in anything it was actually major injuries, and many of those, of course, arose out of motor accidents, so I have, I think, probably a reasonably strong comprehension of the role of the Motor Accident Commission in this state.

Indeed, very early on when I became a member of the Road Safety Advisory Council, I remember its then chairman (a chap by the name of Vin Keane, who would be well known; I think he was chair of SGIC at the time as well) talking about the need for some change to our SGIC system, as it was then called, because the situation in Victoria was that they were about to go bankrupt because of the payouts. There was a need to adjust our system and put some limits on the amounts that could be paid to victims of road accidents.

Those changes were introduced, and my recollection is that that would have been in the early 1980s; I think I was put onto the Road Safety Advisory Council at that stage. We looked at changing our system here to save us from the fate that was awaiting the Victorian system. Indeed, the Victorians changed as well and, as the leader mentioned, their system is now going strong—and so is our system. It is going very well. It was going so well that last year the government decided to

back up its own coffers by taking \$100 million from the Motor Accident Commission's funds and sticking it into the budget to try to prop up the budget which was failing so badly. But then, last year, the other thing we did—and I expressed concern about it at the time—was the government changed the entitlements of people injured in road accidents.

There was no basis for saying it this time. We changed those proceedings previously and put some limits on what could be applied in calculating the entitlements of people who were injured in motor accidents in this state, and we put those limits on to save the system. Here, the system was actually working well and had so much in surplus funds that the government took \$100 million out, yet the government said, 'No, no, we need to make special provision. We've got to make provision for the catastrophically injured.' I have no problem with that. I absolutely agree that we need to make provision for the catastrophically injured, but the catastrophically injured are a very small percentage of the people who bring claims.

The evidence is not in yet. I talk to lawyers quite regularly and, of course, having practised in the area, I know that most of the flow-on from the changes that were made to the legislation last year will not come into being until two or three or more years from now because mostly, if people have a relatively serious injury that impedes them—they have to be injured enough to be significantly impaired for a week or two to be able to make a claim—that injury is going to take a while to heal, and often the medical report will say that the broken leg or whatever it is has now healed but that we need to wait for a year or so to see whether the healing is complete and what the outcome is ultimately.

It is going to be three or four years at least until the flowthrough effects of the changes that were made last year, but the fear is that whilst, as I said, I am happy about making absolutely appropriate provision for people who were catastrophically injured, there is a vast bulk of people who would in no sense classify as catastrophically injured but who, nevertheless, have a very significant injury.

I am thinking, for instance, of a young man I represented who lost his leg in a motorcycle accident (five amputations, starting at the ankle, that failed to succeed) and who ended up with just a stump of a leg. In his view and in his family's view, that is a catastrophic injury—but not under the definition of what we now have in place. So, someone with a very significant injury who loses the ability to live their life as they previously had is going to be, in my view, catastrophically affected by the changes that were put through in this legislation.

My belief now, given the government's intention, is that the effect of those changes was contemplated by the government when those changes were put through because, now that they are going to close it down, the lower the amount they are going to have to pay out in the future the larger the benefit left for the government—and that is what this is all about. It is not about the system not being viable. It is not about needing to make provisions lower so that we can afford to keep the system going.

This is all about the government having mismanaged the economy of this state and being in the most dreadful state—\$14.3 billion of debt that will cost the people of this state \$2.6 million each and every day. That is what this Motor Accident Commission change is really all about: it is about lowering what the people's entitlements are so that the amount that has to be paid out when they close it down for what is called the 'long tail' of the payments is minimised, and that will therefore maximise the amount the government can take.

This is money paid by the people of this state to set up this system; it is the biggest part of what you pay when you register your car every year. It is money out of the hands of the people of this state, and this government is stealing it to prop up their inadequate financial management which they have done over the past 12 years and which they will continue to do.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (12:07): I want to take some time to make comments about the estimates committees process we have just been through. I want to support the comments the member for Heysen made in terms of the process and so forth. It was the 13th estimates committees I have been part of, and it continued what is an underwhelming experience, given the government's performance.

The member for Heysen highlighted the fact that we see not only the minister sitting with their chief executives of the departments at the front table but also a bank of senior departmental advisers three or four deep behind the minister, and the gallery—the Speaker's gallery and the President's gallery in the other place—is full of ministerial staff and advisers as well.

The point is that questions the opposition put to the government, put to the respective ministers, are unable to be answered. With all those resources here in the parliament—as I said a bank of advisers three or four deep and the gallery full of other departmental and ministerial people—the inability of ministers to answer questions is quite astounding.

We know that months are spent within the respective departments preparing for estimates, and you see the senior advisers with enormously thick folders with briefing papers and briefing notes in them, all tagged on different aspects of the different budget lines, but we still see year after year—and I have just been through my 13th year of this process—that the ministers continually are unable or unwilling to answer questions put to them by the opposition.

I sat in on and attended three specific committees, those dealing with local government, consumer and business services and veterans' affairs, all of which I continue to have a keen interest in. In giving an appraisal of each one of those committees, I will start off with local government. Clearly, the Minister for Local Government is not across the detail of that portfolio and relied heavily on advice from his chief executive on pretty much every question that was asked of him. That was not really anything out of the ordinary, because I have sat in on and led questions in the local government estimates committee, having been the shadow minister for that area in previous years, and a succession of local government ministers have been unable to answer questions and have relied extremely heavily on answers provided to them from the chief executive.

That says only one thing: that the minister is not across the detail of that portfolio. It is pretty obvious that the shadow ministers—the opposition—are well and truly across the detail of their areas of responsibility compared to the ministers. Ministers have enormous resources. They have their ministerial staff, their advisers, and their departments, and supposedly they should be working at least 80 hours a week on their respective responsibilities. You would think they would be full of knowledge and information and hardly have the need to seek advice, but unfortunately we see that the capacity of the ministers—of the government—is extremely lacking in their areas of responsibility.

I think anybody who came in and viewed the performance in an objective manner from the gallery would have had an experience that would show that the shadow ministers are far better across those portfolio areas than the ministers are, and we certainly know the very scant resources we have available to us. When I was shadow minister, there was some basic support from the leader's office, but it operates on a skeleton staff, and it was my two electorate staff who helped me and supported me in my role as shadow minister. Not only did they have to deal with all the electorate work, but they also had to deal with the shadow ministry work. That is a stark contrast in terms of the resources that the opposition has compared to the government.

What do we see? We see questions being taken on notice, them really evading questions and not getting to the core issues of the questions. The leader and the member for Heysen highlighted what happened when the leader asked the Treasurer about Public Service numbers. The Treasurer referred it to the other minister, and then the other minister referred it back to the Treasurer. That situation is just farcical, but that is not really unexpected. As I said, for some members on this side of the house—the member for Heysen, the member for MacKillop (who has been here even longer), the member for Morphett and the deputy leader—it has been our 13th estimates committees and we expected it to be quite an underwhelming experience.

The next committee that I attended was the one on consumer and business services. That is an interesting area and again, I was the shadow minister for that for a period of time. I think that is an interesting area, because it covers a lot of different aspects of activity within government. The minister talked in her opening statement about issues concerning liquor licensing laws and regulations and about how, supposedly with the introduction of lockouts and things of that nature, the incidence of unacceptable and lawless behaviour has decreased.

One question that always comes to my mind is: okay, statistics provide certain information, but I would like to know if there has been an increase in police resources, particularly in the nightclub

area along the Hindley Street strip. It was probably two or three years ago that the then leader (the member for Heysen) myself, the shadow attorney-general and the shadow minister for police visited Hindley Street at about 2 o'clock in the morning, from memory. We walked up and down, and spoke to the police, some venue operators and the like. It was quite an interesting exercise, but what struck me were the few police that I could see who were actually out on the beat—I counted four, to be precise, in the period.

There might have been some more in the station or they might have been out on some other callouts (I do not know), but there were four officers on the nightclub strip of Hindley Street when we were there. We have had lockouts and other measures put in place to supposedly curb antisocial binge drinking and all the activity that goes with that, but I would like to know if there has been an increase in police resources, because part of me thinks there has been. We all know it is human nature that when you see a police officer—even if you are driving along the road, if you see a police car it is an automatic reaction that you check how fast you are driving.

Ms Redmond: Speak for yourself!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Well, I do, because I am conscious of not wanting to incur a fine and demerit points, even though I have a completely clean slate. I have incurred only a handful—

Ms Redmond: A handful?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Not even. You can count on one hand the number of traffic infringements I have received over—

Ms Redmond: How many years?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —41 years of driving. How is that?

Ms Redmond: Forty-one years of licensed driving.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Of licensed driving, yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: So we can work out how old you are now.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That is pretty easy; just look at a website. It is not very hard to work out how old I am. I was a fairly young-looking bloke when I came into this place, but 12-and-a-bit years have made my hair go grey and taken their toll. Anyway, be that as it may, that is digressing. I think it is an interesting point whether there has been an increase in police presence and police resources put in around the nightclub scene.

Another interesting aspect is that a couple of years ago something came to my attention where there was a significant deficiency in the way the Office of Consumer and Business Services was managing its workload. A particular case came to my attention of a young apprentice plumber. That person had completed their training and lodged an application for a trade licence to become a qualified plumber. That application took more than three months to process because of the inefficiencies within that office. We highlighted that case and it received coverage within *The Advertiser* newspaper and for quite some time on radio programs, where it came to the fore.

I was pleased that I was the shadow minister to highlight this case, because it actually brought some action from the government. A ministerial staff member of the then minister (now the Deputy Premier) was seconded into that Office of Consumer and Business Services to really pinpoint where the problems were and to remedy them. I am not sure whether it is operating completely satisfactorily, but I think there has been an improvement brought about by the opposition shining some light on that issue. There were also some issues in relation to the Residential Tenancies Tribunal and the inefficiencies that they were operating under, the returning of bonds and all sorts of problems within that office. The then minister did address it and I understand there has been some improvement, which is pleasing.

The next committee that I attended was that of veterans' affairs, and this is I think another really interesting area. It is an area of responsibility that I really did enjoy as a shadow minister. It is clearly an important area and really coming into sharp focus in relation to the centenary of World War I. The welfare of our veterans is a very important area of responsibility for both the state and federal

government, because even though some of us do not have family members who are veterans, we all know a veteran.

My family actually bought our farm in the Hills from a World War I veteran, Mr Chapman, whom I still remember from when I was a boy. Even though none of my close relatives served in the forces—their ages did not match up with the conflicts at the time so they were not conscripted or of an age to be accepted into the forces—as I said, everybody knows a veteran. We are all clearly aware of the contribution they have made to our society and I think that even though the Office of Veterans' Affairs is not enormous, it still plays a very important role.

The shadow minister asked the minister concerning the future of the Repatriation Hospital, and we know how crucially important that is to the veterans' community. The minister sort of sidestepped around the question and again handballed it to the Minister for Health. But I clearly remember this incident: before the Minister for Veterans' Affairs changed his colours and went over to the government cabinet benches, he was out I think, from memory, on Goodwood Road protesting with the then people campaigning for the future of the Repatriation Hospital. He was out in the public when he was still on this side of the house, still a member with us, before he went over to the cabinet benches, so it is pretty clear where the minister sits in relation to that. Even though he made some positive general comments about it, it is a pretty poor situation and I am happy to say that.

I did not attend the agriculture estimates committee, but there were questions raised in relation to the future of the Lenswood Research Centre. The minister was asked questions in relation to that, and from memory, again, he said, 'There has been no sale figure factored into the budget', but then he went on and said that things in 10 or 20 years will be different. Well, we all know that.

However, I noted in an article in the local newspaper in the Hills, *The Courier*, that there has been a group of people looking to progress a proposition in relation to the future of Lenswood Research Centre. They are quoted in the paper as saying that the minister told them—and this is something I am going to do a lot more work on obviously—that the place will be sold, and that may well be as soon as in the next year. We need some pretty significant clarification on where we are going with that, because the indication in the estimates committee is quite different from my way of thinking and my view and from what was stated in the local paper last week.

In my final couple of minutes I want to talk about the transport infrastructure part of the budget, and specifically the second freeway interchange that is to be built at Mount Barker. I want to clearly state that, if it had not been for the support of the state Liberal opposition in formulating a policy to part fund that infrastructure work, the vast balance of that infrastructure funding also committed by the federal Liberal government and some money committed by local council, that project would not be proceeding.

I wrote to the then minister for transport and infrastructure, Anthony Albanese—I cannot remember his specific title—when the Labor Party was in federal government and I got a nice letter saying, 'We think it's a good project but we're not going to fund it.' To his credit the member for Mayo, before he became the federal minister for infrastructure, got the federal Coalition to commit funds to that project and I have been pleased—and I want to acknowledge the support I received from the leader in relation to this—that, over two successive elections, the state Liberals committed funding. We were supportive and committed to the project in the 2006 election. We had not committed funding at that time but we were supportive of the project to be progressed.

In 2010 and 2014 this side of the house committed some funding and it was really at the very end of the process that we saw the government come to the party and belatedly commit some funding. We had the then minister for transport try to come up at the start of the election campaign and muddy the water saying that he got some more money out of the federal government in relation to this. A couple of weeks ago, there was an interesting InDaily article where the journalist said that the then minister for transport had egg on his face because that money had not come to fruition and had actually been redirected to some of the transport infrastructure projects in metropolitan Adelaide.

Time expired.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (12:27): This is the first time I have come into the chamber to reflect on the estimates process. I think that doing these speeches drags this process out by another couple of weeks and adds to the pain—but never mind. The person who probably suffered more pain than

me during the estimates process was you, Deputy Speaker, because you had to sit through more of it than I did!

I have been able to think both long and hard, both during the process and since it occurred, about the purpose and point of estimates. I had the privilege of spending many hours of my life in multiple portfolio hearings including with the Premier, the Minister for Small Business, the Minister for Defence Industries, the Minister for Innovation and Manufacturing, the Minister for the Public Sector, amongst others; but the portfolio I had the most misfortune of being part of was, no doubt, the environment portfolio.

The environment department and in fact the whole environmental agenda in South Australia, I believe, has really lost its way with this government. With the drought gone and forgotten and climate change relegated from being the greatest moral challenge of our time, and with Greens' preferences seemingly guaranteed no matter the environmental credentials of the worthy Liberal candidates (not that I am bitter about that), the green agenda has taken a back seat for our state's policymakers.

We found out during the estimates hearing for the department that the government is refusing to rule out further cutting the number of park rangers this financial year. We now have 88 park rangers in the state down from 300 in 2002. Of those 88, I am told firsthand that they spend many hours each week writing ministerial briefings and completing onerous reporting requirements keeping them away from front-line duties.

Today in South Australia we have 343 parks spanning over 21 million hectares and making up 21.5 per cent of our state's land mass. These areas require adequate care, protection and management, yet the people who provide that practical care, the people who can build relationships with communities and the people who can build knowledge and understanding of the way the land works, are subject to continual cutbacks. Similarly, the cuts to the Natural Resource Management Community Grants program flies in the face of good governance. These grants are used to empower community groups and landowners to take responsibility for their local environment by tackling invasive weeds, feral animals and undertaking revegetation programs.

Seed funding programs such as the NRM grants are best practice in governance because they transfer responsibility from a big, out-of-touch government to people at a community level. They empower people, build community capability and stretch the dollar much further than government might be able to do. They are also much more likely to attract additional in-kind support and build goodwill between government and communities, yet these are slashed and burned in the recent cuts.

I have said before in this place that I am an environmentalist, but in a very practical way—not in an esoteric latte-sipping way, but in a real life, tree planting, weed removing, public transport catching way. This brand of environmentalism is focused on community action, encouraging people to undertake practical works at the local level and actually getting things happening.

Consequently, the loss of the NRM grants, the loss of front-line rangers, the loss of goodwill between the environment department and communities, serves to break down the effectiveness of the department and undermine its ongoing existence, an existence which has already been called into question by the Treasurer, who canvassed its abolition as a way to plug the massive holes in the government's budget.

Today the environment department lies broken and humbled like a wheezing mega fauna crawling through the dust to extinction. Once energetic and influential, able to drive across government and community-centric agendas, it now struggles for relevance, pondering its *raison d'être* and giving up the ghost, one front-line service at a time.

The estimates process for the environment portfolio was revealing for me in a whole range of ways. Not only did it draw out the crisis of existence facing the environment department, it also demonstrated all that is wrong with the estimates process. Ministers were sitting there being questioned on budget papers that were so different in format and structure from last year's that they were barely recognisable. This is part of a game, it seems: how much can we hide through structuring the budget documents differently?

My first recommendation to make this process better, more accessible, would be to legislate the format of budget papers, set them in stone, so that only departmental restructures could change their format, and even at that, the budget papers should clearly show which areas have been combined and altered between one year and the next.

In the environment portfolio it was clear from the beginning that the minister did not want to answer our questions. Some ministers were open during this process and had a frank dialogue with their questioners, but in the environment portfolio avoidance and arrogance was the strategy of the day. On one occasion the minister refused to answer a question because it was close to impossible for us to identify where the item lay within the budget papers. There was much back and forward with the minister silently guffawing at us for not being able to translate the interminable gibberish of his budget papers to point to the exact position of the item we were questioning. The arrogance dripped from the minister with syrupy viscous, and each of his words were used to mock and chuckle at us.

Except my next question asked the minister to identify where the item was, and it took him and three of his executive advisers three minutes to find it themselves—and these were the people who actually came up with the budget. What a joke. Each question asked of him was avoided, rebutted, ignored or arrogantly answered with a Dorothy Dixier. I looked at the minister's advisers, some of whom I know well, and they looked uncomfortable, awkward, embarrassed. It got worse.

Next up was the EPA hearing, which was only afforded half an hour, despite the fact that the Clovelly Park and Mitchell Park contamination was the most pressing issue of the month. The minister's now infamous toilet break chewed up most of the time, followed by a lengthy and unnecessary introductory statement. I would ban these introductory statements. They are just self-important and completely unnecessary.

Another problem with estimates is the huge amount of time eaten up behind the scenes, and the members for Heysen and Kavel have already alluded to that this morning. When I worked in the Public Service I was often part of the 'cottage industry' that is the estimates process. Departments spend literally thousands of hours predicting what questions could be asked, writing briefings on these questions, and getting those briefings back to put commas and semicolons in places where you did not put commas and semicolons in the first place.

In fact, I was speaking to a contact in one department a couple of weeks ago, and was told that for two months her team had been completely engrossed in the estimates process and distracted from normal business by the estimates preparation process. And this comes around every year, year in and year out—a couple of months wasted on the estimates process. It is a bit like constructing the Clipsal stadium in the Parklands: no sooner is it disassembled at the end of one race than it is being built again for the next race.

It is one thing to stand here pontificating about the failings of the estimates process, but I would be doing the parliament and the community a disservice if I did not put on record some suggestions for change. Of course, I must put in a disclaimer here that these are my own views expressed as the member for Bright alone and not necessarily the views of the Liberal Party. To date, I have made no effort to persuade my colleagues of the merit of these ideas, though down the track I will try to do so.

I would significantly reform the way estimates is done, mostly because of the amount of time they waste and the lack of accountability that they actually draw out. Estimates are a waste of time. They are a waste of time for the members of the committees, a waste of time for ministerial and senior public servants being briefed and, of course, a waste of time for ministerial advisers and, let's face it, ministerial advisers need all the time they can get to come up with rubbish to tweet on their fake Twitter accounts. More importantly, they are a waste of time for the hundreds of public servants who spend those two months leading up to the estimates in a constant kerfuffle ensuring that those semicolons and commas and hyphens are correctly placed in the many, many briefings that we have to put together.

So, my vision for a modernised estimates process: I would continue to have a hearing for each ministerial portfolio and could use the annual budget as the catalyst for this occurring, but it would not be fixated on budget lines as the current process is. As I have described from minister Hunter's shambolic avoidance strategy, this is just embarrassing, and not just for the questioner; it is

also embarrassing for the avoider, and it is not overly necessary. Why does a questioner need to refer to a specific point in a budget paper? Because it is convention. Well, these old conventions need to be reviewed from time to time.

Since I was elected to this place I have seen so many things that need a question mark hooked around their roots and tugged on until these dusty old vestiges are pulled down and rebuilt. Estimates are one of them. I would only allow ministers and their chief executive onto the floor, no other advisers. They can go and tweet stuff. I would allow as many non-government MPs into the process as possible, both from the lower and upper house, and if anyone has a question they can ask it through the chair—none of this subbing in and subbing out.

I would not bother with government MPs. It is just unnecessary and a waste of their time. The good folks of Morphett Vale would be far better served if the member for Reynell was down in the electorate for estimates week rather than sitting here wasting her time on the government benches. Likewise, the members for Ashford, Elder, Torrens, Napier and Giles—a complete waste of their valuable time. Goodness, Deputy Speaker, the member for Elder could have been down in Clovelly Park digging out the contamination, but, sadly, she was stuck here.

I would have 1.5 hours of questioning for every portfolio. That is plenty of time for the bigger portfolios and it increases time for the smaller ones as well. And here is my biggest reform: I would welcome outsiders into the process. Now that really would be co-designing a new engagement paradigm.

I have heard lots of people say that estimates should be abolished, but I do not think that is the case. I think we could actually really increase their value by bringing outsiders in, by bringing representatives from peak bodies, from community groups, from business leaders, community leaders and not-for-profits. I think there could be a great deal of value in bringing these groups into the estimates process and asking them to sit alongside shadow ministers.

I think sometimes in this house, as a collective on both sides, we do get distracted with a bit of self importance, but we are not experts in everything, and bringing people from the outside into the estimates process would be a valuable reform, I believe. I have heard lots of people from my side of politics really cry out for significant reform in the estimates process, but I do believe that reform is needed; but in the interests of accountability we do need to keep estimates.

The good thing about estimates is that they get ministers to front up and go through an extended period of questioning, sort of like question time on valium. We need to have as many instruments of ministerial accountability at every turn, because we know the government's adverse reaction to freedom of information requests. Openness is not this government's forte. There needs to be mechanisms like estimates so we can get access to ministers without being forced to write to the bureaucracy, because, as I recently discovered, there seems to be a haphazard policy in place that prevents public servants from providing any advice to an MP or an MP's office without writing to the minister's office first.

Here are a couple of anecdotes for the house. A couple of weeks ago I was at Hallett Cove shopping centre, holding one of my regular listening posts, and a young mother came up for a chat. She asked if I knew whether the government had set down its kindergarten operating hours for the next year, 2015. I said that I did not know but that on Monday I would contact the education department and find out. So on Monday that is what my office did. A simple question for the education department. As soon as they heard it was from an MP's office they closed down: 'No, we can't tell you the kindergarten operating hours. We can't give MPs any information—you have to write to the minister.' Yes, write to the minister! As if the education department is not bureaucratic enough, they want me to punt another piece of rubbish into the system.

What if a member of the public called to ask the same question? What if one of my staff members rang the agency and asked the question, but instead of being from the Bright electorate office, imagine they were a young mum! Imagine they were called 'Lisa', and for good measure imagine if they were called 'Lisa Rankine'. So that is what we did: 'Lisa Rankine' picked up the phone and called the crazy bureaucracy that is DECD. You could almost see the DECD operative look at their checklist: No. 1—is it a bomb threat? No! Okay, do not transfer it to SAPOL. No. 2—is it a school principal? Okay, do not hang up! No. 3—is it the member for Unley? Okay, it is not, do not hang up.

No. 4—is it another MP? It is not—okay, do not hang up. No. 5, is it Lisa Rankine, young mum from Brighton—okay, continue the call. So, quick as a flash, Lisa (who really was one of my staffers) was provided with information about kindly hours for 2015. That is really frustrating in the extreme. Could it be an isolated incident? I think not!

A couple of weeks back I received an email from a Hallett Cove resident concerned about the safety of an intersection. The fluorescent paint that covers the edges of a traffic island was worn away and needed to be repainted. Could I do anything about it, my constituents asked. Sure, I said, 'It's pretty easy, I'll call the transport department, I'll report it, something will get done.' Or not! I made a mistake: when I emailed the Traffic Management Centre at Norwood I revealed my identity. Heaven forbid, it was an MP's office emailing, so I was ignored.

Remember, this was a pressing safety issue, so the following week, having had no response to my email, one of my staff called again, and again we made the mistake of saying that we were from the office of David Speirs. It was like an earthquake warning had been sounded in the office: everyone got under their desks and hid. 'Is it over—has the MP gone away?' Actually, this phone call was quite open: the public servant we spoke to said there was a policy in place that no DPTI staff member is allowed to interact with MPs or their offices, and we have to write to the minister.

If there is one thing I have learnt in my four months in this place it is that DPTI is a black hole when it comes to ministerial correspondence. Remember, this was a safety issue. This traffic island had visibility issues, and we were told to write to the minister. Good luck to my constituent who impales their car on the traffic island while this correspondence works through the layers of bureaucracy in DPTI.

But, I am a tenacious sort. I want to achieve for my electorate, so we decided to call back, and third time lucky! We had learnt our lesson. We are learning that, if we identify that we are from an MP's office, we will not get any luck, so we had to call back as a member of the public. How about Lisa again, but not Lisa Rankine? She has already done her duty for the state. How about Lisa Mullighan? No, my staff member said, Mullighan is too rare a surname. 'Milligan', I suggest—M-I-L-L-I-G-A-N—so 'Lisa Milligan' picked up the phone, called the department and, hey presto, this morning, within 40 minutes, they are sending out a maintenance team to take a look at the dangerous intersection.

Spare me the pain. This is what we are dealing with. A government so averse to interacting with the democracy that they will not have anything to do with MPs but if you are 'Lisa Rankine' or 'Lisa Mullighan', well that is a good thing. So I look forward to 'Lisa Bignell' coming to the fore in the coming months, and 'Lisa Close' and 'Lisa Weatherill' and 'Lisa Rau' and even 'Lisa Koutsantonis'. They all live in the electorate of Bright and they can be looked up on the electoral roll.

I will leave it at that. I believe that the estimates process should be reformed. There are significant changes that need to be made but it should not be abolished. Because the government is so averse to interacting with members opposite and doing the right thing by democracy in our state, we need as many accountability mechanisms in place as possible and, though estimates does have its failings, there is still a bit of accountability present within the system.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:45): When bills are dealt with by the house which see a large number of opposition speakers making contributions, we tend to randomise the order with the exception that the deputy whip goes second last and the whip goes last because we tend to be in the chamber quite a lot and, therefore, if a member might be running late for some reason then that means we can step in. I fear after following the deputy whip now on about five or six occasions, we are going to have to change this process because there is nothing worse when giving a speech than doing so right after the person who has given the best speech of the session, which the deputy whip is making a habit of doing.

Member for Bright, I share your pain, and I think that all members who have served in opposition under this government would feel the same, and possibly even some MPs who are out of favour on the government benches might from time to time feel the same. If the Deputy Speaker were still in the chair she would be able to advise us on whether or not she has had that problem herself in the past when she was not in such high favour as she is in her illustrious new position.

I enjoy the estimates process more than some. As the member for Goyder occasionally tells us, he is a sponge for knowledge, and I feel the same way in some sense and it is a good opportunity to learn about some of the portfolio areas. However, I certainly concur with the frustrations that have been presented and some ministers do a better job than others at even attempting to present accountability to the public. I was the shadow minister responsible for a number of areas. I was able to assist firstly in relation to the Electoral Commission budget line, and I thank the Deputy Premier for not taking Dorothy Dix questions and for making the staff and the Electoral Commissioner available to answer questions.

However, I am concerned that 10 minutes of his answer time was taken up with a long Dorothy Dix-style response that bore no relation to one of the questions asked but, for the most part, I think he allowed information to be gathered. I thank the Minister for Police and Correctional Services, who I had extensive discussions with, for taking only two Dorothy Dix questions, I think, throughout those two portfolios, and for the most part information was made available. However, I do have strong concerns about one aspect of the questioning which I will get to shortly.

The minister responsible for higher education and science took Dorothy Dixers, and I had an hour of sitting through that with the shadow minister responsible, the member for Adelaide. I note that the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion was surrounded, and I counted 22 advisers on the ground floor at one stage, but rumours said that a number of those in the gallery, which was at the time quite full, were public servants here to help her with the estimates as well. Given that for the 45-minute session of communities and social inclusion I think six government Dixers were taken, and possibly less than half the time allocated to opposition questioning, this was possibly overkill and somewhat unnecessary.

At any rate I want to focus my limited time today on the portfolio responsibilities for which I have carriage for the opposition. Beginning with police, I think the first thing that I want to say in relation to this matter is that the first hour of the two hours allocated for estimates was spent discussing issues related to the Coroner's finding into the case of Zara Abrahamzadeh.

I thank the minister and the deputy commissioner, who was acting as commissioner due to the illness of the commissioner on that day, for the information provided to those questions. It is clearly a case where the police have admitted they got a number of things wrong and in which improvements to processes have been identified by the police themselves. The police deputy commissioner has advised the public previously, and in more detail in the estimates process, of the 47 recommendations that are being undertaken, led by himself as the deputy commissioner with the domestic violence portfolio newly created inside his role. Those 47 recommendations are being implemented by the police as we speak, under the leadership of the deputy commissioner.

The Coroner, in investigating the case in some detail, made 10 recommendations and he made them to the Premier. In doing so, he identified that the Premier has said on a number of occasions that this is an area for which he wishes to take personal leadership. So, the Coroner has made his recommendations to the Premier and not the police commissioner, on the understanding that the police are responsible, of course, to the government of the day, who are accountable to the public. The Coroner identified that this was an area of such significance that it needed leadership from the Premier and the Premier acknowledged on the day the findings were handed down that this was a function of leadership that he was happy to take responsibility for.

With that in mind, we look forward to the Premier's response. We understand that the police commissioner, and this was confirmed in estimates, is preparing a response to the Coroner's findings himself. That will be provided to the Premier and will inform the Premier's response. We understand that will be provided to the Premier in the coming weeks and we will see from there how the Premier's response goes. The opposition is eager to work with the government in a bipartisan way as much as possible to ensure that a situation such as has occurred to the Abrahamzadeh family and the children who have suffered so much need not happen to anyone else and that processes and policies can be improved.

Unfortunately, after we had spent a good hour discussing ways that this matter could be addressed, the next topic that was gone into on the police was pursued by the shadow minister for road safety, and I say unfortunately in the manner of the minister's response because there was an

issue that came to light several weeks ago to do with a number of fines that were imposed erroneously by police on the public. The member for Mitchell asked the minister why this information was not given to the public in January when the mistake was discovered; why it was in fact only in July, after cheques had been sent out on 30 June to affected parties, that this information was received? The Minister for Police's response was:

My understanding is that the minister of the day was acting on advice given by SAPOL and that is good advice.

He went on to say:

...what the police said is that they were still working through the process, the advice provided at that point in time was limited and they could not actually give dates of refunds, etc.

To be clear, what the shadow minister for road safety was asking about was the detail: what was the nature of the advice provided? Was the advice in fact to not tell the public, to actively not tell the public, or was the advice silent on the matter of whether the public should be informed or not, in which case it was the minister of the day's own prerogative not to tell the public? This went on for a while and in one passage, for example, the minister said:

I am advised that the minister acted according to the advice given by SAPOL.

The member for Mitchell said:

Again, I just want clarification. Did SAPOL advise the minister not to tell the public?

Minister:

I am saying the minister acted in accordance with the advice provided by SAPOL.

Member for Mitchell:

I understand that, but I just need the clarification.

Minister:

If you ask the question again, you will have the same answer.

This went on for three pages of *Hansard*, back and forth. The minister characterised it, as he has done on a number of occasions—his refusal to explain the reasons why the public was not told—as this constant response that they were acting on the advice of police.

What he characterises as the advice of police, without being open to any further question, opens up the question: was the advice actively not to tell the public, or was the advice passive on the matter, in which case the minister has made the decision to tell the public? The minister refused to provide any detail and he refused to provide any detail of the advice. This is the concern I have with the way the minister is operating. He went on to say, in relation to me and an interjection I had made, 'This is not the first time you have made an attack on the police. You did it with the refugee matter as well.'

The problem is that the opposition must be able to ask questions of the government on matters that are in the public interest. There is a Police Act, which identifies specific criteria around the relationship between the Minister for Police and SAPOL, which rightly stops political interference taking place in operational matters. However, that does not mean that the Minister for Police has no accountability to the public for matters that are in the public interest, for matters that are not operational.

This is a prime example where the minister, through refusing to identify the nature of the advice and just putting up this blanket response, 'That's SAPOL's business and nothing to do with us. Nothing to see here,' has not acted in the best interests of the police. In fact, his idea is that he can set up this argument whenever he does not want to answer a question, just saying that it is a matter for police and then going further and attacking members of the opposition, saying that members of the opposition have no faith in the police and do not respect the independence of the police. When the minister makes the accusation that the opposition in asking simple questions is attacking the police, the minister is being offensive. He is better than that. We all know the Minister for Police—we know that he is better than that—but that cannot be his standard go-to political response, otherwise he opens himself up to further criticism.

To be clear, my grandfather was a police officer in England before he came to Australia and we have family and friends who are police officers. As the Acting Deputy Speaker knows well, we have been in the situation where police officers have been in danger and we have sat with family and lived through those moments. It is beyond offensive for the minister to have this constant refrain that members of the opposition may not have faith in the police. I urge him not to make the accusation a third time because I know that he is better than that—I hope that he is better than that. I hope I have not mis-characterised him, and I hope we do not see that accusation made again and we can have a positive discourse for the people of South Australia about how to best serve the needs of our community through the important police portfolio.

On Corrections, a number of issues were raised; I will start touching on them now and we may need to conclude after the adjournment. In relation to prisoner capacity, I identified that the budget papers state that in the 2012-13 year the average prisoner population daily in South Australia was 2,177 and that the approved capacity beds available was 2,262, so that left a gap of about 90 beds. We know there is a surge capacity as well of 90 beds, so we need 180 prisoners more than the average daily number before we get into serious trouble.

In 2013-14, the year just ended, that gap went from about 90 to about 30. There was a daily prisoner population of about 2,418 and 2,448 beds. With that gap of 30, we learnt during estimates that that surge capacity at the City Watchhouse, for example, was used on over 300 days. That is the sort of level: when there is a capacity of about 30 above the average population, almost all of the year we are using our surge capacity beds.

The numbers will tighten in the future. The minister identified that this year we are going to have a daily prisoner population of 2,494 and 2,500 beds; six is the gap. Next year, it improves slightly—that is, 2,572 prisoners for 2,610 beds—but then in 2016-17, that is, from 1 July 2016, we will have average prisoner numbers of 2,654, with total beds of 2,610, and we start to enter real problems. I seek leave now so that after lunch I can explain what the minister has not been able to achieve in identifying a plan for that.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. L.W.K. Bignell.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Bills

LADY KINTORE COTTAGES (TRUST PROPERTY) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Administrator assented to the bill.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Ms Chapman: Last year's estimates.

The SPEAKER: No, not at all; it really is answer time.

Motions

WORLD WAR I

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:05): Mr Speaker, an indulgence. I rise to recognise the 100 year commemoration of the beginning of World War I. Late in the evening in England on 4 August 1914 Great Britain declared war on Germany, a moment recognised as the beginning of World War I. In Adelaide on 5 August 1914 the then premier Archibald Peake received notice from the Governor-General, through the Governor, that Australia was subsequently at war. At the commencement of question time that day the then premier advised the parliament as follows:

I have received a minute from His Excellency the Governor Sir Henry Galway as follows—

"I have just received the following telegram from the Governor General of the Commonwealth. 'War has broken out between Great Britain and Germany. I would suggest that you announce the news in the House this afternoon. I feel confident that the grand spirit of patriotism and brotherhood which binds together the peoples of the many component parts of the British Empire will carry our country triumphantly through the great ordeal, and make the Empire stronger and more confident than ever.' "

This moment confirmed the worst fears of the South Australian people at the time: that we were to enter a devastating conflict that would affect every part of our community.

Over the period of the war more than a third of Australian men aged 18 to 44 enlisted. This included nearly 35,000 South Australians, approximately 5,000 of whom lost their lives. While devastating, the war demonstrated to Australians what capacity we had to achieve. It helped shape so much of what we today recognise through the birth of the ANZAC spirit. This is an important commemoration and over the coming years there will be many more important days for us to recognise.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): A century has passed since the start of the war, but one thing has not changed: we still remember the brave sacrifices that our service men and women made for peace and for our country. Not only is this century a time for Australians to remember the fallen, it is also a time for the world to reflect on the impacts of war. Sixteen million people died during the Great War, and such a loss of human life must never be repeated.

One could only imagine what it would have been like to read *The Advertiser* 100 years ago and to have been sitting in this place as an elected member listening to the official announcement in the parliament that Australia was now war. In 1914 Australia was a young and peaceful nation that had not yet seen the full atrocities of a war of this scale, and on this day 100 years ago no-one could have predicted the carnage, horror and loss of life that would follow.

As a parent I can only imagine the fear that South Australian families faced during this period, sending their children across the waters to foreign lands hoping and praying that they would return safely and unharmed. Unlike today, in a world of modern technology with social media and a 24-hour news cycle, these parents and families had to wait in anticipation for news of their loved ones. Would they receive a letter splattered with mud or would they receive the dreaded knock on the door to inform them that their child would not be coming home? In reality, one in five did not. Australia lost almost 2 per cent of its population during the war, with around 62,000 deaths. We had one of the highest casualty rates, proportionate to our population.

The war affected all communities. In my own electorate of Dunstan, the World War I memorial at the Norwood Primary School was, in fact, one of the first memorials to be constructed in Australia.

The obelisk was erected in 1916, and was designed by the school principal and built by the students. It was paid for by members of the local community, with families donating one penny per brick to pay for its completion. This was despite the government at the time limiting memorials to honour rolls.

In South Australia, we have seen our veterans community come together to commemorate the centenary of the Great War. I would like to congratulate everyone who has been involved in this mammoth task around the state. It shows that the RSL and veterans community, 100 years later, is playing a vital and everlasting role in ensuring the legacy of our veterans lives on.

Over the past 24 hours, tales of heroism, sacrifice and bravery have resurfaced and will continue to do so for the next 100 years. We truly live in the lucky country, and we are indebted to our servicemen and women. We will remember them.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:10): On indulgence, I speak to contribute because it is a very sombre day in this state's history. We pause to remember the many young South Australians who lost their lives in the First World War.

As a small country of only five million, the loss we experienced as a nation and as a state of our best and brightest young people was profound. Very few families and communities were left

untouched by this tragedy, and memorials in every city and every country town across South Australia bear testament to the courage and the sacrifice of these outstanding young South Australians. These brave men and women created a culture of valour, selflessness and mateship which continued to define our Australian servicemen and women in future operations and conflicts, and continues to shape our national psyche to this day.

We honour the 60,000 individuals who made the ultimate sacrifice and also remember those who returned to us physically and emotionally damaged. At a time when there was no understanding of the term 'post-traumatic stress', when the study of psychology was at its infancy, these young men came home to mothers, to wives and to families who did not understand, and neither did they.

They returned to a sympathetic society which honoured their service; however, many struggled for the rest of their lives with their ongoing injuries. There would be many who remember a father or a grandfather or a great-uncle who returned to us changed—one who would not speak of the war—and a mother or grandmother who struggled at times to support that changed man. My nine-year-old son is named after one of them—his great-uncle—as, I am sure, are many.

One of the tragic stories of South Australia's sacrifice was that of the Watherston family of Port Lincoln. Four brothers and one cousin from one family made the ultimate sacrifice for their country. Frank Watherston died of gunshot wounds he sustained at Gallipoli in July 1915. Frank's brothers—Cyril, Edward and James—all subsequently died within four months of each other in France during 1916, and their cousin Sidney Watherston was killed in action in August 1918 while serving with the 50th Battalion. What an incredible loss for one family. What a burden for one mother to bear.

The sacrifice of these men must not be forgotten. Their deaths on foreign soil, far from the comfort of home and the people they loved, is a story that was replicated across our country 60,000 times. Their service and sacrifice is etched in history along with many others—not only on the World War I honour roll in Port Lincoln Civic Centre but across the nation in the memorials in every city and in every town.

At this time of remembrance, our thoughts are also with our contemporary young men and women serving overseas as we speak, who have sacrificed their lives in overseas conflicts or returned to us bearing the same physical and mental scars. It is more important than ever to recognise them and provide them with ongoing support as they return to our families and to our communities.

The world today is a different place with many conflicts and a changing international political landscape. We must work together as a nation to ensure our current service people have our full support and the best equipment and services at their disposal to defend Australia and Australia's interests, and to support our allies, for many of us walk free today because of their sacrifice.

In closing, could I share a verse from the poem *The Soul of the Anzac* by an Australian wartime poet, Roderic Quinn:

The form that was mine is mine no more,
For low it lies in a soldier's grave
By an alien sea on an alien shore;
And over its sleep no wattles wave,
And stars unseen on their journey creep;
But it wakes no more from its dreamless sleep.

Lest we forget.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:15): A lot has been said, and a lot more needs to be said about the centenary of World War I. I would like to echo the words of the Prime Minister and the federal Minister for Veterans' Affairs who yesterday made comments and speeches about the anniversary.

Yesterday marked 100 years since the start of the First World War. Here in Australia, from a population of just under 5 million, 417,000 enlisted; 332,000 served overseas; 152,000 were

wounded; and 61,000 never came home. Of the men aged between 18 to 42, almost one in two enlisted and, of those who served overseas, almost one in five were killed in action. Of the 270,000 who returned, more than half were wounded and many more quietly carried the psychological scars and trauma until the end of their days.

Over one-third of all the soldiers killed were 'missing', or had no known graves. They were ordinary men and women who did extraordinary deeds in the face of both catastrophic military defeats and the most stirring of victories. For Australia, the effects of the war were profound and enduring. Together with the loss of those who died and the devastation to the living, the war left a young nation in mourning. Entire families lost their next generation of sons, either in the war itself or in the years that followed as the war took its toll.

Yet, the nation took pride in the fact that Australian soldiers had played a pivotal role in the Allied victory of 1918 that liberated the invaded nations of France and Belgium. It was a defining period in our nation's history. At the end of it all, Australia's official First World War historian Charles Bean wrote the following:

What these men did nothing can alter now. The good and the bad, the greatness and the smallness of their story will stand...It rises, as it will always rise, above the mists of the ages, a monument to great-hearted men; and, for their nation, a possession for ever.

Over the next four years our nation will remind itself of the sacrifice, valour and dreadful triumph that was the First World War. For us at least World War I was not a war of conquest, it was a war of freedom; it was a war for our allies; it was a war for our values.

Those who died, they fell with their mates fighting for our freedom. Over the course of the next four years, we should reflect on the tragedy and the magnificence of the human condition. We should remember the good, the bad, what was achieved and what was not. We owe it to those who gave their lives, the families who mourned them, our generation and our nation's future, to remember extraordinary service and sacrifice made in our name during the First World War and through the century since.

We should always, as we reflect, dedicate ourselves to being better people, creating as best we can a better world. Lest we forget.

Ministerial Statement

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO THE SAFETY AND WELFARE OF AT RISK CHILDREN

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:18): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I rise to inform the house that consultation on a term of reference for a royal commission into the safety and welfare of 'at risk' children will begin today. The recent allegations against a carer in Families SA are shocking to me, the community, and those who work every day to keep our children safe. The allegations have also raised concerns about our child protection system. These concerns must be addressed and that is why the government has committed to an inquiry of the highest level looking into how we can best protect children in our care.

Children have a right to be safe, nurtured and supported and we, as a government, and the broader community have an obligation to protect them from harm. The proposed Royal commission will inquire into the state's child protection system: it will look at the policies, practices, procedures and structures of how we care for vulnerable children.

Broader than that, it will also look at government and non-government organisations charged with the care and protection of children deemed at risk of harm. It will also inquire into the structure, staffing and resourcing of the state's child protection system.

Formal terms of reference for the royal commission are still being finalised and, because of the importance of the subject matter, the government will consult with the community on the matters to be investigated. Draft terms of reference will today be published on the government's yourSAy website. They will remain on this website for a period of seven days, during which time interested

members of the community are encouraged to comment on them. These comments will be considered by the government before the final terms of reference are settled.

We need to do all we can to ensure children are protected, and I welcome the feedback to these terms of reference and, once settled, the commencement of the royal commission.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Remuneration Tribunal—Determination No. 3 of 2013: Travelling and Accommodation Allowances for Ministers of the Crown and Officers and Members of Parliament Report

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations)—Declaration of Corresponding Laws
Rules made under the following Acts—
Magistrates Court—
Amendment No. 49
Civil—Amendment No. 6
Supreme Court—
Fast Track
Fast Track Supplementary

By the Minister for Housing and Urban Development (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Renewal SA—Urban Renewal Authority Charter

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

National Health Practitioner Ombudsman and Privacy Commissioner—Annual Report 2012-13

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. G.G. Brock)—

Local Council By-Laws—
District Council of Grant—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Local Government Land
No. 3—Roads
No. 4—Moveable Signs
No. 5—Dogs

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia)—Variation—Fees
Motor Vehicles—Variation—Other Prescribed Classes of Vehicles
Passenger Transport—Variation—Interpretation
Rail Safety National Law (South Australia)—Variation—Drug and Alcohol Testing
Road Traffic—
Miscellaneous—Administrative Provisions
Road Rules—Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions—Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions
Variation—Apparatus Approved as Traffic Speed Analysers

Rules made under the following Acts—
Road Traffic—Australian Road Rules—General

Ministerial Statement

CHILD PROTECTION

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development)
(14:22): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Today marks two weeks since SAPOL broke the news that a man had been arrested and charged with alleged sex offences against seven children in state care. We have said since day one there are limits to the information that can be provided publicly; that is because there is an ongoing investigation and prosecution that must be protected. A suppression order has been put in place by the courts and it is vital that nothing is said publicly that could compromise the case.

Since the initial details of the case of the Families SA worker's arrest were made public, I have directed my department to commence a number of actions to further safeguard children in care and provide reassurance to the community about our workforce. We are increasing mobile night officers randomly checking residential units each night. The recruitment of new residential care staff is being fast-tracked, with a focus on early childhood qualifications.

I can today announce that former South Australian police commissioner Mal Hyde has been appointed to oversee the employment processes and records of residential care staff. We have engaged a firm of experienced forensic psychologists to conduct these reviews to assist with this process. The task force which has been established to oversee this case has advised me that all parents and carers of the alleged victims have been informed, aside from one biological father whose whereabouts remain unknown.

The hotline we have established remains open. To date, I am advised a little over 100 calls have been made to that hotline. A letter has been sent to the school community where the arrested individual previously worked as an out-of-school-hours care (OSHC) worker. For those families who have left the school and—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir: can we have a copy distributed, as is the usual practice, please?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Sorry, I think they have just arrived. For those families who have left the school and their whereabouts unknown, Department for Education and Child Development is checking the electoral roll to obtain a current address and have a letter sent. I understand they are sending those letters by registered mail to ensure that they are received.

Social workers have regularly attended the school since Tuesday 22 July and will continue to do so as required. I am also advised that two positions within the department will be advertised this coming Saturday. These are: the Deputy Chief Executive Child Safety and the Executive Director Families SA Operations.

At this stage, my priority remains ensuring all the families identified have the support they need at this time. I have asked that individual support plans are established for each family, and I am advised that regular contact has been maintained with each family since they were notified of the alleged offending. The individual support plans will ensure emotional, medical, education and financial support available for each child. That support will be ongoing.

I would like to also acknowledge the commitment of the child protection workforce at this time. The Premier and I have met with a number of staff, and I want to recognise that our child protection system is full of hardworking dedicated men and women who work tirelessly to protect our community's most vulnerable children. Their work is mostly thankless. It is incredibly difficult work, and I would like to take a moment to thank our staff at the front line, who must be feeling very betrayed right now at the alleged offending that has taken place.

Our commitment to children and young people is unwavering. The assurance I can give the South Australian public is this: this government's number one focus is the protection of children, and we will be getting on with supporting these families and children and doing everything we can as quickly as we can to strengthen our system.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSIONER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:26): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The state's inaugural Small Business Commissioner, Mr Mike Sinkunas, has tendered his resignation from the position. He is retiring after more than 40 years in the workforce. As such, a search for a new Small Business Commissioner is underway, and the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment and the Department of State Development will lead the process. In the interim, Deputy Commissioner Professor Frank Zumbo will act in the commissioner's role until the recruitment process is complete and a new commissioner is appointed.

The Office of the Small Business Commissioner provides small businesses, franchisees and tenants with a champion to help them through tough times, disputes and compliance issues. The office has made great headway since opening in 2012, with over 10,000 businesses having contacted the office, with a range of issues, seeking assistance. Significant assistance is provided to businesses at the initial assessment/inquiry stage with issues such as termination of lease or franchise agreement—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —end of lease arrangements, outgoings and disclosure requirements.

I am confident that the next commissioner will continue this fantastic work and strive for better outcomes for South Australian small businesses.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Hartley to order. The member for Colton.

Parliamentary Committees

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:28): Thank you very much, sir, and may I say how sharp you are looking today.

The SPEAKER: A form of dress not far from your father's part of the world.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Dead right, sir. I bring up the annual report 2013-14 of the committee. Report received.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:29): I bring up the 36th report of the committee entitled the Sale and Consumption of Alcohol.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today students from Grant High School who are here as guests of the member for Mount Gambier.

*Question Time***CHILD PROTECTION**

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house whether she has provided any inaccurate statements on the public record related to the allegations of multiple child sexual abuse by an employee of Families SA?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:30): I am sorry, sir. I will need more detail from the Leader of the Opposition in relation to that question.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary?

Mr MARSHALL: A supplementary question, sir.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Does the minister stand by her statement on ABC 891 radio on 25 July that, 'No child protection notifications have been received about the alleged offender?'

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:31): On 25 July when I gave an interview on ABC radio I was speaking about his employment, and what I said was that there was no criminal history and no child protection notifications. What I said on multiple occasions was that I could not talk about the allegations about a care concern relating to this employee after his employment. So, I have spoken about the assessments that were taken in relation to this employee at the time of his employment and I have been very circumspect since that time about anything that I could say in relation to his employment record since that time.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, leader.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Was police commissioner Gary Burns correct when he stated this morning on ABC 891 radio that a care concern notice was provided to SAPOL by Families SA regarding the Families SA employee charged with multiple child sexual assaults?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:32): Everything that I have said publicly in relation to this matter has been guided by advice that I have received. My first priority throughout this whole process has been about these children and their families: providing the support that they need; making sure that we got advice out to families of the school in which this person was employed; and thirdly, being very, very careful about what I say publicly so as not to circumvent or impede the investigation, or circumvent the judicial process that is going to occur. That is very, very important.

Today, the police commissioner provided some additional information to the South Australian public and I am very pleased. It is my position, and I know it is the Premier's position; it is this government's position: we would like to provide as much information as early as we can to the public. But I will not say anything that is going to jeopardise this investigation.

I am advised that the police commissioner issued a further statement today and in that statement he said and I quote, 'I am satisfied that the government's position in relation to the release of details has been consistent with the advice provided by SAPOL.'

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Final supplementary.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Why was the police commissioner able to confirm on the radio this morning that a care concern notice was provided to SAPOL from Families SA related to the Families SA employee while the minister has continued to refuse to comment?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:34): Because it is an investigation led by SAPOL at any point in time they are in charge of the investigation and we take advice from them about what—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I can reiterate what the commissioner said in his statement today. He said, 'I am satisfied the government's position in relation to the release of details has been consistent with the advice provided by SAPOL.'

Ms Chapman: So what? Answer the question, then.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Well, I just answered the question.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I'm really sorry, but our role is to assist the police. The department's role is to assist the police in their investigation. We take advice from police as they proceed with this investigation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned, the deputy leader is warned, and the member for Morialta is called to order. Leader.

Ms Chapman: What a disgrace!

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned for the second and final time.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): When was this notification provided to SAPOL by Families SA?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:35): I'm not providing any more public information about this notification. If the police commissioner is comfortable with the release of information, I'm happy for him to provide it, but I will not be providing any information in relation to this person's employment history without their authorisation.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. P. Caica: You should wait for the call.

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

Mr Pederick: Chuck him out.

The SPEAKER: Well, thank you to the member for Hammond to suggest that I chuck the member for Unley out, but I'm not inclined to do so at this stage. The leader.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Given that Mr Burns said on the radio this morning that it was determined there wasn't anything concrete enough to proceed, what actions did Families SA take to ensure that they were satisfied that this alleged perpetrator was suitable to be in the care of children here in South Australia?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:36): I'm not going to speak about this case specifically—I'm just not going to do it.

Mr Pisoni: Why not?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I'm not doing it because it is a live investigation and there is a prosecution—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Commissioner Burns confirmed today on the radio that a matter was referred to South Australia Police, that they had carriage of that investigation.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister outline what prompted David Waterford to resign as CEO of Families SA?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:37): Sir, the leader of the opposition was briefed on this in a confidential briefing. He knows the answer to the question and he knows—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: He knows that I can't speak about that publicly.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the first time. Supplementary, the leader.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): Can the minister provide an explanation to the house of who has provided her with specific information that she cannot discuss the terms of David Waterford's resignation with this house?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:37): I don't know where the Leader of the Opposition was on the afternoon that he was briefed by myself and the acting police commissioner and a member of the crown, but the very clear advice that we have is that we cannot speak publicly about anything to do with this man's employment. Now, regrettably—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Well, it goes to the crux of issues in relation to this man's employment. It's enormously regrettable that Mr Waterford made the mistake he did. He's an incredibly—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: What mistake?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: He's an incredibly honourable person, and as soon as he realised the extent of his mistake he tendered his resignation. Now, he didn't offer it; he tendered it. It was the provision of inaccurate information; that advice we had is that it cannot be in the public domain at this time. I would be very happy to tell you if I could, if I were free to do so. This is an enormously tragic set of circumstances.

It's the children in this case that we should be concerned about, and we should be concerned about ensuring that justice is done in this matter, not scoring political points. This has to be above political pointscoring. This case is being referred to a royal commission. We are taking this seriously. We want openness, we want accountability. We want to know what, if anything, we can do better, to make sure that we weed out any potential perpetrators in our child protection system.

The SPEAKER: Before you ask the second supplementary on the second question, the member for Heysen is called to order and warned for the first time, the member for Unley is warned for the second and final time, and the members for Hammond, Finniss, Morphett, Kavel and MacKillop are called to order. Leader, supplementary?

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): Yes. Can the minister at least rule out that Mr Waterford did not resign for providing inaccurate information to the minister relating to child notifications?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: Well, she won't say what it was, so let's at least rule something out.

The SPEAKER: The leader is on his second and final warning.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:40): Thank you, sir. I am not going to do that because, by ruling something out, you put a focus on other aspects of advice that Mr Waterford had provided, and I am not going to do it. It is not because I have anything to cover up. I was given inaccurate information; we have said that publicly. Mr Waterford has taken responsibility for his mistakes. Let me go back again: our concern should be for these children; our concern should be for these families. Our concern should be making sure that we do everything we can to support the police investigation and making sure that justice is done when this matter comes to the courts.

The SPEAKER: Before the leader asks his next question, the member for Morphett is warned for the first time and the member for Hammond is warned for the first time. He said, 'Someone has to go, let's make sure it's not him.' The leader.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Did the minister ever raise with David Waterford the need for a written briefing subsequent to providing a verbal one?

The SPEAKER: The leader means 'oral'.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:42): I received multiple oral and written briefings.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, third supplementary?

Mr MARSHALL: No, I am moving onto a new question, sir.

The SPEAKER: New question.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Did the Families SA employee who has been charged with multiple counts of child sexual abuse pass all Families SA employment screening processes without any issues being raised?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:42): My advice is that this person underwent criminal history checks and underwent working with children checks and that there were no issues in relation to the screening that he underwent.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Does the minister believe that the employee was thoroughly vetted enough before being employed?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:42): These are issues we are going to be looking at. We have put legislation in place now that requires significant screening of people who work with children or who come in contact with children

as volunteers in our department but also in other volunteer areas. Non-government organisations, sporting groups—they all have requirements about working with children.

Clearly, nothing is foolproof, but we are looking at all of our processes. Criminal history: you get that from SAPOL. The screening unit goes through very detailed processes in assessing child protection issues in relation to people here in South Australia. I can't give you the numbers, but I know that there are people who are rejected and are not allowed to work with children. They don't get a clearance. It is quite a strong preventive mechanism that we have in place.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Is the alleged Families SA child sex offender still being paid by the government?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:44): No.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): Subsequent to the minister's commitment last year to fully implement the findings of the Debelle report, who was placed in charge of ensuring the implementation process?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:44): The deputy chief executive, child safety, Mr David Waterford.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): Is the minister satisfied that all recommendations were implemented as per her commitment to the people of South Australia last year?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:44): We have some issues in relation to Mr Debelle that remain outstanding, and I have reported to the parliament on those.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): Given that the Premier described the alleged crimes committed by the 32-year-old Families SA employee as unprecedented in possibly South Australia's or the nation's history, why did the minister accept a verbal briefing on this shocking crime rather than request all departmental files and records related to the matter for herself to peruse?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:45): We have outlined the time frame in relation to this. From the first advice we received around the arrest of this man we were required to keep this matter extremely confidential, so that very few people knew about this arrest. The police were conducting a very, very sensitive investigation. It was not until the week before, the Wednesday before, our announcement that we were advised that the offending involved contact with children.

We were still being governed by SA Police in relation to their readiness to contact the affected families. So again, people in the department were not made aware of this arrest so we never had the same resources that we would normally access in preparing written briefings. But, again, I stress that I had received multiple written and oral briefings.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Just a point of clarification, sir—

The SPEAKER: Let's make it a supplementary.

Mr MARSHALL: Well, a supplementary. Did the minister request all departmental files and records herself to peruse?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:46): No, sir. These are matters that are being investigated by SAPOL. It is not appropriate for me to call up all records about a particular individual who is under investigation. What I have done is make sure that those records are secure in the department should SAPOL require any further information, and that they are available for a royal commission.

REX MINERALS

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister inform the house of recent developments in the state's resources sector?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:47): I am pleased to inform the house that the state government has granted Rex Minerals a mining lease for its \$800 million Hillside copper, gold and iron ore project near Ardrossan. The mining lease is a major step in the approvals process for this significant project, which would see copper mining return to Yorke Peninsula after 100 years. In line with our world's best practice regulatory approach, the mining lease included a number of conditions—ranging from environmental management to rehabilitation—which will be publicly released once, and if, the offer is accepted.

This project is good news for South Australia and our regional communities, providing investment and jobs for all South Australians. A new copper, gold and iron ore mine is good news for South Australia and has the potential to create hundreds of jobs for the region over the life of the mine. This project is one of many that continue to diversify the economy and provide flow-on benefits, including increasing demand for services and other related industries. The government is committed to diversifying our economy, where the state's key strengths in agriculture, food and wine, tourism, and the defence and resources sectors operate side-by-side for the benefit of the local, regional and broader South Australian community.

The lease approval is a major step towards delivering this project and demonstrates that the Hillside mine can be operated in an environmentally reasonable and responsible manner. Once Rex Minerals accepts the offer it will have 12 months to prepare a detailed plan for the safe operation of the mine—a Program for Environment Protection and Rehabilitation (PEPR)—that meets all the government's stringent requirements.

The offer to Rex comes after comprehensive community consultation, ensuring that concerns and issues have been fully considered in the assessment of the mining proposal. The formal community consultation period conducted by the government prompted more than 266 submissions from members of the public, community groups and government regulators.

I am firmly of the view that this mining lease strikes the right balance between environmental and economic priorities. I also want to take this time to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his party's support in this mine approval. It is clear, however, that there are some in the community who continue to oppose this development. While I respect the rights of farmers and other protesters to express their views, I simply do not agree.

Fundamental to the expansion of the state's resources sector is regulation based on science, not emotion. This government also recognises that to grow we must change. We cannot simply rely on the traditional industries of the past. This government is committed to growing new opportunities for our cities, our towns and our regional communities.

This government will stand by emerging sectors, and we will stand by our vision for a stronger, more prosperous South Australia. In doing so, we will not compromise on the state's reputation as a clean, green food producer, which is why we have a world's best regulatory system in place to ensure mining and farming can coexist and the environment is protected.

The state government's recent decision to grant a mining lease to Rex Minerals strikes the right balance between protecting the environment and amenity of the Yorke Peninsula while diversifying the local economy and creating jobs. Opposition to South Australia's mining and oil and gas sectors demonstrated at recent rallies ignores a decade-long partnership between South

Australia's resources sector and the agriculture industry. Now is the time for leadership, not scaremongering. Indeed, the shared benefits—

Mr Bell: I represent my community.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Good on you. I represent South Australia. Indeed, the shared benefits of expanding our state's resources and agricultural sectors are many, from investment in infrastructure to job creation and training. The benefits that resources exploration and production bring to regional communities can be shared by all.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Regrettably, your time has expired.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What a shame!

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. When did the minister receive advice from SAPOL that she was unable to provide details of David Waterford's resignation?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:51): I've had crown advice that we cannot go to the circumstance of this man's employment record, and I will not do it. I will not jeopardise this investigation, and I will not jeopardise the prosecution. What we have done is advise the South Australian public and the Leader of the Opposition of a serious mistake in advice that Mr Waterford has made, and we have advised the public that we cannot publicly say that because it may, in fact, cause a problem with the prosecution.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Who provided that—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this another question?

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary: who provided that advice? Was it SAPOL or was it crown law? Who specifically provided that advice, and when did they provide it?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:52): The same advice was provided to you in your briefing.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): I am asking a very specific question here.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary, leader?

Mr MARSHALL: Yes, it is a question. Can you inform the parliament who provided that advice, and when that specific advice was provided to the minister that she is now relying on not to inform this parliament as to the reasons for David Waterford's resignation?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:53): The advice we have received is that we cannot go to the employment record—

Mr Marshall: Who provided it?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Crown law have provided it. They provided me with the same advice they provided you in your briefing.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Marshall: Nothing to do with it.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Yes, it does. It goes to the very heart of it.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I need to remind the leader that I have inherited a list here and he has two ticks, so we would like to hear the minister's answer in silence. A new question?

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): Yes. My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development: with the resignation of David Waterford, who is now responsible for overseeing the department's response to the current allegations of child sexual abuse within Families SA?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:54): Ms Julieann Riedstra has moved over to oversee the area of child protection.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): A supplementary: what child protection qualifications does Julieann Riedstra have?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:54): She is acting in that role. She was a current deputy CE of the department—a very competent and capable public servant—and she is overseeing that aspect of the business whilst we advertise for a replacement.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): For clarification, Julieann Reidstra has no qualifications or experience in child protection whatsoever?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:54): I could make some obvious comparisons with shadow ministers and ministers about their qualifications—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm on my feet, which means we have silence. The minister is entitled to be heard in silence. I do ask for goodwill for the minister to be heard.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: We have a very capable and competent public servant undertaking this role in an acting position while we advertise for a permanent appointment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader, new question?

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): Does Julieann Reidstra have any—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this a new question?

Mr MARSHALL: —background or experience whatsoever in child protection? Yes or no?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:55): Same question, same answer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, same question. New question?

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): Has the minister received any briefings on child protection from this person since they commenced in their role?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:55): I am receiving briefings on a very regular basis about the operations of the task force that Ms Reidstra is overseeing, and the general business of the department continues.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): For clarification—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary?

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Supplementary, and then we're moving along.

Mr MARSHALL: Are you indicating that Julieann Reidstra has or hasn't provided you with any written briefings since she has been in this role?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:56): We have briefings coming through from the department on a daily basis so—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The deputy CE signs those briefings. I have received multiple briefings from Ms Reidstra. They go through the chief executive, Tony Harrison, to me.

SOUTHERN EXPRESSWAY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure: can the minister update the house on the opening of the duplicated Southern Expressway?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:56): I thank the member for Reynell for this very important question, and I note her strong interest in this subject, particularly given the benefits the project has for her constituents in the southern suburbs and, of course, for people living in or visiting the Fleurieu Peninsula.

On Sunday I had the privilege of joining the Premier, as well as the members for Kurna and Reynell, to officially open the duplicated Southern Expressway. For many years South Australia's one-way expressway has been—probably the most congenially I can put this—an oddity. It has been a significant traffic impediment for southern suburbs commuters and businesses, as well as for tourists and visitors—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —on their way to South Australia's Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Want another crack, do you?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for MacKillop.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The \$407 million duplication project has been undertaken to address these shortcomings and to put an end to the frustration of traversing to and from the outer southern suburbs to find that, in fact, the expressway was not open to one's direction of traffic.

This 18.5 kilometre section of duplicated road will save commuters up to 13 minutes in travelling time, compared to travelling on Main South Road. It will also reduce traffic on other nearby arterial roads such as Lonsdale Road and, of course, Main South Road. I know this will be particularly important for many people travelling to and from the city, as well as local businesses in terms of reducing transit times and costs and increasing their productivity.

The construction stage of the duplicated expressway has also brought many benefits to South Australia and the South Australian economy. The project has had over 1,800 workers on site, and I am advised that nearly 90 per cent of these workers were from South Australia and 58 per cent of these, or nearly two-thirds, came from the southern suburbs. South Australian businesses also benefited with, I am advised, approximately 86 per cent of subcontract packages being awarded to South Australian businesses, with nearly a quarter going to local southern suburb businesses.

One particularly pleasing aspect of the official opening on Sunday was the involvement of Mr Rex Herde of SA Guardrailers. Rex has been installing guardrails on South Australian road projects for nearly 30 years. Based in Kadina, Rex installed nearly seven kilometres of guardrail on the original Southern Expressway project. On the duplication project, Rex was involved in the installation of significant tracts of guardrail as well. Quite proudly, he wielded the scissors with the Premier and cut the ribbon at the opening of the Old Noarlunga southern end of the new duplicated roadway.

Just as pleasingly, once the contractor vehicles had left the road, the first driver on the new section of road from Old Noarlunga was driving an HSV—a Holden-based vehicle. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the main contractor Lend Lease and the 1,800 workers for their hard work and dedication to this complex project, as well as the DPTI project team.

To put the project into some small perspective, it involved 20 bridges being constructed, extended or duplicated and over 250,000 tonnes of asphalt being laid. I would also like to acknowledge the southern suburbs residents and businesses that have been very understanding and patient during the construction period.

There will be some minor construction activity, such as landscaping and fencing continuing over the coming weeks that will require some lane closures, some interpeak and weekend closures, as well as reduced speed limits as the open-graded asphalt is worn in. I can advise that once grip testing has been satisfactorily reached, the duplicated section of the Southern Expressway will be ready for its 100 km/h speed limit. Finally, a project that South Australians can be proud of.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. When was the minister first briefed on the alleged rape of a 13-year-old girl by a Families SA contract driver?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:01): I understand the first advice that I received, I think, was on Monday, the day after the arrest.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Supplementary: who gave the briefing and was it in writing?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:01): Yes, it was; it came from the department.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Supplementary.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Was it in writing?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:01): Yes, it was.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): When did the acting CEO of Families SA first brief the minister on the allegations?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:01): I am happy to go back and check. I am not sure whether that particular brief that I received immediately was from the deputy CE or not but, in line with all of the recommendations of Debelle, I was advised, and advised in writing.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): Can the minister advise if the vehicle that the alleged sexual assault of a 13-year-old girl occurred in was fitted with a CCTV camera?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:02): I can't answer that question, and I am happy to take that on notice.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): Are there any protocols in place around accessing of information, such as CCTV footage, to assist in investigations?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:02): I would imagine they are potentially questions that the Minister for Transport could answer in relation to incidences in relation to licensed vehicles like chauffeur-driven cars, but can I say: I spoke with the foster carer on the weekend, and my concern was obviously again for this little girl. I was really concerned that the trauma she suffers is reduced, or certainly not exacerbated, and I was pleased that the carer was ensuring that this little one did not see the papers and was not watching the news broadcasts, because she is dealing with enough, and I certainly do not want to be in a situation where we are exacerbating that.

RIVERLAND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Can the minister inform the house about government support for major investment in the Riverland, and particularly the recent announcement of a new Riverland spirit distillery?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:04): I thank the honourable member for his question. As members would be aware, the government recently held its first community cabinet meeting in the Riverland. This was an excellent opportunity for members of the government, including senior public servants, to better focus their work on how the government can support regional investment and jobs.

In addition to speaking to the local community about what they want to see in their region, we also were able to speak to local businesses to find ways that government can help and what industry wants. It was through this that I was able to tour through the proposed Bickford's redevelopment of the Renmano Winery site with its owner, Angelo Kotses, managing director of Bickford's. My department is now working with Bickford's, helping to case manage their investment throughout South Australia, including this key investment in the Riverland. This work is in line with the state government's recent announcement of Jim Hallion as Coordinator-General, tasked with breaking down roadblocks to investment across our state.

The new development in the Riverland has been supported by the state government through \$2.36 million in Riverland Sustainable Futures funding. The investment in the new facility promises to produce an outstanding facility for Bickford's and the Riverland, supporting jobs and creating a tourist drawcard. Plans for the site include re-establishing the original still house, reinstalling the original black bottle pot stills and building a visitor's centre and cellar door attraction for tourists.

Along with the Minister for Investment and Trade and the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, I recently held an investment roundtable that included Mr Kotses as well. This meeting with key investors further underlines our commitment to unlocking investment across the state to support jobs, and I hope that many more projects like the Bickford's investment in the Riverland can be supported.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How many accusations or investigations of alleged sexual misconduct against employees of the Department for Education and Child Development are currently pending?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:06): I thank the member for Adelaide for her question. I am happy to take that on notice and come back to the member.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:06): Supplementary: is it now policy for the minister to be made aware in writing of all accusations or investigations of alleged sexual misconduct against employees of the Department for Education and Child Development?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:06): I am advised of all police investigations that are undertaken in relation to criminal matters.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:06): My question is again to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Have the children allegedly assaulted by the 32-year-old Families SA worker been interviewed by the Child Protection Services clinicians at either the Women's and Children's Hospital or the Flinders Medical Centre?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:07): My understanding is that all of the children had their health checks undertaken, but consideration is given by those professionals as to whether it is appropriate to undertake those sorts of forensic investigations. Again, I am happy to take that on—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Yes, Child Protection Services. They determine—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morphett.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: They determine whether it is age-appropriate for those children. So, again, I am happy to take that on notice and come back with an answer if I can provide that to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before you continue, the member for Morphett is warned for the second time. Member for Adelaide.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:08): Supplementary: were the allegations of inappropriate behaviour by the 32-year-old Families SA worker treated as tier 1 complaints and investigated within 24 hours?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:08): I won't talk about this particular person, but I will tell you what the process is. If we receive an allegation that is in relation to criminal offending or sexual abuse of children, Families SA does not investigate it. It is referred immediately to South Australia Police.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Defence Industries. Can the minister inform the house about what the South Australian government is doing to retain naval shipbuilding projects in South Australia?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:08): I thank the member for Taylor, because I can advise the house of what is going on. Can I just start by saying that there is probably no more important decision for manufacturing in this state since World War II than this decision about what is going to happen with naval shipbuilding. We have lost Holden and all the automotive jobs that go with it, and if through mismanagement or poor policy or bad government we now lose naval shipbuilding in this state, it will have a catastrophic effect upon tens of thousands of Australian workers and their families, it will close business after business, and it will have a very catastrophic effect on the future of this state.

It is vital that action be taken, and the Premier has called for a coordinated and constructive approach to be developed between the states and key industry associations to ensure major defence projects are not tendered overseas. The Premier and I have written to the premiers of New South Wales and Victoria calling on them to join with South Australia and lobby the commonwealth on future projects. The Premier spoke to Premier Baird and Premier Napthine yesterday morning, and they said they were both keen to develop a cooperative plan to help Australian industry to be more competitive.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, they don't seem to be very interested, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: They don't seem to be very interested. They don't seem to care, particularly the member for Finniss, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can only presume the opposition is looking for someone to leave the room if they continue in this fashion. The minister is entitled to be heard in silence, and I would ask you to listen to the answer.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: And I will tell you why, Madam Deputy Speaker: because it is a Coalition government in Canberra which is threatening to build submarines in Japan and build naval ships overseas, not in this state.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr GARDNER: The minister is debating: 98.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have taken advice. I am listening to the answer, and we are waiting for him to continue in silence, otherwise I won't be able to give you a ruling.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond is given another tick, which means you are on two.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: MacKillop, you can have another one. You are on one.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I am answering the question—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I know you will.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —about what the government is doing to retain naval shipbuilding because there is a threat, there is a risk, and that risk has to do with promises that were made prior to the last election that submarines would be built in Adelaide, centred here. I know they were made. The Leader of the Opposition knows they were made. The shadow minister for defence knows they were made because they were made to all of us—not just on this side. The promises were made to members opposite as well.

Mr Marshall: What is your point?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: My point is very simple: this parliament and this state face a potential crisis and that is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: No. No, that is a potential decision for a Coalition government to build 12 submarines in Japan or overseas—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —to spend \$250 billion of taxpayers'—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down!

Mr Gardner: Stop undermining the Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, you have done that on your side and it is an embarrassment to the house. I have asked you to listen to the answer and you won't do it. You've got loaded bases and you are leaving me no choice. Two or three of you will have to leave the next time someone's lips move. The member for Chaffey is given a warning as well. MacKillop, you are on one tick and Morphett is on two. Please don't embarrass the house by your bad behaviour.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker—\$250 billion of the Australian taxpayer's money is on the table over the next 30 years to build naval ships; one-third of it will be spent buying the ships or building the ships, two-thirds of it will be spent sustaining the ships. I ask you: what government could spend that \$250 billion overseas creating jobs and enterprise in somebody else's country?

Mr Whetstone: What are you doing about it?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I hope the answer to that question is not a Coalition government—and the question is not what I am doing about it: the Premier and I are taking action. The question is: what are you doing about it? What are they doing about it, Madam Deputy Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down!

Mr Marshall: Throw him out!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I won't be throwing him out. I will have to throw someone here out—and it won't be one person. I did ask for your cooperation; you can't provide it. Clearly, you can't listen to the answer in silence. We have taken advice: he can answer the question in any way he wishes. The member for Chaffey is given a warning, and it will be the very next person who moves their lips. Don't embarrass the house on this important day.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And your point of order is?

Ms CHAPMAN: Whilst we fully appreciate that you have indicated that the minister can answer as he wishes—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Correct.

Ms CHAPMAN: —the fact is, quite simply, the minister is entering into debate—poor as it might be. He is entering into debate, making demands of the government. This is question time of the government, not of us. This is poor debate, and it is in breach of the orders.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Madam Deputy Speaker, can I—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You need to wind up.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can't hear what he is saying anyway, because you're all screaming. It is an embarrassment to this house that you're continuing in this fashion in question time.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He is winding up.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That's correct; that's the ruling.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. Around two minutes of time has been taken up by—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That doesn't matter—

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —vexatious and pointless interjections from members opposite.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your time has been—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That's it, I think. Next question, let's move on. Member for Adelaide, you have one more.

FAMILIES SA SOCIAL WORKERS

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:15): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the outcome of the departmental investigation into two Families SA senior social workers connected to the appointment of a convicted embezzler as a financial counsellor at Families SA?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:16): I am happy to take that on notice and provide that information to the house.

FAMILIES SA SOCIAL WORKERS

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:16): Supplementary: are the two social workers still employed by Families SA?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:16): As I said, I will take that on notice and get the information for the member.

MULLIGHAN INQUIRY RECOMMENDATIONS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Has the government placed six social workers in schools on the APY lands, and also two specialist child protection workers, as promised in the minister's response to the Mullighan recommendations?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:16): The placement of social workers has been a difficult issue that we have grappled with on the APY lands. It's very difficult not only to get social workers who are prepared to go up there but also to get people who are appropriate for that environment, and I am sure the member for Morphett would appreciate that. What we have done is make sure that we have regular coverage of that area. We have put a lot of resources into the APY lands that have never been there before.

MULLIGHAN INQUIRY RECOMMENDATIONS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:17): Supplementary: minister, what plans has the government got to allocate these resources in the future?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:17): Our plan and our commitment have always been to have those positions filled.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport - Can the minister inform the house about his recent visit to the 20th Commonwealth Games in Glasgow?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:17): I thank the member for Torrens for her question and acknowledge her great netball career as well. I know that she did play for the federal parliament netball team, not quite to the standard I saw last week in Glasgow, when we saw Natalie Medhurst and Renae Hallinan, two great South Australian netballers, play against the South Africans on their way to a gold medal play-off on Sunday night at the Commonwealth Games.

It was a pleasure to be in Glasgow for three days last week for the Commonwealth Games and to get out to have a look at the sorts of facilities that they have and the facilities that we would need to have here if we were successful in hosting the Commonwealth Games. We have asked the Australian Commonwealth Games Association to consider us for the next time Australia gets to host the games after 2018, which, of course, is when they will go to the Gold Coast.

I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition, who is on a committee with me. We have spent the past 12 months having a look at the possibility of Adelaide hosting the games. There is no doubt, after visiting the facilities in Glasgow last week, that South Australia would be a fantastic place to host a Commonwealth Games. We've got brilliant facilities already, and that was brought home last week.

While I was in Glasgow we joined with Swimming Australia to announce that the Olympic swimming trials for 2016, in the lead-up to the Rio games, will be held right here in Adelaide at the Marion Aquatic and Leisure Centre. The same thing happened in 2012, in the lead-up to the London Olympics as well. It just goes to show that we have the best swimming centre in Australia, one that is capable of hosting international events.

We also have two fantastic pitches out at the hockey centre at Gepps Cross. We put a second one in there last year at a cost of about half a million dollars, so that is up to speed to host a commonwealth games. Of course, we have the best stadium in Australia, with the Adelaide Oval, a half billion dollar investment that is proving a real winner with football. We are seeing big bookings for cricket over the summer, and thousands of people are coming here to watch the footy who didn't come when the football was down at football park.

We visited the athletes' village, the transport coordination centre in Glasgow, the city operations centre, the Commonwealth Games headquarters, the national hockey centre, the Tollcross swimming centre (and I have to say that the Marion one is better than the Tollcross one), and Hampden Park, where the athletics and the opening and closing ceremonies were held. Then there was the Scottish Exhibition and Conference Centre Precinct, where we saw the netball, and there are also gymnastics, boxing, wrestling, weightlifting, and it was the home also of the International Broadcast Centre and the main press centre.

One of the interesting things was to go through the athletes' village to see how big that is. They have MRI and CAT scan facilities. It is pretty high tech for a village that has been put up as a temporary centre but one that is home to the best athletes from around the commonwealth.

I want to put on the public record my thanks to Gordon Matheson, the Glasgow City Council mayor, who was terrific in his being very open with us in talking through what you need to do to get up a successful bid. He spoke about when they went to the Manchester games and then worked with

the Scottish Federation, and then there was a bit of a contest between Edinburgh and Glasgow on who would host the games.

Also, my thanks to Ian Hooper, the director of sports and special projects, Glasgow Life, Francesca Osowska from the Scottish government, Phillip Walker and the police and emergency services team at Safety Glasgow. All these people, who have put on a fantastic games, took time out of their busy schedule to meet with us and give Adelaide a few hints on how we could do it so well here in 2026 or 2030.

MULLIGHAN INQUIRY RECOMMENDATIONS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Has e-notification technology been placed in APY schools to assist staff with their statutory reporting obligations, as recommended by the Mullighan inquiry?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:22): I will take that question on notice.

MULLIGHAN INQUIRY RECOMMENDATIONS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:22): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Are reports of child sex assaults being reported by Nganampa Health to Families SA, as per the Mullighan inquiry recommendations, and how many reports were there in the last reporting year?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:22): Again, a fairly detailed question, and I will take that on notice.

MULLIGHAN INQUIRY RECOMMENDATIONS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:22): My question is to the same minister. Are meetings between Families SA, Nganampa Health, NPY Women's Council, AARD, DECD, SAPOL and SA Health being held as promised in response to recommendation 10 of the Mullighan report, and how many meetings have been held?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:23): Again, the member is asking for detailed facts and, again, I will take that on notice, but I can say that I am aware that agencies on the lands work very collaboratively together. It is fantastic that we do have now sworn police officers on the lands. When we came to government, there were none.

MULLIGHAN INQUIRY RECOMMENDATIONS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:23): My question is to the same minister. How many children have been removed from the APY lands to Adelaide, and has the government provided the necessary accommodation and care as promised in response to recommendation 11 of the Mullighan inquiry?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:23): I think our policy has always been never to identify specific numbers in relation to a specific location—that that would be a very unfortunate situation for those communities on the APY lands. If there are areas in your question I can answer, I will do so.

MULLIGHAN INQUIRY RECOMMENDATIONS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:24): My question is to the same minister. Are all reports of positive screening tests for sexually transmitted infections of children on the APY lands being reported to Families SA and that report forwarded to SA Health?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:24): I would expect that is information held by Nganampa Health, which is the health agency there. But I can certainly inquire of my department how those issues are being managed, and provide an answer for the member if that is at all possible.

MULLIGHAN INQUIRY RECOMMENDATIONS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is a supplementary?

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:24): It is, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It will have to be, because you have had six questions.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Were positive tests for STIs in APY children immediately reported to child protection services at the Women's and Children's Hospital for investigation, as per recommendation 19 of the Mullighan inquiry? If not, why not? How many cases were referred to the CIB or SAPOL?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:25): Of course I do not have those sorts of figures at my fingertips. However, again, I am happy to take the questions on notice.

MULLIGHAN INQUIRY RECOMMENDATIONS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Morphett. This is a supplementary supplementary supplementary.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:25): It is; it's a supplementary. How many safe houses have been built on the APY lands for children who need sanctuary from abuse, as per recommendation 33 of the Mullighan inquiry?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:25): My understanding is—and I am working from memory here—that working with the NPY women's organisation up there, there was, in fact, concern about building safe houses on the lands, and that accommodation was provided in other areas.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am happy to double-check that, but that is my understanding of what has occurred. There was consultation with the community in relation to the recommendation.

BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION VOUCHER PROGRAM

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:26): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation. Can the minister inform the house about the new Business Transformation Voucher Program?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:26): I thank the member for his question; I know he is extremely interested in the future of our manufacturing sector, particularly in the face of the closure of Holden, which is a looming tragedy for the northern suburbs in particular.

The South Australian government is committed to supporting South Australian manufacturers to enhance their competitiveness, their productivity and their profitability. The recently launched \$4.5 million Business Transformation Voucher Program has been developed to help high-value South Australian manufacturing businesses to identify opportunities to accelerate their growth through innovation.

The Business Transformation Voucher Program is one of the first initiatives to be rolled out as part of the state government's \$60 million Our Jobs Plan, a plan which is necessary due to the unfortunate loss of our new car manufacturing industry after the withdrawal of support from the current federal government.

The Business Transformation Voucher Program provides up to \$50,000 for manufacturers to gain expert advice and implement recommendations to improve their profitability and competitiveness. Vouchers will be awarded to businesses to engage specialist service providers to assist them with a range of ways in which their businesses can improve. These include:

- review and identification of business/manufacturing process improvements;
- marketing and brand strategy;

- business model development—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, that is your second warning.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Just in case people did not hear that last bit:

- marketing and brand strategy;
- business model development and business planning;
- management training/mentoring;
- export readiness (and we all know how well exports are going in South Australia, and what an important part of our growth that is); and

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I don't think I heard that, did I?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I repeat:

- export readiness; and
- implementation of review recommendations once those reviews have occurred.

Successful applicants are required to provide dollar for dollar matching funds. It is very important that we are investing in businesses that are capable of also investing in themselves and going through that partnership. To date three local companies have been approved for a total of \$150,000 to transform their business.

Wire By Click Group, which is an exciting Lonsdale firm, has received funding to investigate the feasibility of manufacturing locally with an optimised process, and will work with another local success story, SAGE Automation, to achieve this outcome.

The second company is the northern suburbs-based engineering plastics manufacturer RMAX, which will conduct a detailed energy analysis and productivity review of its facility to identify opportunities for key efficiency gains in energy and raw materials. Williams Metal Fabrication will review its manufacturing processes and costing system to develop an integrated financial management system to efficiently analyse and track manufacturing costs.

These vouchers will also serve to position South Australian manufacturers to compete strongly for competitive federal grant programs. Yesterday, the federal government announced a \$20 million fund, and I encourage local businesses to engage in that. It is competitive across all of Australia, despite the fact that we have the disproportionate effect of the car closure in this state, so I encourage our businesses to apply for those.

They are great companies and, if they apply, they will succeed, but businesses have to put in, and I urge them to go to the relevant website for that. I encourage all South Australian manufacturers who look to transform their business and to capture new opportunities to visit the Department of State Development website, or the www.grantassist.sa.gov.au website, which contains the full range of grants that are available at present.

Grievance Debate

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:31): I rise today to speak out about the proposed reforms to our emergency services sector and the government's response in regards to the Holloway Review of the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005. I note the very reliable information given to me that the Minister for Emergency Services sent a letter dated 27 July 2014 to volunteer associations, allowing any feedback on the proposed steering committee as to the next stage of the reform process, with comments to be received no later than 5pm on Sunday 3 August 2014.

Well, that's not bad! We have got about three days to review and respond. Obviously, no mail can be delivered on the weekend, so you have to wonder about the level of consultation there in regards to the proposed reforms that the Minister for Emergency Services is putting out there.

I am informed in regards to this reform that this means that the Metropolitan Fire Service will be well and truly covered and their jobs will be safe. They do valuable work in our community—not just here in the city of Adelaide but in Murray Bridge and other regional centres. However, the volunteer associations and the volunteers feel that they will have to justify their jobs. How many volunteers will we lose in this overarching bureaucracy that will be developed as part of this reform process?

This reform, I am told, has the potential to cost \$13 million to rebrand all these organisations, including the Country Fire Service, the State Emergency Service and the Metropolitan Fire Service, if this reform goes ahead—and the people involved are not using the word 'reform' but are using the word 'amalgamation'. What happens to SAFECOM in this process, which is already the overarching organisation in regards to policy planning, governance and resource allocation for our fire and emergency services?

Where is the consultation? I note there have been some so-called consultation meetings in the Adelaide Hills. I know there was one at Mount Gambier. The problem is a lot of volunteers have not been given access to any of these so-called consultation meetings. I note there was not one in my electorate. I just ask: is this is cost-cutting by the government?

What about all the volunteers—the well over 12,000 CFS volunteers alone, of which I am one? When do they get a chance to be part of this so-called reform/amalgamation? It sounds like cost-cutting.

Where is the paper trail of the meetings and briefings held? I am told that, when the minister holds these meetings, he has a whiteboard. He scrawls up some ideas of what is going on. He does not like photos being taken of what is on the whiteboard, and then it is wiped off so there is no record of what has been said at the meetings.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have a point of order.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Given that the member has not attended one of these meetings, I suggest—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. Member for Hammond.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I appreciate your protection. I have had very good advice from people who have attended these meetings. Obviously the minister is a little sensitive. I will note that the Metropolitan Fire Service currently does not have trained staff to manage incidents such as bushfires and storm damage, certainly in the bush areas.

I would like to pay my regards to our Country Fire Service and our SES volunteers. Obviously the CFS evolved from a long and complex partnership between volunteers and local government to meet community safety needs. The CFS response has expanded beyond rural firefighting into road accident rescue and general emergency response, especially where there are no other emergency services.

The volunteer members of the CFS are fundamental to emergency management in South Australia and their value and importance is recognised and highly regarded by the South Australian community. Volunteers and the commitment they bring to the community delivers professional fire and rescue services, and remains the core strength of the CFS. SES volunteers also have a major commitment in road crash rescue, vertical rescue, air search observation, and a whole range of other issues. The biggest problem we have is that if this amalgamation goes ahead, where do the people of the Country Fire Service and the State Emergency Service go—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member's time has expired.

Mr PEDERICK: —to an overarching body to complain if there is an issue with their functions under what the minister has proposed?

COUNCIL ON THE AGEING SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:36): The Council on the Ageing South Australia (COTA SA), as members in here would be aware, is the peak body for promoting the interests of older South Australians. As the member for Taylor said, it is a fantastic organisation. They have over 17,000 individual members and, I am told, at least 250 senior organisations, including clubs, aged-care providers, councils and service and education institutions, bringing the overall membership to more like 60,000 members.

It is sobering to note that South Australia is the second most rapidly ageing state or territory after Tasmania. In the 2011 census results it makes it clear that a significant number of South Australians (some 22.3 per cent) are over the age of 60 years. That will be comforting for some members in this chamber but I still think it is a significant statistic: 22.3 per cent.

When I look at the new seat of Ashford the number of constituents that are over 60 years is significant and I think we have been told for quite some time that the federal seat of Hindmarsh, at one stage, was the seat with the oldest number of people over the age of 60. I think it might be second or third now but, still, that is a significant statistic.

Through an extensive consultation process, COTA has identified some major areas for the government, and that includes all levels of government, to consider. The term that COTA used was 'our top 10 action areas' and that included discrimination and ageism, age-friendly living, employment and volunteering, housing, transport, cost of living, health and wellbeing, support and care, protection and security, and end of life.

I am particularly interested in all of those areas but I should point out that, I guess because of my experience as a trade union official, my area of special interest is employment and volunteering. As was said, there are a number of people over the age of 60 in South Australia. I was told that in 2012, 12 per cent of those aged over 65 years were still in the paid workforce, and this trend is expected to continue. More than one-third of those over 55 are now in the workforce compared with only 25 per cent a year ago. Obviously, older workers are becoming more and more part of the paid workforce.

In terms of volunteering—and, as we know, volunteers, whatever their age, are a significant part of our community—the state government figures tell us that the economic value of volunteering in this state is more than \$4.89 billion annually, and that is based on 2006 data, so presumably it would be much increased in 2014. One area that I do seem to see a number of constituents about is barriers to employment, both paid and unpaid. We know that there is discrimination with regard to insurance.

There is workplace discrimination and inflexible working arrangements. While some of the constituents who I talk to may not have childcare concerns as such—although there are a growing number of grandparents who have childcare responsibilities—they quite often have responsibilities as carers. They are either recognised as carers or are looking after people in the community who they have taken responsibility for. So, the whole issue of carers is certainly raised with me.

It is all very well to talk about upskilling and training, but my understanding is that it is very difficult for people, particularly over the age of 45, to easily access some of the training that is available, and that is a whole other issue that I am passionately involved in and think is worth campaigning for. We are told there is inflexibility in work arrangements and job design. Also, the thing that I think really upsets a lot of constituents who I represent is the lack of recognition and knowledge in decision-making ability.

Time expired.

DYSLEXIA

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:41): I rise today to talk about an issue that is very close to my heart and that of my family, and that is learning difficulties throughout primary and secondary

education and, in particular, dyslexia. Dyslexia is a lifelong language-based learning difficulty, primarily affecting the skills involving accurate and fluent word reading and spelling. There is evidence that there is a small but significant proportion of students who do not catch up in reading, and are not what is termed 'instructional casualties' but identified as children with dyslexia.

There are approaches that have been taken in the UK, the US and Canada, referred to a response to intervention model, which helps to identify these children and how we can help to deal with them. It is estimated that approximately five to 10 per cent of Australian children and adults struggle daily with the implications of dyslexia.

This issue is very close to my heart because it is something that has struck my family in a reasonable way. About half my family exhibit signs of dyslexia, but especially my youngest brother. He is three years younger than me and, growing up, I took time out to try to help teach him how to read. To watch him struggle to rote learn every single word that he learned to read was difficult and it was a struggle. His amazing memory is a testament to how far he has come today. He also had a lot of help from a lot of one-on-one learning both in school and outside of school, especially at the primary school level and, as a family, we tried very hard to help him overcome it.

Having said that, throughout the latter parts of his schooling, my brother was failed by the schooling system. This issue is very difficult to deal with in a classroom setting, and I want to talk a little bit more about that. The reason I want to talk about this issue today is in light of a lot of the manufacturing jobs that we are losing in South Australia. As somebody who comes from a food manufacturing background, we have so many people who come and present for jobs and go into manual labour industries because of their inability to read and write that there is a group of people whose intelligence and talent we are not able to utilise because they have not been able to gain enough skills whilst at school to be able to participate more fully in the workforce. In light of the manufacturing jobs we are losing, it is precisely these people who are going to become more and more vulnerable as the skills required to get the available jobs are skills that they do not have.

In the Barossa and more broadly, there is an action group called DAGBAGS (or Dyslexia Action Group Barossa and Gawler Surrounds) who are really helping to bring this issue and broader learning difficulty issues to light in the Barossa and Gawler areas. DAGBAGS' mission is to equip schools and families to assist and support students with learning difficulties. DAGBAGS recently took out a top accolade at the SA Health Awards and was also a finalist in the community group category of the SA Regional Awards for the Barossa region.

I was lucky enough to meet with Dr Sandra Marshall and Kylie Fotheringham last week as they discussed with me some of the issues personal to their families and how they have gone about trying to educate and make the schools in my area and my electorate more aware of these issues. I want to say, though, that as I go and visit all of my schools within the Barossa, it astounds me how good is the level of education that exists in both the public and the private sector. We do genuinely have a number of world-class educators out there in Schubert and they are doing a fantastic job. The more I talk to them about tackling and dealing with these issues, the more I realise that there is a lot that has been done and a lot more that still needs to be done.

The current model is one where students are taken out of the normal schooling environment. There is a lot of one-on-one learning, but it is often done by LSOs or SSOs as opposed to the qualified teacher. It creates stigma around students who are taken out of classrooms and it creates a real perception issue that we need to get over. I think that there is a better model of differentiated learning where up to a quarter of the students within a classroom are under a differentiated model, identifying ways that dyslexic and other students with learning disabilities learn. There are better ways that we can go about helping this group within society to be able to achieve into the future.

TAIWAN

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:46): I just rise today to talk briefly about a recent trip to Taiwan that I made, and I must declare that it was as a guest of the government of Taiwan that I was able to travel there. It struck me, having been there for the second time now, that it has been and remains a particularly remarkable society. It is one of our larger trading partners as a country, one of Australia's larger trading partners and obviously a consumer of raw materials: coal, iron ore and others.

Having not much in the way of their own resources and a country that is approximately half the size of Tasmania, of which only 30 per cent of the land can be actually used for settlement and agriculture—despite that, they have still managed to build one of the larger economies in the world and a remarkably free society. It is free in the best senses of the word, in that they are free to go about their business, to have a truly free press, and they have free and fair elections. It has not always been that way, of course, but they have gradually come from what was essentially a dictatorship.

After the civil war in 1949, they removed themselves to Taiwan from the mainland and have progressed from essentially a dictatorship to an interesting democracy to what is now a truly free and fair democracy. It is a remarkable thing to see, because it is not often that that transition is made painlessly—well, maybe not painlessly, but smoothly and in the absence of violence—in the way that Taiwan did. Citizens there are free to go about their business, to build businesses, to become artists and to do the full gamut of human activity and endeavour. They are a free society with freedom of association and freedom of religion; all of these things that we value in Western society they have, and it is a wonderful thing to see in this day and age.

We were able to do a number of things while we were there and we had some pretty decent briefings, particularly on the first day. Mainland Affairs Council got their briefing on the relationship with China—or mainland China, as they call it—and the interesting thing is that I was last there in 2006 and there was at some time—under President Chen Shui-bian—talk of holding a referendum on independence from China. That was causing some consternation inside mainland China and there was quite a bit of tension between the two societies of mainland China and Taiwan. That tension has lessened.

There has been a change in government and President Ma has taken a different approach and has sought to engage less confrontationally with mainland China. They have had 10 negotiations and as a result of that you have seen 21 significant agreements on things like flights in and out of mainland China and Taiwan and free movement of money and investments—a whole range of agreements.

There is greater interaction between mainland China and Taiwan such that there are now 2.8 million tourists a year coming from mainland China to Taiwan. If you consider that the population of Taiwan is about the same as Australia at 23 million—remembering their 23 million are occupying 20 per cent of a land half the size of Tasmania—you are looking at more than 10 per cent of the population of Taiwan in tourists coming from mainland China and returning every year. It is quite a substantial interaction they are having with 40 per cent of their exports now going to mainland China. Taiwan is a significant investor in mainland China being one of the biggest sources of foreign investment into China.

Time expired.

ZONTA RIVERLAND WOMEN IN BUSINESS AWARDS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:52): Today I rise to highlight the fantastic work in Chaffey—in the Riverland and Mallee—being done by a passionate and committed community—our dedicated women in business. On Saturday the Riverland hosted the 2014 Zonta Riverland Women in Business Awards recognising Riverland and Mallee women who have achieved at the highest level in the local business community.

These individuals are role models and leaders in the community and these awards highlight the important role that women play in our businesses and the community social structures and recognise the growing participation of women at the highest levels, particularly in South Australian small business and in regional areas. The awards aim to:

- encourage women to advance in their business and reward their achievements;
- identify and showcase role models for other women;
- provide inspirational and motivational support;
- encourage networking and advancement through personal and professional development; and

- highlight the importance of women in our business and social community.

I would like to commend the Zonta Club of the Riverland on its initiative to host these awards and the volunteer hours and effort that goes into organising and judging such an event. It is an outstanding opportunity to recognise and reward women for their efforts in the regions, particularly in the business community.

The awards celebrate the high quality of candidates received by judges which is held on a biennial basis. The major award winner for this year was Koula Papageorgiou, owner of Dimples Boutique in Berri and Renmark. I know Koula and she is a remarkable woman. Her shop is open seven days a week, 12 hours a day. She is there for the community and to help women in business. My passing interest has been that she is not just there to sell fashion; she is there to give advice and to be a mentor to not only the young women, but to all women who come into her shop. I think that is a testament to why her business is so successful and why she has been there for 22 years. So we thank Koula.

Dimitria Dale of Andrew and Dale Solicitors was the Business Owner runner-up. Nicole Bratis of Pure Skin Beauty Therapy was the Young Achiever winner. It is great to see so many young women having a go at running a small business. In my time in the Riverland, once upon a time, young women used to only go out to work for someone else. Over time, things have changed, yes. These young women have got the confidence now to enter the workplace, set up a business and have a go, so it is great to see. Chelsea Ling of Riverland Physiotherapy Works was the runner-up for the Young Achiever Award.

Erica Babbage from Banrock Station Wine and Wetland Centre is well known to many in the area. Obviously, many people visit the Banrock Wetland Centre, and she is always a friendly face who meets and greets and who offers people an experience at the centre. Lyn Bretag from Renmark Primary School was named the Business Manager runner-up. I think it is vital to have strong business leaders and managers. Lyn often says that it is not only about her being a principal of a primary school, but it is also about her being a great mentor to those students at that school. I think her work has been outstanding over an extended period of time.

I would like to see further government incentives to increase the uptake of apprentices and trainees, and in doing so this would support small businesses. We often hear about these incentive programs for apprentices and trainees. I was listening to one of our federal ministers on radio last night who said that on average 50 per cent of apprentices and trainees across Australia drop out. I think that is a terrible indictment on the support given to apprentices and trainees. Obviously, there is not enough incentive for employers to take on the burden of an apprentice or a trainee, and that needs to be improved. It is important to continue to recognise the hard work of our female business leaders. Once again, I commend everyone involved with the Zonta club and these fantastic awards.

Time expired.

HEALTH SERVICES, SOUTHERN SUBURBS

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (15:57): I rise today to talk about health services in my electorate and in the southern suburbs of Adelaide and some of the threats to services in the area. I was lucky enough to visit some of the health services and hospitals in the last week before parliament sat. In particular, I visited the Aldinga GP Plus clinic, the Noarlunga Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre. It was a good opportunity to meet some of the fantastic doctors and nurses who provide such great care for our community.

I was very impressed at the Aldinga GP Plus clinic, firstly at how busy the waiting room was first thing in the morning. There are clearly a lot of services being offered there. After-hours GP services are offered from the clinic, which is very popular in Aldinga. They started off there when there were very few GP services in the area. There are now more available, which is fantastic, but those after-hour services are there for the community as well. There is a whole range of other specialists who come to visit and use the facilities, such as paediatricians and allied health services, including dietitians. It was good to meet with Nicole Keller and Lynda Hamilton.

I was then lucky enough to visit Noarlunga Hospital with the member for Reynell. We met with Joe MacDonald and Kathy Egel. It is an increasingly busy hospital at Noarlunga, in the surgery

and medical wards and the emergency department. It services a large area of the state, stretching from the southern suburbs around Noarlunga all the way down to the Fleurieu. People come to Noarlunga Hospital for treatment.

What really struck me there was that when we visited the medical ward, which is very busy this time of year, there were 15 patients who were ready to leave. They had had their treatment and were ready to be discharged into appropriate care, whether that be aged care or rehabilitation services. But they were waiting at the hospital before leaving to go to those services. Those beds were being used by patients who could otherwise have been cared for in the aged-care or rehabilitation sectors.

I think that really highlighted for me that a hospital system is not just confined to what is within the boundaries of those hospitals but are really connected to the other services, particularly those run by the commonwealth, either in primary health care or aged care, and that, to get an efficient, affordable hospital system, we need investments in those other parts of the health system too.

We then visited Flinders Medical Centre, and we were given a tour by Belinda Moyes, the chief executive there. It was great to see the new emergency department, which is a great redevelopment which has happened in recent years. It has much better facilities for patients and for medical and nursing staff, as well as its having a great new paediatric emergency department, which is a separate unit for children and which is appropriately established for children's needs. That has not been in place before and, given the huge number of children who visit Flinders Medical Centre for emergency visits, it is well needed. In fact, Flinders is now the busiest emergency department in Australia, and it has a huge number of patients visiting every year, particularly in this winter period.

We also visited the intensive care unit, which is also very large and which handles a number of the very complex cases, and we saw the new birthing unit which this government has invested in, which provides very modern facilities for mothers having their babies.

Unfortunately, there are a whole range of cuts that are threatening the public hospitals in this state, particularly in the southern suburbs of Adelaide. As we know, the federal government has cut \$50 billion worth of health funding over the next 10 years, and that is because they have removed the fifty-fifty growth agreement that was in place between the commonwealth and the states, so that the commonwealth would fund 50 per cent of the growth in health expenditure, which, as we know, continues to go up and up and up.

That equals \$5.5 billion worth of funding for South Australia over those 10 years, which is a huge impact upon the hospitals in this state, and the hospitals in my area will not be immune from those cuts should they go ahead. There is also the \$7 co-charge, which will increase the number of people visiting emergency departments, and that is not just on GP visits but on blood tests, diagnostic tests and a whole range of other areas.

Time expired.

Ministerial Statement

SITE CONTAMINATION, HENDON AREA

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (16:02): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to site contamination at Hendon made earlier today in another place by the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation..

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (16:02): Earlier today, the member for Hammond, during his grievance, made a couple of assertions which I would say are incorrect. It is unfortunate—

Mr PEDERICK: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He can make a ministerial statement, which is what he is doing.

Mr PEDERICK: Has he sought leave?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave is sought?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes, madam.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave is granted, minister.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. As I have mentioned, the member for Hammond made a number of assertions, during his grievance earlier today, regarding the review of the emergency services sector, which I am undertaking in response to the Holloway report, which was tabled in parliament late last year.

It is unfortunate that the member for Hammond has made a number of assertions, given that he has not attended any of the briefings I have provided or any of the round tables, so he is actually working on hearsay evidence. He could have asked the member for Goyder, the member for Mount Gambier—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Morialta has a point of order. What is your point of order?

Mr GARDNER: The convention of the house is that ministerial statements are circulated as they are being read, so I ask that this be done in this case.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that this is it coming down the pathway now, is it?

Mr PEDERICK: I don't think it is, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You don't think it is.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Madam Deputy Speaker, the statement will follow. As I said, the member for Hammond could have asked the member for Goyder, the member for Mount Gambier or the member for Finnis, who have attended the round tables or, alternatively, a number of Liberal staffers who have also attended these forums. So, to suggest that somehow I did not consult him in the open is a pretty weak case put by him. The second point he made is that I have not consulted widely on the consultation process completed, and to give an indication of the places I have actually visited and the people I have spoken with. I have attended:

- the MFS Murray Bridge;
- the CFS Murray Bridge;
- the SES Murray Bridge;
- the SAAS Murray Bridge;
- the SAAS Taillem Bend;
- the CFS Taillem Bend;
- the CFS Jervois (I think that is in your electorate, Member for Hammond; I think that is correct. In fact, one of the members from that CFS actually attended more than one of these forums);
- the CFS Jamestown;
- the MFS/SES complex in the Riverland;
- the CFS Waikerie;
- the CFS Napperby;
- the MFS Port Pirie;
- the SES Port Pirie;
- the CFS Parndana;
- the SES/CFS Kingscote;

- the VMR at Kingscote;
- the CFS Naracoorte;
- CFS Group HQ at Naracoorte;
- CFS/SES Mount Gambier;
- MFS Mount Gambier;
- CFS Ardrossan;
- CFS/SES Maitland;
- CFS Port Victoria;
- RVCP at Port Victoria;
- CFS/SES Port Lincoln; and
- MFS Port Lincoln.

I have held forums in Barmera, Port Augusta, Clare, Noarlunga, Belair, Kangaroo Island, Mawson Lakes, Hahndorf, Mount Gambier, Maitland and Port Lincoln. In addition, SAFECOM HQ staff there, also CFS/SES HQ staff, MFS HQ staff, SES unit managers, also the MR Council. I have also visited the Coromandel Valley CFS, Concordia CFS, the AVCG new vessel launch, and the MFS Gawler. Through this whole process I have been engaging with the volunteer sector to discuss with them the proposed review. Regarding the other assertion that I somehow prohibited the taking of cameras, there were photographs taken by a whole range of people at these forums. They came out—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am sure there was; that is fine. I did not in any way, as asserted, try to persuade people otherwise. If members do not believe me they can ask the members who did attend, like the member for Finnis, the member for Goyder and the member for Mount Gambier. They were there; they can actually put it correctly regarding whether I did or did not. In fact, one of the pictures was taken by a journalist, because it appeared in the *Port Lincoln Times* this week. So to suggest that this process has not been open or transparent is just a nonsense. It is unfortunate—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order. The minister has spoken for another seven minutes since advising that copies of the ministerial statement were, in fact, on their way. I note that he is wrapping up, he is straying from his script, so I assume that what he is about to say does not form part of that ministerial statement—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think he has finished—

Mr GARDNER: —which I am sure is on its way now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you nearly finished, minister?

Mr Pengilly: He sure is.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Finnis, let us just listen to the end of the statement.

Mr GARDNER: Madam Deputy Speaker, if he has not finished—as was your suggestion—can I ask you to rule on whether the convention of the house that materials be provided is, in fact, supposed to be maintained?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You know it is, and I have taken him at his word that it is on its way. What can I do? If you told me something I would have to take it—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Two things: first of all—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am on my feet! It has been a very exciting time for you this afternoon, but all I can say is that he has told me it is on its way and I am taking him at his word. I said I would take you at your word. He is finishing shortly, aren't you minister?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Hammond!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Madam Deputy Speaker, this is actually in the *Hansard*, it is actually on the record, so I cannot see what the fuss is. Secondly, it will be on its way.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEDERICK: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. The convention of the house—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are right.

Mr PEDERICK: —is that if someone wants to make a ministerial statement they need to provide copies to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are right; we have already gone through that. The minister has finished his remarks. The Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation has something to say.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2014

Estimates Committees

Adjourned debate on motion:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before you commence, member for Morialta, we are having trouble with this gizmo, but there is a gizmo over here that we are all watching that gives you eight minutes. That gizmo is not working: this one is. We have you down for eight minutes, and you can send your deputy over if he wants to watch. Your time starts now.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:09): I cannot help but feel aggrieved because, at least in the old days when we had the ticking timer, we had something to keep an eye on.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I know.

Mr GARDNER: I have so much I want to say that eight minutes is—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! You are wasting ten seconds.

Mr GARDNER: Prior to the luncheon, question time, grievances and whatever that was from the minister's adjournment, I was talking about the prisoner numbers as opposed to total beds in South Australia. We had identified over 12 years of Labor that, especially after it had cancelled the public-private partnership in 2008-09 which saw, in fact, the government having to pay out \$10 million to the private sector as a result of failure to meet that contract, the then deputy premier Kevin Foley said that the government was going to respond and deal with it by 'racking, packing and stacking' prisoners.

Well, for five years they have racked, they have packed, they have stacked and there is no longer any room to rack, pack and stack anymore. They have racked, packed and stacked as much as can be done and, in 2016, we have identified that the average daily prisoner population will supersede the approved capacity of the number of beds.

There are, in fact, a total of 65 surge beds and then 34 of what was described as 'additional surge beds', so I would assume that, given the nature of where they are at Holden Hill, Sturt and Port Augusta Prison infirmary, they are only a last resort. The watch house, which is the main surge venue, was occupied for 308 days last year. So, when we have actually got a higher average daily prisoner population than we have beds in the regular capacity, you can assume that the watch house will be full all the time.

At the same time, we have issues of staff cuts. So, there are significant problems with the capacity of prison numbers, and there is nowhere else to rack, pack and stack anyone. Mr Brown, the fine CEO of the department, identified that there are 1,696.6 FTE staff working in the department, and we know from the budget papers that the 2014-15 budget identifies that that will be cut to 1,632.3 staff. Minister Piccolo identified that there will be increased use of prisoner labour for some activities, so there will be savings of 12 to 15 FTEs through that.

There will be Community Corrections savings of 3.5 to 4.5 FTEs, and they are currently negotiating and reviewing the prison rosters from which they are hoping to save 26 to 34 FTEs. It was also identified that 25 trainees had just come online, so there certainly will not be the capacity to have any more trainees coming out in 12 months' time, otherwise they will breach their limit. So, that is where the 60 staff cuts are coming from, at a time when prisoner capacity is increasing to the point when it is going to be overflowing the prison beds available.

The minister identified no plan as to how to fix this problem. He identified what the problem was, and I am pleased that he was willing to admit that figure—it was one of the things that they did not take on notice—but there are no plans to fix it. We asked the question: is the government considering any plan that would involve using beds at either of the juvenile justice facilities at Cavan? While the minister said no, he refused to rule it out.

Two days later, having seen this issue come up in the Corrections estimates, knowing that this was a concern for the opposition, we had the minister responsible for youth justice (the honourable Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion) facing estimates. In her testimony, she was asked four times to rule it out. Four times, she was asked if she could rule it out. The closest we got was a referral to Peter Bull from the department that identified there were no plans to do so in the current financial year—the 2014 financial year.

I asked: what about future financial years? Mr Bull said that will be a policy decision for the government. Six times, we asked ministers in estimates to rule it out. It took until the following day, the Thursday on the radio, when minister Piccolo (the Minister for Correctional Services) was finally able to do so.

It was only as a result of this sincere questioning by the opposition that the government was able to rule out using our youth prisons, which are entirely inappropriate for holding prisoners sentenced as adults, but it took three days to get there, and we still do not have the plan for how they are going to manage the significant concerns about overcrowding and beds just not being available. I look forward to the government's response, and I am sure that the Treasurer looks forward to the application from the minister that is surely to come.

However, in the meantime, the minister has 60 staff cuts to make and no outlined definition, no agreement with the union and is not able to answer the union's concerns at this stage about where that is going to come from—sincere concerns. In fact, when the member for Bragg and I visited the Remand Centre last week one of the units we visited was locked down because of a lack of staffing in the space. It is all very well to keep increasing prisoner numbers, but the government has to face the critical crisis that is of its own making where it has cancelled the PPP, paid out the private company for not being able to go through with the PPP, and not having any long-term plan to manage the bed numbers.

One of the things that is critical in this space is rehabilitation, of course, and the reason rehabilitation is important is that ideally we would like to reduce the recidivism rate. We would like to try to use the time that people are in the prison—that is eight hours a day in their cell, potentially—to make them better members of society when they come out.

We identified that there were 65 people, I think, in the last financial year who undertook the three main rehabilitation programs: one of them is Making Changes, having a focus on substance abuse; one is the Violence Prevention Program, having a focus on murderers and other high level and serial violent offenders; and the other is the Sexual Behaviour Clinic, which speaks for itself.

However, the Abuse Prevention Program—identified on the department's website as being the key driver to fix problems related to offenders with domestic violence related offences—actually does not exist. It is on the website, but it is not in the prisons. This is of sincere concern, because

there are many domestic violence related offenders in our prisons who we really need to be putting through a program such as this so that they are less likely to reoffend when they come out.

On the website it is identified as a 24-week program. When we asked about it in estimates it was identified as a 10-week program, actually not in the prisons but in Community Corrections, and it was only a pilot program that finished last year and they have not got around to finishing the evaluation as yet. There are sincere concerns in this area. The opposition is not satisfied that the government has any plan to deal with the concerns available.

We look forward to, in the coming months or maybe the coming years, seeing some sort of plan from the government. In the coming weeks we hope to see some sort of outcome to the negotiations with the union. Frankly, the minister needs to do a lot more before he is going to inspire confidence in the opposition or, indeed, in the community that he has any clue as to what he is doing.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (16:17): I move:

That the remainder of the bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (16:17): I move—

An honourable member: That the bill be read a third time?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I appreciate the bipartisan assistance. I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BUDGET MEASURES BILL 2014

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 July 2014.)

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:18): My submission was abruptly terminated last time. It was a shame, because I was beginning to get some momentum, but I will aim to close with the same amount of gusto. In summary, this is an appalling bill, and I will certainly be opposing the Budget Measures Bill in relation to the car park tax 2014.

I honestly call on the government to retract it and stop this atrocious levy on parking spaces within the Adelaide CBD. There are many reasons: first, to reiterate, this is a tax that is not only going to hurt small business but it is going to hurt students, it is going to hurt retailers, it is going to hurt parents, and it is going to hurt anyone who goes into the city and parks their car. The government does not have a mandate to pass this bill. It only got 47 per cent of the two-party preferred vote. Let's not forget that.

They think they can come in here when they claim to be trying to grow the economy and what are they going to do? They are going to punish people for coming into the city. That is hardly the way to grow the economy and to instil more confidence in consumers and retailers who are already struggling in the economic state that this government has cast its eye over. This is a tax on middle class South Australia—as I said, the mums and dads, and the students.

Mr Knoll: The forgotten people.

Mr TARZIA: The forgotten people—exactly right, member for Schubert, the forgotten people. The aspirational middle class, because this government thinks—

Mr Knoll: Working families.

Mr TARZIA: Working families—exactly right. This government thinks that people who drive cars are rich. You know what, they are not rich, and I will tell you why: because there are a lot of people who cannot use public transport services because they are not good enough, which the member for Lee oversees. This car park tax is going to hit these people who go to university in the city. They have no other way of getting there, so what do they have to do? They have to use their cars. I ask the government to listen to retailers, to the students and to the parents who are going to be hit by this tax. It is a disgraceful tax.

We have heard not only from opposition members but also industry experts in relation to this bill both here and interstate on the effect that it has had interstate. There is nothing more punitive than to put another tax in the city. How do you expect more money to flow into the city when you are punishing people for coming here? When the government was looking at introducing the bill, Nathan Paine, the executive director of the Property Council of Australia, said in May 2013 that this tax is designed to reduce the number of people driving into the city.

To wind up, I cannot support this bill. This is a bill that attacks middle class South Australia and there is no way that I am going to stand here on behalf of the residents of Hartley and support such a bill when I want this state to grow and flourish. I want to support retailers, students and middle class South Australia, and that is why I cannot support this bill.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (16:21): Often it is the tragedy of parliament that the old convince the young that they know better. I look at the future of the Liberal Party and, other than having a quiet laugh to myself, I think to myself, 'One day they will be in positions perhaps here on Treasury benches and they are following blindly off a cliff a precedent being set by a group of shadow ministers who have lost four elections in a row.' From those four elections, they have learned nothing. They make their speeches bravely about how they will defend middle class South Australia, whatever that is, by opposing the executive's right to impose levies and taxes.

I say this to members opposite who are now saying that the executive has no right to assert its own budget: if you wish to bring in that type of political system into this state, you are breaking years and years of precedent, and we will pay you back in spades, because you will not always be on opposition benches. One day you will be in government—members directly opposite probably never will be, but members at the back may be. However, if the young want to blindly follow the old and follow them off the cliff—because there is a definition of stupidity. If you do one thing and it does not work, and you continue to do it over and over and over again, and you do not change your actions, well, that is just stupid. It has been said of the Liberal Party that not only are they stupid but they are stupid often.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Militant stupidity.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Militant stupidity. It seems to me that there are younger members of the Liberal Party who want to govern, who want to lead and who want to implement their vision of liberalism in this state, but they are being held back by the tactics and the same political strategies of the old men who run the Liberal Party who have failed them. Remember that they won the largest landslide election in South Australian and indeed Australian history in 1993 and were out of government in 2002, after being in a minority government four years later. These are the same men and the same strategies that they are following now. I say to the young men at the back and the new members who want to one day be in government that you are setting a dangerous precedent by following the old through the same tactics that have failed you in the past, but by all means, following the principles of *The Art of War*, if your enemy is acting stupidly, do not get in their way.

Before closing the debate, I want to say a few things about Treasury and the public servants who have formulated not only the Budget Measures Bill but also the Appropriation Bill. I did not have a chance to thank them in my budget speech to the parliament, but can I just say that all members of the house would be truly proud if they could see the work that they do behind the scenes: the hours away from their families, the time that they spend making sure that they deliver the very best budget they can within the frameworks that their political masters set. These are people who do not think politically and do not act politically but act in the very best interests of the people of South

Australia. They are truly a credit to the Public Service and I hope all members realise the hard work they do. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Consideration of clauses 1 and 2 postponed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clauses 4 to 23.

Mr MARSHALL: I will be moving to delete these clauses.

The CHAIR: So your intention is actually to vote against clause 4?

Mr MARSHALL: Correct.

The CHAIR: Do you wish to speak to that?

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, Chair. I think that I have already outlined the opposition's case regarding the imposition of the Transport Development Levy in previous contributions to this house. I would just be happy if we could put the amendment.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I might start by asking some questions of the mover of the amendment and then make some comment. First of all, can I say by way of background that the Leader of the Opposition has asked me questions in the house on this subject and I chose not to answer the question at the time but to refer it to the Treasurer. I presume that because the leader has asked a question of me in the house he has invited me to reflect on decisions that I may have made when I was a member of the opposition, and I presume he wants me to go into why I supported the opposition's position on the car parking tax and why I might now have a different view. I am going to take this opportunity to explain to the leader, since he asked me the question, why that is.

I start by making it clear, as he would know, that from the very outset I had some concerns about whether this was a wise position to take, that is, opposing the car parking tax. He would know that I shared that view with him and others in the shadow cabinet. My argument was—as he would know, since he is asking a question about it—that I thought other taxes were causing more pain to the broader community, particularly payroll tax and land tax, and that before we decided to oppose a car parking tax we should give some consideration to what our policy might be on payroll and land tax and even motor vehicle registration fees and certain other fees that were hurting the average punter.

My argument was that the people using car parks in the CBD are not the broad community. Certainly for people living in regional communities—if you are on Kangaroo Island or Eyre Peninsula or Yorke Peninsula or in the Mid North—you would not be using that central car parking facility all that often. Similarly, if you are a single mum living in Mitchell Park, or a low-income family living in Elizabeth, you might not be coming into town to park at the DJ's car park (or wherever it might be) but what does worry you are your electricity bill and your water bill—some of the other taxes and charges which you have to pay that everyone pays.

My argument was that we should look at that first rather than oppose this. Perhaps we should let this go through and take the revenue from the car parking tax and use it to deliver land tax reform or to get the punters' land taxes or other taxes down so that they were better off, because I think they were the people who were really hurting. However, I lost that argument and subsequently showed the discipline and supported the opposition on the car parking tax.

Since the leader has asked me that question I wanted to get it on the record that I had some concerns about this from the outset. I am free to share those concerns again, and I make the point that I would think that, of all the taxes and charges that the people of South Australia have to pay, this would not be the first I would pick to reduce, cut or amend. I think the average punter out there is suffering quite a bit, as I have mentioned, and this one is quite targeted.

Others have spoken as to why Adelaide is well served with car parks and well served with these arrangements; the public transport system is there to carry people. Why? For a host of reasons. The community can probably take this car parking levy ahead of an increase in, say, payroll tax or land tax or some other device that would really hurt the average punter, because I am thinking about the people who cannot afford to come in and park in the city because they cannot even afford to own a car in some cases, and let us think about them.

Since I was asked the question I am responding to it, and I am indicating in regard to this amendment that I think it is unwise to attempt to interfere with this levy. I will add that I think that the fact that these car parks are owned by some wealthy individuals or entities who ran a political campaign, in effect, prior to the election might have had some influence on decisions people have taken.

Mr Marshall: I beg your pardon?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, I know that they played a consideration in decisions that were taken.

Mr Marshall: In what way?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, since the leader is asking me, I will respond. As he well knows, there were discussions in various forums within the Liberal Party about the very fact that the people who own those car parks were prepared to run an advertising campaign against the car parking tax.

Mr Marshall: Are you suggesting that I was prepared to change my position because of a political donation to the party?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: No, I would not go so far as to suggest that—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —but what I will say to the leader—and he knows it to be a fact—is that he himself raised the fact that these wealthy car park owners were prepared to run an advertising campaign against the tax and that that might be a good thing. He did raise that. He knows he did raise that.

Personal Explanation

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:35): I would like to make a personal explanation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you seeking leave to make a personal explanation?

Mr MARSHALL: I'm absolutely seeking leave.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave is sought; is leave granted?

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Is this the right time?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm only going by my advice. What is your—

Mr MARSHALL: The comments which have been made by the member for Waite are completely and utterly extraordinary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Were you misrepresented?

Mr MARSHALL: Completely and utterly misrepresented in this parliament. I am—

The Hon. P. Caica: How are you going to prove it?

Mr MARSHALL: I beg your pardon?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Apparently you just need to say why you have been misrepresented and how it misrepresented you.

Mr MARSHALL: Because the statements that have been made by the member for Waite are completely and utterly inaccurate. What he has asserted today in the parliament is that the Liberal Party changed its position regarding the imposition of this tax based upon political donations. That is—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am advised there is no debate; you can just put that on record.

Mr MARSHALL: And I completely and utterly reject the assertion which is being made by the member for Waite, and if he has got any proof whatsoever he needs to substantiate it.

Bills

BUDGET MEASURES BILL 2014

Committee Stage

Debate resumed.

The CHAIR: Okay. Minister.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you. Of course—and it is not unusual—the Leader of the Opposition has completely either misunderstood or mistaken my remarks. I did not mention the word donations. Donations are quite a different thing to a group of businesspeople being prepared to fund and advertise an advertising campaign against a tax which was going to hurt their financial interests. That is what I said. And we all know—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, if you want to use that sort of language, leader, you might get a response, because we all know—

Mr Marshall: So now you're coming into the parliament threatening?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I'm not threatening anyone; I am simply stating the facts.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: No; I simply said you might get a response. You're the one—

Mr Marshall: That is a threat.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, I'm glad 'a response' is now a threat. Listen carefully, leader—just listen carefully—because you well know that an advertising campaign was run against this tax by financial interests who own the car parks.

Mr Marshall: The Adelaide City Council.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, you know the advertising campaign was run because it ran publicly and openly, and I am simply saying—

Mr Marshall: What are you asserting?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I think that was perceived to be—I know for a fact that was perceived to be—in the political interests of the Liberal Party, because it was an advertising campaign being run by the business community against the car parking tax. It was, in effect, free advertising, I suppose you could say, against the government; so why would one want to get in the way of that, the argument went. Why would we not be seen to oppose it? We were getting pressure to agree to oppose the car parking tax so the Liberal Party could be fuelling this campaign.

Now, you asked me the question, leader; I did not offer this information. You came into the parliament shortly after my decision to join the government and you asked me whether I still supported the car parking tax, and in so doing you invited me to reflect on those decisions. I have now reflected, and I am telling you what happened. I could go into a lot more detail, because I could

probably give you the date, the meeting and the place when that was openly discussed. Members opposite know very well the discussions that went on, and I was around the table with them, so do not try to deny it.

I am not suggesting that the opposition is not genuine in its opposition to this tax—alright? Frankly, I do not like any new tax. If you ask me objectively, I would be opposing this tax increase and any other tax increase, because I do not like tax increases. In a perfect world I would like to see no tax increases; but if you ask me to choose between this one and some other tax increases that I think would be far more hurtful to far more people I would choose this one ahead of, for example, land tax, where I know members of the leader's own electorate are in significant pain. I am simply making the point—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: You can interject as much as you like, leader, but I will just say this: I have made decisions that I have made, and one of them is not to belt up the Liberal Party. But I will say this: you ask me questions, be prepared for the answers. If you come in here and ask me whether I still support the car parking tax, I will tell you. If you invite me to reflect on decisions made when I was a member of the opposition, I will reflect on those decisions. But if you do not invite it by attacking me, you will not get the response.

I will say this: I know for a fact that a very big influence on the Liberal Party's considerations when it decided to oppose this tax was the knowledge that business interests would be running an independent advertising campaign against the tax, which was perceived to be in the political interests of the opposition. I know that for a fact, and so does every member opposite. So, let's just get that truth out on the table.

If you want me to reflect on those things, I will. But I simply say that I lacked confidence in this decision from the outset. I also add that I think that it would have been much better to look at land tax, payroll tax and some of the other taxes first. Can I also say that I think that it would have been better to consider an overall tax reform plan, as an opposition, rather than to cherrypick this one first, another point I made at the time, so that we had a balanced approach to tax reform.

We knew what we wanted to do for land tax, payroll tax and other tax concessions, we understood where the parking tax levy fitted into that and came out with a balanced array of offerings, rather than to run into this, which we did, months before other tax reforms were offered. I am simply making that point because you asked me a question. I make this point: if the opposition wants to ask me any question that invites me to reflect on decisions made when I was a member of the opposition, be prepared for the answers. There is a further reason why I will be opposing this measure. Although I do not like it, and I freely admit that I do not like it, I am opposing your amendment.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: If you would like to listen intelligently—

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —you might benefit from the contribution.

The CHAIR: Order! I think we all know what the minister meant.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: The other reason is that I have made a commitment to the government and to the Premier that I will support the government's budget, that I will support the government on supply and confidence. You may not like it, but this is part of the government's budget plan. I make this point in the firm view that it is extraordinarily important that this government reaches a surplus. I know that the Treasurer understands that, I know the Premier understands that, and I did hear the leader, in his earlier contribution, signal that he also thought that was important—and it is. Frankly, it will be difficult, but it must be done.

If the committee supports the amendment moved by the leader, we will be blowing a massive hole in that proposed budget surplus of over \$100 million. Last time I checked, \$100 million was an awful lot of money. So, if the leader would like to suggest an alternative to that \$100 million—does he have a suggestion as to where that \$100 million might come from?

Mr Marshall: Yes, further savings. We have outlined—

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Further savings? Well, would he like to outline \$100 million worth of savings right now?

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, but in the context of his amendment, would he like to come forward specifically with a proposal—not a general one—that adds up to exactly the same amount of money that he is proposing to slash out of the budget with this measure? If he is, I would be very happy to hear it—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —because the important part about running a budget is that, before you remove revenue, you need to find a saving. It is called balancing the books.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Actually, I can share with you that the Treasurer is already very sick of my making this point in cabinet, if I can reveal that confidence. Believe me, they have their worst nightmare—an Independent Liberal in their own cabinet room, and I keep harping on about tax reform and WorkCover reform, small business and a few other things. I am like a record that does not stop. So, I am already driving the poor old Treasurer mad, but that is what happens when you have a Liberal in your party room. I must say—

An honourable member: Party room?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: In your cabinet, I should say; thank you for correcting me. In your cabinet, I beg your pardon. He is already sick of me banging on about this, and he already knows that if he tries to lift any more taxes I will probably rugby tackle him. However, to be fair, this car parking tax and the amendment we are discussing, along with some of the other measures in the budget, have been tough decisions for a Labor government to make, particularly decisions about cuts to health and particularly the decisions that I know will be forthcoming soon about WorkCover that were promised prior to the election.

It would have been very easy to further run up the credit card and run us further into debt, but the government held its nerve on this issue. I do not like the car parking tax any more than I like any other tax. I would like a world where we paid the bare minimum, and I am sure every member of the house would, but I do not want to see the punters faced with higher electricity or water bills, higher registration fees, or suffering small businesses paying higher land tax or small businesses paying even higher payroll tax because a \$100 million hole has been blasted in the budget and something else needs to be cranked up. I do not want to see our health system or our education system suffer any further than they are already as a result of \$100 million worth of cuts having to be taken out because this amendment was agreed to.

That is not to say that there is no scope for further government efficiency: there is. That is another thing I am driving the Treasurer nuts about, but that is something the cabinet is working on. However, I would say that blowing a \$100 million hole in the budget is not the way to do it. To summarise, I was uncomfortable with opposing this from the outset. The leader knows that, and so do others in the shadow cabinet. I argued against opposing it; I felt that other tax cuts were more important.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: That is, I am afraid. If you would like me to come in with the dates of the shadow cabinet meetings, not only—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, you were.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, where was I?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Was I? Because we had a very lengthy discussion about it—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I beg your pardon?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The CHAIR: Order! The Treasurer has a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I ask that the Leader of the Opposition withdraw the word 'lied'.

The CHAIR: Yes, I heard the word 'liar'. Leader?

Mr MARSHALL: I withdraw that comment.

The Hon. P. Caica: Stand up when you are talking; come on.

Mr MARSHALL: We are in committee.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. P. Caica: He can show a bit of respect, can't he?

The CHAIR: Order! The leader has withdrawn the offensive word.

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Madam Chair, this has been a defining moment in the parliament—

The CHAIR: We need to move on.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —because now I know who tells the truth and who doesn't. That is the first time the leader has directly or indirectly said something that I know and he knows is not true.

The CHAIR: Before we go on I want to make sure that everyone understands—

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! Are you listening? Listening sticks over here. We are talking about clauses 4 to 23 inclusive, that they be deleted. Does anyone else need to speak on these clauses 4 to 23?

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIR: If you put clause 4 through it is a test clause, and they all go through. So we just need to make sure everyone is happy.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I want to thank the member for Waite for his support in opposition to the opposition's amendments, and make this remark to the opposition. There has been a fine tradition in this parliament—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You can sit or stand, whatever you like.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Follow my example—

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Let's all just get along; follow my example.

The CHAIR: Could we return to the bill?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Madam Chair, I think it is important to remember that there has been a fine tradition in this parliament, displayed by past Liberal oppositions and Labor oppositions as well as the current Liberal opposition, to allow the government to set its budget.

There has been talk of mandate on both sides and I understand the arguments, but the reality is this: the government was able to form a majority in the House of Assembly. We are the executive. We have set a budget. The precedent that you are setting by attempting to remove this revenue measure from our budget will haunt you because there will be a time when you will form government and you will attempt to impose revenue measures.

I plead with members opposite to think of future Liberal governments and future Labor governments in a state of our size—that we have a legislature that allows the passage of budgets unfettered. It has been a very good guiding principle, one set by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford and followed by subsequent premiers ever since. I think it is very important that we take a moment of pause. The election is over. The Liberal Party can relitigate its case at the next election. I think it is an important principle that we stand on here.

I think the Independent members of the government have stated that the government, the executive, is entitled to set its budget. If you attempt to change it—if you attempt to change revenue measures, if you attempt to change royalties and you attempt to change the way the measures are set without the corresponding savings or other budget measures—you are guilty of what you accuse us of and you are changing the way we govern. I say this to you, without it sounding like a threat: we will pay you back in spades.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I am serious. The moment the precedent is set, the practice changes. You have to think to yourself what it is you are asking the parliament to do. I would say to you again that, if you want to form a government and sit on this side of the house and form your own budgets, you are setting a dangerous precedent by attempting to remove revenue measures from a government's budget and I would ask you to reconsider your position.

The CHAIR: We need to apologise: you must stand in committee. We have just checked all the rules, so that information given to you earlier was incorrect, and I apologise for that. I just want to again clarify that everyone understands that we are talking about clauses 4 to 23 and that we are going to be voting on them to stand as printed; therefore, if anyone has anything to say—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Are we voting on his amendment or on the clause as it is?

The CHAIR: His amendment is to delete, so that means we are voting that they stand as printed, which gives the opposition the opportunity to vote against them. Is everyone with me? No-one wants to speak on clauses 4 to 23 in any other way?

Mr Gardner: They may, after the amendments.

The CHAIR: No, after we put this through no-one can speak on clauses 4 to 23; it is finished.

Mr GARDNER: So, any further questions on matters relating to the car park tax must indeed be asked prior to us voting on them?

The CHAIR: If they are before clause 23; if they are after clause 23, you can ask them.

Mr GARDNER: In that case, just before we get there, can I identify to the Chair that I think the member for Hammond has something he wants to say.

The CHAIR: What does it relate to, member for Hammond?

Mr PEDERICK: In relation to deleting these clauses and amending budget measures, the Treasurer has indicated that there have not been precedents. Well, there have been precedents. I just wonder whether he can check the record because I know that two years ago we knocked out a fee in regard to biosecurity from the budget and—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You are making precedents, not us.

Mr PEDERICK: Well, let's just be honest about what has happened in the past. It has happened in the past. There was also a police court costs part of a budget that had been opposed. So, this has happened before and we certainly—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Regret.

Mr PEDERICK: —well and truly won the day. No, I do not regret standing up for my primary producers. I ran the lobbying on this side of the house in regard to the biosecurity fee because our primary producers have had the guts ripped out of the primary industries budget in this state since Labor have been in here for the last 12 years. They have had the lowest net amount of money spent in primary industries for 12 years. I just want the Treasurer to perhaps check the record. To make statements that none of this has happened before is completely wrong.

The CHAIR: Does everyone understand that once we put clauses 4 to 23 as printed there is no further opportunity? The question is that clauses 4 to 23 stand as printed.

The committee divided on the clauses:

Ayes	22
Noes	19
Majority.....	3

AYES

Atkinson, M.J.
Brock, G.G.
Gee, J.P.
Kenyon, T.R.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Snelling, J.J.
Wortley, D.

Bettison, Z.L.
Caica, P.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Key, S.W.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Rankine, J.M.
Vlahos, L.A.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.
Koutsantonis, A. (teller)
Piccolo, A.
Rau, J.R.
Weatherill, J.W.

NOES

Bell, T.S.
Goldsworthy, R.M.
Marshall, S.S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Wingard, C.

Chapman, V.A.
Griffiths, S.P.
Pederick, A.S.
Redmond, I.M.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Gardner, J.A.W. (teller)
Knoll, S.K.
Pengilly, M.R.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Williams, M.R.

PAIRS

Digance, A.F.C.
McFetridge, D.

Evans, I.F.

Hughes, E.J.

Clauses thus passed.

Schedules 1 and 2 passed.

Schedule 3.

Mr PISONI: I have some questions in broad terms, Treasurer, on schedule 3. Are you able to identify how many employees of the Education Act are affected by these amendments?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the Australian Education Union has identified 991 people affected by this, but I expect that number to be larger. We are attempting to calculate the total number of teachers—or subcontractors or contract teachers—who have been affected by this.

Mr PISONI: I was aware that that 991 figure was union members; I was not sure that it was total.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that they are AEU members, but I am also advised that the AEU represents the majority or a very large percentage of teachers. However, we are attempting to get a much larger number. There may be people who the AEU have not identified and there may be people who are not members of the union, but we are attempting to find that out and, when we have a number, I will report it back to the house.

Mr PISONI: And the total value of the budget measure itself?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised it is \$15 million.

Mr PISONI: Are you able to identify what impact this measure will have on those who have already taken the entitlement?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that employees have not been paid the entitlement on the basis of the two-year rule.

Mr PISONI: So are you saying is that none of the temporary teachers that qualify for this at the moment have actually taken their entitlement? Can you just clarify that for the committee?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the two-year rule has not been implemented because of the ongoing court cases.

Mr PISONI: Even prior to the legal action being taken?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that it is accurate.

Mr PISONI: Subclause (10), minister: there is reference that the section has effect despite a term of contract or enterprise bargaining agreement undertaken or other instrument or agreement. Are you able to confirm that amendments to the Education Act can actually null and void elements of an existing enterprise bargaining agreement?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the long service provisions are not covered by the enterprise agreement. They are covered by the act and are therefore subject to parliament's deliberations.

Mr PISONI: So, are you able then to advise whether the amendments to the Education Act in regard to this measures bill are the only ones that can affect the enterprise bargaining agreement, or can other amendments to the Education Act also have impact on the existing enterprise bargaining agreement?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the amendments in the Budget Measures Bill will have no impacts on the current enterprise agreement now or in the future.

Mr PISONI: I am asking you, minister, if you are also able to use this opportunity to advise whether any amendments to the Education Act can have the same effect as this subclause (10) of schedule 3.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could you repeat the question? We are finding it difficult to understand what you mean.

Mr PISONI: What this actually says here is, 'This section has effect despite...a term of contract, enterprise bargaining agreement undertaking or other instrument or agreement'. I am just asking whether any other amendments to the Education Act will have the same effect and could override an enterprise bargaining agreement.

These amendments are about the Education Act and the question is whether any other amendments to the Education Act are able to override any existing enterprise bargaining agreement? You have referred to this one—and I understand that because it is in the bill—but I am also asking you whether that intention or ability is exclusive only to this particular measure or this particular case that went to the High Court or whether the parliament has the power to override (through legislation or amendments to the Education Act) any contracts or enterprise bargaining agreement for those employed under the Education Act?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the legislation before the house in the Budget Measures Bill is exclusive to this provision. If you are asking me a question about whether the government sought advice whether it has the power to override enterprise agreements through legislation not being contemplated in this bill, I cannot answer that.

Mr PISONI: With due respect, minister, you have an adviser sitting next to you. Schedule 3 relates to amendments to the Education Act so I am talking in general terms about amendments to the Education Act and asking whether amendments to the Education Act can override an enterprise bargaining agreement?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not want to be difficult but it seems to me that what you are asking me is: exclusive of the legislation being considered now, does the state have the power to override enterprise agreements through legislation? That is, I suppose, a hypothetical question.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, the advice I have given you is that our legislation does not interfere with the advice that I have received on the enterprise agreement.

Mr PISONI: If it does not interfere with the enterprise bargaining then, why is there a specific part in this clause that refers specifically to the enterprise bargaining agreement? That would tell me as an 'Average Joe' reader of the act that there is a risk that it may, so it is the intention of the writer of this bill to make it absolutely clear that it was the intention of the parliament for this to be removed regardless of what is in the enterprise bargaining agreement and I am asking whether that application is uniform throughout the Education Act?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised by the department that that is a safety clause in the Budget Measures Bill to ensure we can deal with any unforeseen arguments made by the Australian Education Union in the courts.

Mr PISONI: Now we are getting somewhere. There is some concern with the government that the enterprise bargaining agreement or any existing contracts may have some effect on the government implementing its Budget Measures Bill and this clause or this part was put in place to articulate the fact that it was the intention of this Budget Measures Bill not to allow the enterprise bargaining agreement to override or have precedence over the Budget Measures Bill. Again, I ask you the question: is that measure available for any other changes to the Education Act?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My advice is no; it is exclusive to the long service provisions.

Ms CHAPMAN: Forgive me if I cover a matter which you may have already addressed, as I have not been following the entire debate. As I understand the situation in relation to the amendments under the Education Act, a couple of years ago, the High Court determined against the

mechanism used by successive governments to appoint teachers since 1972, which had an effect on their long service leave entitlements, and struck it down.

It is your understanding that it was not the intention of your government or the government since that time to give teachers a more generous entitlement to long service leave than other public servants had? That is the situation, as I understand it. Independent of what enterprise bargaining agreement you have with the teachers employed by the education department, in anticipation that there might be some claims by current or former employees for funds consistent with the situation we are left in as a result of the High Court decision, you are introducing this legislation to ensure that it suffocates those claims. Is that as I understand the situation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised we are attempting to clarify the original intent of the Education Act.

Ms CHAPMAN: And the purpose of that is to ensure that the government does not have to pay out a whole lot of money that otherwise might be claimed by those former employees, or current employees, for that matter?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that is accurate and through a quirk of the legislation.

Ms CHAPMAN: This is the legislative remedy to protect against these claims. Obviously, we have heard from the Australian Education Union representatives, in recent time, about their concerns about this legislation having an impact retrospectively. I suppose implied in that is their view that their members as employees ought to have been able to have access to this if they are able to establish the other threshold entitlements. The Australian Education Union, in their plea in relation to this, have asserted that the education department has done some calculations and that they would estimate the claims are somewhere between \$100 million and \$200 million. That is as I understand it. Is that consistent with what you understand they are claiming?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not have with me accurate numbers, so I do not wish to speculate.

Ms CHAPMAN: Let me ask this then: irrespective of what the Australian Education Union says, who within the education department has actually been responsible for producing the estimate, whatever that might be? It may be between \$100 million and \$200 million, it may be some other figure. Who in the education department has prepared the modelling and assessment of this for you?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will have to take that on notice and get back to you.

Ms CHAPMAN: To the best of your knowledge, has anyone in your department done that assessment?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think it is fair to say Treasury does assessments regularly, but I am not at liberty to discuss those. I am happy to give a briefing to the member.

Ms CHAPMAN: Leaving aside the AEU and anyone possibly in the education department, what is your understanding of what is the range of liability that the government would be up for in the event that they remain unprotected by this legislation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will have to take that on notice.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, Treasurer, you are asking us to make a decision on legislation having retrospective applicability in expectation that there may be some liability for the government, and therefore taxpayers, without giving us any clue as to what the liability might be?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not want to be difficult in terms of the opposition because I am seeking their support on this measure, but you are asking me detailed questions in light of ongoing litigation in the courts, but I would—

Ms Chapman: Where is this going to be heard?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand that it is in the Supreme Court. They are still pursuing their claims. In light of that, I will take the question on notice.

Ms CHAPMAN: Just so that I am clear about this: there are current claims for entitlements under long service leave that are pending. Obviously, they then would have been encouraged by the High Court's decision and probably prompted to go and make their applications as a result of it. I take it then that, as there are already some pending claims, you want this legislation to go through so that you can extinguish those claims as well?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the High Court decision was about the appointment basis of teachers. It did not deal with long service leave or other conditions of employment. The effect of the High Court ruling is currently the subject matter of litigation before the Supreme Court. It is inappropriate to discuss the details of the matters that are the subject of this litigation as to do so would prejudice the state's position.

Ms CHAPMAN: Can I clarify whether the Supreme Court action is in relation to claims that teachers consider they may be entitled to as a result of the High Court application?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Given that I have the first law officer alongside me advising me on these matters, I think that it is fair to say that I will be very cautious in my response, given that there is ongoing litigation. Again, I do not want to be difficult. I understand that what is occurring now is that the High Court has determined whether these applicants had continuity of service for the purpose of the calculation of long service leave entitlements. It did not individually determine any entitlements for any individual claimants. What is occurring now in the Supreme Court is that they are litigating that aspect of it, and our legislation's effect, I think, is self-evident, and I mean that with all due respect.

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, I understand that, Treasurer. Let me say that, on this area, I was with you completely. I am just getting a bit concerned with these answers as to where we are going with it, so I want to clear it up because—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You had a private briefing.

Ms CHAPMAN: We did have a briefing; let me put that on the record. The Hon. Rob Lucas organised that with a number of your representatives, and we had specialty people from various departments, including the Department of Transport and Infrastructure, so I had a lot to ask them about the car park levy and other things, and we went through a number of these taxes. There was no-one there from the education department to tell us about this, or specifically in relation to that. Let me say that we took the government at face value as to what was said in the second reading in relation to this; there seemed to be some significant merit in what you were presenting, particularly as there is potentially a 40-year lot of claims. We are not big on retrospectivity on this side of the house, I can tell you that, and I have said it plenty of times before, but sometimes it is meritorious. In this instance it may still be.

In fact there are already claims, and I always get a little bit concerned when particular claims are going to be crushed out as a result of introducing legislation, to sort of snuff them out. So we are back to what you said in the parliament in your second reading, which is, I think, consistent with what you are saying. We had the High Court decision, and it opened the door for a number of these people to say 'Well, on my calculation of long service leave, sorry, the High Court says you didn't do this properly in the sense of the mechanism of taking into account whether it is three months or two years, etc., and therefore I am going to claim the higher amount.' So, you have a log of these in the Supreme Court by the sound of it.

The bill before us will have the effect of extinguishing any scintilla of hope these people have for getting their better termination, and they will be stuck with what you want them to have. So I think we are all of the same understanding now. Do we know how many pending claims there are in the Supreme Court?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that we are aware of 991 claims but there may be more, and there may be others.

Ms CHAPMAN: In the Supreme Court?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes; I understand it is a class action. In terms of the concerns you have about the retrospectivity of this matter and people who have current claims before the court, the government did announce a fund.

Ms CHAPMAN: The 991 is an estimate of what the AEU says is the expected number, on their records of members—most of whom are in the union, as I think you have already said in the debate—as potentially being entitled to this under the class action. Is that where we are at?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: As I understand it, there is also some litigation in the Supreme Court. I am sorry that I do not have the exact details with me, but I am sure the Attorney-General, who is giving you excellent advice at this point, may be aware of this—although there is so much litigation in the Supreme Court and other courts against the government that it would hardly be surprising if he does not. Anyway, let me just go to this. Rose Park Primary School has raised some litigation matters which were referred from one of the tribunals across to the Supreme Court for determination on the question of entitlements of employees in after school hours care.

We all understand that there are significant ramifications to taxpayers—in the first instance to government—if they are successful in certain determinations in respect of those proceedings, culminating in a multi-million dollar claim against the government for employees and former employees of these after school hours care services, not just in Rose Park Primary School but in any of the other public schools that operate after school hours care. Is that litigation, or the outcome of that litigation, going to be affected by these amendments in any way?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand attempts are being made to resolve that matter, but I do believe that the advice I have received shows that this matter currently before the house and that matter are not linked. However, I suppose you could argue that they are similar in nature.

Ms CHAPMAN: But at this stage the amendments you are proposing here will not have any impact, to the best of your knowledge or the Attorney's, in respect of that litigation? I appreciate it is an employment matter. I do not have all the detail with me, so I cannot recall whether it was all long service leave or the five minutes off they have at recess time or what, but to the best of your knowledge they are not—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To the best of my knowledge, no. The matters are not linked.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is the fund you are referring to the \$15 million fund for ex gratia payments to 'some teachers whose LSL entitlements will be brought into line with other public sector employees' in the budget?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: In the event that this bill goes through, why is it necessary to have the \$15 million? Is that to cover the costs of litigants or those who have put in claims and will have their claim wiped out, or for some other reason?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think it is fair to say, in thinking of a way to answer your question, 'Why a fund?', that it is in recognition of the length of this dispute. I think it is in recognition of the government's attempt to show goodwill towards the litigants and people who may have an entitlement, but it will be a discretionary account. The ex gratia funds will be administered in an entirely discretionary way, and applicants will be identified for the consideration of the decision-maker. That is the most I am prepared to say on the fund to the house.

Ms CHAPMAN: Minister, who is going to have the discretion as to who gets the money and who does not? We have 991 potential applicants in a class action. Presumably, we have the accumulated legal costs of their representatives in this class action. I am assuming, for the purpose of this, there is only the class action, but obviously there would be accumulated costs.

If you were to say to me, 'In all fairness to the litigants, we are not going to be leaving them with a bill. We are legislatively extinguishing their capacity to be able to argue their case, so we want to pay off their legal costs,' I would understand that. That would be fair in the circumstances.

What I am not sure of now is whether you are going to keep this fund to be able to hand out to some who you think have been more aggrieved than others, in which case that can produce some

inequity. I would like a little bit of detail about who is going to have control of this money, or whether you are going to hand it over to the AEU or some other entity who will make determinations themselves about who gets the money—but \$15 million is a lot of money.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that there is no uniformity in terms of the type of person who would be making a claim to this fund. Most claims will be individual in their nature, and they will be wide and varied. The fund, I am advised, will be administered in the same way as the fund was administered for the children in state care.

In terms of who will administer the fund, cabinet will be deliberating on which minister, if a minister indeed will be responsible for it. The fund, as I said to you earlier, will be administered in that similar way, given the very varied nature of the applicants to the fund. I think it is unfair to categorise the applicants as being uniform in the length or amount they may be claiming, so it is difficult to structure a fund to deal with this. The best advice we have is to manage it in a similar way to that of the children in state care because of the varied nature of the claims being made to the fund.

Ms CHAPMAN: For the children in state care, as you would remember, minister (and I am sure you can be prompted by the Attorney sitting next to you), there is a provision for up to \$50,000 to be paid to those who can establish that they have some damage as a result of their experiences, and the Attorney-General is the minister who is in charge of hearing those and, obviously, giving the directions for ex gratia payments.

Obviously, just like that, we accept that, of the 991 potential claimants, there will be some who have worked for a short time and might be missing out on a few dollars if they do not have the pre-High Court determination amount and others who would be missing out on a lot. We might have claims of \$10 to \$10,000, or more. I perfectly understand that. But, apart from the amount that they might lose, the principle is the same. They are supposed to be getting only the same as any other public servant and some of them might have pre-spent the money, for example. They do not have it yet, but they have already bought a house in anticipation of getting the money, for example.

Are there going to be some criteria upon which the entitlement is going to be assessed? Is there a threshold over which there has to be an entitlement that has to be assessed? The Victims of Crime Fund, if it is going to be the same, does have a minister responsible for it, in this case the Attorney-General—and, frankly, I do not really mind who is in charge of it as long as a minister is in charge of it. But, if you tell me it is going to be a fund that is handed over to the Australian Education Union for them to put in recommendations for distribution, then it is completely outside the education department and it is completely outside the Treasury and I would have some concerns about how that is going to be administered.

I am really looking for some assurances here. I appreciate that you have put this money in the budget and cabinet might want to work out the detail—I understand that—but we certainly want to have some assurances about how this distribution is going to be scrutinised and what the criteria are going to be for someone to apply and be eligible.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They are all very good points the Deputy Leader of the Opposition makes. The details of the ex gratia scheme are yet to be finalised. Once they are finalised, the details will be brought to the attention of all DECD employees and also will be made publicly available.

Payments from the ex gratia fund will be entirely discretionary using criteria such as length of service, and potential impacts of the amendments to the Education Act and the individual circumstances of an applicant will be identified for the consideration of the decision-maker—who, in all likelihood, will be the Attorney-General. We will make all the criteria public. It is yet to be decided, given we are awaiting the parliament's decision on our amendments.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am pleased to hear that you are moving towards making sure some minister is in charge. That is great. Can you assure the house that the money is not going to be going out of government hands to some other entity, like a union or other body, to process these claims for ex gratia payment?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No. The advice and the intent of the ex gratia fund are not for it to be handed over to any entity, whether it be a union, law firm or otherwise. It will be for individuals to make applications. It has not been designed to appease one group or another.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is there any provision in this fund, or any other part of the budget allocation, to cover legal costs of the class action to date? If so, is there some provision—I do not need to know the amount because you might still be working out some taxation costs, or something like that in your negotiations—for the covering of the costs of this claim which is going to be extinguished by the passage of this bill?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am glad I have been a justice of the peace for 17 years because—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It does. I understand that it is an arrangement to be made between the parties, and any disclosure of those costs or discussions about it would be subject to legal professional privilege. That is the advice I have received and, as a justice of the peace of long standing, I concur.

Ms CHAPMAN: Given that you are probably not a party to those proceedings at this point, I find it difficult to see how you could concur to that. That is why I am not asking the amount. You are asking us to support legislation which is going to extinguish their claim—you know, all over in the Supreme Court. That has an accumulated cost that goes with it. I would agree that it is not unreasonable, if we are being asked to do this, that the government is going to be saying, 'Look, we will meet the reasonable costs to date of this application.'

That would be quite reasonable—and the Attorney-General is nodding. That is not an uncommon situation. It is the sort of thing that we look at, as legislators, to make sure that we are not picking off some individual's right or entitlement and, if we are, that we are not going to be punishing them for taking what was otherwise their lawful avenue for recovery of benefit. I am really looking for some reassurance that there is at least an opportunity for the litigants in this class action (which is the only one as I understand it) to be given some consideration to having those costs met.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The advice I have received is that it is not appropriate for us to publicly discuss any terms we may reach with parties who make applications to the fund before we have settled, indeed, if the fund will exist, and any costs in relation to making an application, not only just to the fund but through the court. That is a matter between the government and the parties that we will be dealing with. We cannot discuss those until we have the agreement of the other parties making the applications to release those agreements.

Ms CHAPMAN: You see, what is going to happen is that, with the passage of this bill through this house and before it gets to the other house, undoubtedly the opposition and probably other parties are going to have presented to them some argument that this issue needs to be resolved. For you to satisfy us as a parliament that you are going to extinguish this avenue for these people, we need to have some satisfaction that you are doing the right thing; that you are being the model litigant and you are doing the right thing by these people.

As you know, and I think as you have indicated, there is good reason to have a bit of a catch-all fund there to deal with ex gratia payments, because some of these people quite reasonably might have relied upon an entitlement and they are not going to get it, and there will be some ill as a result of it, and so the Attorney-General or someone will have the right to say, 'Well, we hear that and we're going to give you some money for it.' That is different.

What we are looking at is the fact that we have pending litigation in the Supreme Court for a class action, and you want us to be able to pass a law which is going to cut it out from under their feet. At the moment they are on pretty good ground, by the sound of what the High Court has said. This is why I respect the fact that you do not want to be disclosing figures, but it is reasonable that the parliament has some explanation and some assurance that we are not going to be doing that.

Normally, if we pass a law which has an effect on individuals, we have to go into a special committee process here, because we have a principle that says that all people who line up before

the law get treated the same. If we are going to pass a law that affects just one person or a narrow group of people, we have a whole parliamentary process that we go into to deal with that. I am not advocating to have a hybrid bill process interrupting the due progress of this bill, but you are not giving me a lot of comfort, Treasurer, in relation to what you are asking us to do in a circumstance which, on the face of it, is meritorious but may well be disadvantaging a certain group in the community.

The Treasurer can sit there and repeat, 'Well, I've got the Attorney-General telling me that I have to be careful about what I say; we are in negotiations' and all that other nonsense. It is nonsense in light of the fact that you are asking us to pass this legislation. It will go through today, but I place on the record my concern that the government, having the opportunity here to be full and frank in their disclosure about what they are doing to make sure that people are not aggrieved under this process, have not been forthcoming. I expect we will get it from other parties between here and the other place and we may need to deal with that in another place but, in the meantime, we note the High Court's decision and the government's decision to deal with it in this manner. We otherwise will not be objecting to it progressing.

I have just one other matter in relation to the same issue. If between the houses there is some capacity for the government to be a bit more accommodating in relation to this information, we would like to receive it. Secondly, in answer to the questions of how and who—not particular names, but there are people in the departments, yours or the education department, who have actually done the assessments on the cost of this. Remember, the AEU is saying that it is a \$100 million to \$200 million claim.

They could have it completely wrong, but they say that that assessment has come from the education department. Now they could have it completely ballsed up for all we know, but I just make the point that you do not have any information on that. We would like some information between the houses and we would appreciate some clarification on whoever has made this assessment, what assumptions they have relied on, and the number of possible teachers that have been taken into account in that modelling, apart from the AEU's estimate from their records.

The other matter on which I would like some assurance is in respect to where the employment records of all these teachers are. You may not know the answer to this but, again, I would ask you to take it on notice and inquire of the education minister—assuming we still have one—essentially where all the employment records are kept, if they are kept centrally at the education department, or whether some of the employment records that relate to our teaching staff are kept locally by schools or in regional offices. I would like to have that clarified.

In the event that any of the potential claimants are relatives of deceased teachers—which, of course, is another category—a family member may have been in employment and had a legal entitlement. They are not here to put anything to either you or the parliament. If that teacher had died but had otherwise been eligible for a payout, are their relatives expected to be in a class of persons who will be eligible to apply for an ex gratia payment?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: First of all, I agree with a lot of what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said. I understand her frustrations and I wish to allay those frustrations and to work with her to give her a better understanding of what it is the government is attempting to do. I will remind her that the Crown is bound to be a model litigant and that it takes this very seriously, and the Attorney and I will ensure that we behave accordingly.

I accept the criticism that the deputy leader has made of the government and my own shortcomings. I apologise to her if she somehow feels that I have not been able to allay her fears, but this is a very complex matter and the government is attempting to walk through it in the most respectful way possible. However, I understand the position that we have put the opposition in and I understand the deputy leader's frustration. I apologise to her if she feels as though we have not given her all the information she needs.

I will endeavour to give the deputy leader a full and thorough briefing between the houses to make sure that she is given all the information she needs to give her a better understanding of what it is we are attempting to do, and to better inform her and her party room between the houses of what

the government is looking for as an outcome through the parliament. With those reassurances and apologies, I thank the deputy leader for her contribution.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have questions on page 20, part 2. I asked some questions in estimates about this issue and I think I recall that the situation of the government is that there is no eligibility for this for retirement villages. Is that the position?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, the deputy leader is absolutely right: a right to occupy is a different criteria from ownership.

Ms CHAPMAN: Was any consideration given to retirement villages being in this category and, if so, was there a cost attached to it that might have been so prohibitive that it was rejected, or was it not considered at all?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, it was not considered at the time because of the cost (it was very expensive), but I have had discussions with the industry and I am looking at it for them, because I understand their argument. The intent of the grant is to stimulate activity but, again, through a quirk of the law, they sell a right to occupy rather than a title, so I will be looking at it and there may be something else that we can do to stimulate that industry.

Ms CHAPMAN: Of course, we could change the definition and make it broader, but I understand what you are saying. So, you are having a look at it. What modelling has your department done and what is the assessment of the cost of this annually if we were to consider supporting it, assuming the government even wants to present it?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that a specific final costing has not been done on that. I do not have that with me so I will take it on notice.

Ms CHAPMAN: Again, we ask to have that prior to it being debated in the other house so we can deal with it.

Mr WILLIAMS: I have a series of questions, and I will start at clause 18. I see that the intent is to change the royalty on extractives from 35¢—I am not sure whether it is per tonne or cubic metre, actually; I think it is per tonne—to 55¢. It is my understanding at the moment that, of the 35¢, 10¢ goes into the Consolidated Account and 25¢ goes into the Extractives Areas Rehabilitation Fund. It is also my understanding that the whole of the extra 20¢ increase will go into the Consolidated Account. Can the minister confirm that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you. I wanted to get that on the record. Can I say that I personally have some issues with this on behalf of the industry. It has been expressed to me that the industry has been caught out on this. They were not aware and they were not warned that this was coming, and a number of the people operating major quarries in particular have already written significant contracts and all of a sudden this is going to impact on their contract and on their bottom line.

I heard what the minister said earlier about giving the executive government their way with their budget, otherwise I would be arguing very strongly that the house not accept this at this instance and would urge the minister to have delayed this for at least six months, if not 12 months, to try to overcome that issue for the extractives industry, which is a very important industry. Notwithstanding that, I wanted to get onto the record those couple of points.

With regard to section 73E and private mines, I have a series of questions there. I understand that up to date the current situation is that royalties are only paid on extractive minerals from private mines, they are not paid on any other minerals extracted from a private mine. Basically, the new section 73E(1) through to (1g), on my reading of it, will create a type of transition where a relevant event occurs with regard to a particular private mine and that particular private mine will thereafter be liable to pay royalties on all minerals. Can the minister confirm that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that is accurate.

Mr WILLIAMS: Minister, are you able to inform—and this is really interesting in the context of the debate that is going on in the community at the moment with regard to landholders' rights

versus mining—the house of how many private mines are in existence, how many of them are mined for extractive minerals and how many are mined for other minerals?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that there are 245 private mines listed as active on the department's tenement system. Only 80 of the private mines have operated in the last several years. Of that 80, only nine have produced minerals that are classified as industrial minerals and did not pay a royalty. Two of the private mines, out of the nine I just mentioned, produced 85 of the potential royalties, if royalties were payable. The biggest non-royalty paying private mine is from a Penrice mine.

Mr WILLIAMS: I understand that that mine has transferred and that will be captured by these changes?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, it will, and so it should be.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Mr WILLIAMS: Minister, personally I agree with what you are doing; I do not have a problem with that. I just want to make sure that I am clear on what you actually are doing. With regard to new section 73E(1c), which says:

If a private mine has 2 or more proprietors, a change in any of those proprietors will be taken to be a relevant event for the purposes of subsection (1a)(a).

That must mean that all of a sudden the private mine will be subjected to royalty if it is on industrial minerals. So, would that capture the circumstance where, for instance, a married couple owned a private mine—I don't know whether this circumstance exists—and one of them became deceased and the ownership reverted to the surviving partner? Would that be a relevant event?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The advice I am given is that if no other parties are entering into the arrangement, then no, but if a daughter or son entered into the arrangement, then yes. So, if you passed away and Leonie inherited the mine, she would be much happier.

Mr WILLIAMS: We won't go there. Minister, subsection (1d)—are you able to explain to the house what that means, because I tell you, I have read it a number of times and I can't get my head around it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The advice I have received on this exceptionally well-written piece of amendment is that it is a catch-all. So, it is the government's intention that a relevant event will occur that, where there has been a change in propriety rights, the minerals recovered from the private mine and/or where there has been a change in the person claiming under the proprietor of the mine, including whether the claim is of legal or equitable kind. Simple!

Mr WILLIAMS: I just wanted to get it on the record, because at some stage in the future somebody might ask us the question. I will go back and read your answer and try to put the two together. The only other question I have is with regard to clause 21, new section 73EA, where it says:

If a relevant event within the meaning of section 73E occurs, the person who, as a result of the relevant event, becomes a proprietor of a private mine or acquires a right to carry out mining operations at a private mine (as the case may be) must, within 30 days after the relevant event, notify the Minister of the relevant event.

Maximum penalty: \$5 000.

That seems to me to be a sledgehammer to maybe crack an acorn, and what really concerns me is, is there likely to be a situation where somebody might trigger that new 73EA subclause (1) and have no knowledge that they have an obligation under that subclause and thus would I guess be in danger of capturing a \$5,000 fine?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I half agree with the member for MacKillop. It is a lot, but we have halved it. It used to be \$10,000, so we have made the sledgehammer slightly smaller. This is an opportunity for us to be able to notify people who may have ignored us in the past and be told the relevant act, but we of course will act in the very best interests by re-notifying everyone and giving them every opportunity to comply. I am not interested in the fees or the penalties; I am interested in compliance.

Mr WILLIAMS: This will be my last question, Madam Chair. Just in a more broad sense, as I said, I think you are transitioning what are currently private mines—and you have put on the record how many there are—to be more like mining leases under the Mining Act. Is it the intention of the government, over a period of time, to get rid of the notion of private mines altogether? From my understanding, I think the private mines predate the legislation of 1886. They have been around for a long time and there are not a lot of them, but it has concerned me for a long time that we have two management systems within your agency—private mines and mines under the Mining Act, which are managed under two different systems.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think it would be a lot of regulation for very little gain. We do have inspection rights on all mines and there is a turnover, but I think it was an arrangement reached in 1971 when the Mining Act was first introduced and then there were amendments made in 2001 by, I think, Wayne Matthew. I think we have the balance right. In a perfect world, yes, you would probably change it, but the world is not perfect.

Ms CHAPMAN: In the interests of time, I will just make some comments in relation to this matter and also the events levy. In relation to the mines, I thank those who provided us with the briefing. There was an indication that there were some 230 current mines. I think there was a slightly different figure given today, but I would have to say that I am surprised there are so few because obviously the history of our state is littered with what were mines operating, most of them unsuccessful.

It does concern me that the transfer of land on which these are accommodated—and often they have not been touched for a hundred years—could at some future date attract some attention if something is found which would be identified. I have not seen the principal act as to what the definition of a private mine is, but if it is some scratching or hole in the side of a hill where someone has abandoned the attempt, there are plenty on Kangaroo Island, I can tell you, most of which people have left poor trying to find some silver or gold. I am not suggesting that they are going to have any luck in the future, but if they do they will attract some attention, so I think we do need to tighten up this question of who this is going to apply to.

I think the intent is to cover those who have stone and quarries operating, and there are a number of private ones. One of them is in my electorate at Stonyfell. It is a big one and it is one which, if it is subdivided off, and that portion is not used for quarrying, I do not think will attract the royalty, but if it is potentially able to be utilised for that purpose, it will affect the value of transfer and may attract the attention of your department. I just put on notice that I appreciate what you are trying to do and, in general principle, we are not opposing the initiative, but you might have some people inadvertently captured.

In relation to the events levy, can I just say this: I listened with interest when Mr Hook announced during the election campaign that there was going to be free travel to various events, only to have that crushed, of course, when it now seems that a proposed levy on major events related to that, particularly at the Adelaide Oval, is going to raise revenue of around about \$4 million a year. Currently there is about \$800,000 going towards the ticketing costs for that, of course, but I think that is about \$2½ million from football and \$1½ million from non-football Adelaide Oval events, which means there is going to be a significant cost for someone to pick up. I am assuming that that will be people who want to go to these events.

The thing I just wanted to raise about this—and it has not transpired in any form of a foreshadowed amendment—is that I had asked during the briefing about the fact that whilst there is an obligation to notify of events that are likely to be of a certain size and expected population, I had pointed out that there is no penalty clause in not providing that. Of course, the concept goes along the lines that, if you do not notify, then you are not going to get any help to get transport services and other security and extra police personnel and so on down there to help your event run smoothly, and therefore it is expected that it is in the interests of these big event operators to notify under this mandatory process, even though there is no penalty.

The problem is this: let us assume the event operators say that they do not need to have other services, that they are making provision themselves or that everyone is going to walk. It is a guitar festival, say, and all the people who go to the guitar festival catch the bus or do not catch the

bus or walk or whatever. There can be circumstances where they either elect not to or inadvertently do not notify and then find that they are served with a notice—the event is coming up and someone in the department has assessed that it is going to have an impact on services. Those services are provided and suddenly they find they have a bill.

I would like there to be some tightening of the process in relation to this. It seems a rather heavy-handed and clumsy way to mandate that these people do these things, but it also seems a bit inconsistent that there is no actual direct penalty other than the fact that they run the risk that, even if inadvertent, they are going to have a notice served on them to pay a huge amount of money for services they have not asked for.

I do not have any problem with people who operate private events when they secure the services of a government resource, whether it is transport or whether it is extra security, like police at major events, that there is a user-pays contribution. I do not have any problem with that at all. When I do have a problem, though, is when they do not ask for it and they get it and/or there is some cost shifting over there for the cost of the services on the day. So, with those comments I indicate that we will not otherwise be impeding the passage of the bill.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will just make one remark at the end—that we do negotiate directly with the venue managers on this issue so, hopefully, the issues the deputy leader raises will not occur. I thank members for their questions, their debate and their views and, of course, all the staff who have made their time available to help out; indeed, can I thank once again parliamentary counsel for the exceptional work they have done.

Schedule passed.

Schedule 4 passed.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Title passed.

Third Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (18:12): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**PASTORAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION (RENEWABLE ENERGY)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 18:14 the house adjourned until Wednesday 6 August 2014 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***INDIGENOUS PROGRAMS, GRANTS AND FUNDING**

2 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (27 May 2014). What Indigenous programs, grants and funding were provided by each department or agency under the minister's portfolio for 2011 and in each case, were these funds recurrent, current, operational or capital expenditure?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations): I have received the following advice:

Aboriginal Power Cup

Since 2008-09, funding of \$97,920 per annum has been provided for the Aboriginal Power Cup, an initiative of the Attorney-General's Department in partnership with the Port Adelaide Football Club, SANTOS, the SA Aboriginal Sports Training Academy and the SA National Football League. It is an early intervention program that engages young people at risk in sporting activities to encourage them to continue with their education and make positive lifestyle choices.

Crime Prevention Grants Program

The Attorney-General's Department provided the following one-off funding in 2011-12 for Indigenous programs:

- West Coast Youth and Community Support, Port Lincoln—\$50,000
 - Project for families experiencing domestic violence with local Aboriginal services to be consulted.
- Aboriginal Foundation of SA—\$50,000
 - Training and mentoring for Aboriginal people.
- Port Pirie Regional Aboriginal Community Centre—\$22,000
 - Mentoring program for young people.

The Attorney-General's Department provided the following one-off funding in 2010-11 for Indigenous programs:

- Nganampa Health Council—\$16,000
 - Young Anungu Women Education Project.
- Port Augusta Youth Centre—\$50,000
 - Bush Mechanics Project.
- Port Augusta City Council—\$50,000
 - City Safe Program, Youth Employment & Education. An early intervention project with an objective to increase indigenous employment in Port Augusta.

Operation Flinders

- Current funding agreement for the period 1 July 2011—30 June 2014 is for \$447,000 per year.
- The Operation Flinders program provides a crime prevention program for young offenders and young people at risk of offending. Participants are taken on an eight day exercise to the far northern Flinders ranges.

Port Augusta Youth Support Strategy (PAYSS)

- This Program includes funding for the Port Augusta Youth Centre, Port Augusta Youth Support Strategy and the Port Augusta Summer Activities Program.
- One-off funding provided in 2011-12 was as follows:

- \$80,000—Port Augusta Youth Centre (a total of 4,604 young people attended the centre with 3,935 being Aboriginal);
- \$2,587—Port Augusta Summer Activities Program; and
- \$100,000—Port Augusta Youth Support Strategy (a night time based youth support and mentoring strategy and bus service, delivered on Friday and Saturday nights and on week nights during school holidays. A total of 1,062 young people were picked up by the bus service of which 1,016 were Aboriginal.)'
- One-off funding provided in 2010-11 was as follows:
 - \$80,000—Port Augusta Youth Centre; and
 - \$100,000—Port Augusta Youth Support Strategy.

WEST BEACH ROAD UPGRADE

62 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (25 June 2014). Is the state government planning to help fund the upgrade of West Beach Road?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I have been advised of the following:

West Beach Road comes under the care, control and management of both the Cities of Charles Sturt and West Torrens.

The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has met with representatives from the Cities of Charles Sturt and West Torrens to discuss traffic and parking management on West Beach Road. The City of West Torrens, as the lead authority, along with the City of Charles Sturt, Adelaide Shores and Adelaide Airport have developed four road layout options for West Beach Road which consider improvements to parking, traffic management, pedestrian and cycling facilities, and landscaping.

Although the South Australian government has provided assistance in facilitating discussions regarding West Beach Road, it has no plans to provide funding for an upgrade of this council road.

WATARRU ANANGU SCHOOL

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (6 May 2014).

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

In early Term 1, 2014, Watarru Anangu School was broken into and caused damage to a window, a door and general littering of items off shelves. The total cost for remediation was \$27,143, which included the installation of security screens on the windows and doors, and a security gate.

As the community of Watarru have made decisions to live elsewhere, and no children currently attend the school, there are no current plans to re-open the school.

NEWPORT QUAYS DEVELOPMENT

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (22 May 2014).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations): I have been provided the following advice:

Mr Fred Hansen signed the agreement on behalf of Renewal SA.

The agreement was also signed by directors of Newport Quays Pty Ltd, Multiplex Port Adelaide Pty Ltd and UCPA Waterfront Redevelopment Pty Ltd, pursuant to s 127 of the Corporations Act.

NEWPORT QUAYS DEVELOPMENT

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (22 May 2014).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations): I have been provided the following advice:

Negotiations with a view to settlement commenced during court proceedings between the parties and were completed in December 2013. The final settlement was signed by both parties on 13 February 2014.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (4 June 2014).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been provided with the following advice:

The letter from Adelaide Capital Partners in respect of the Gillman property constituted an unsolicited proposal, which expressed that party's interest in the land.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (4 June 2014).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been provided with the following advice:

The unsolicited proposal was a detailed proposal. It contained information as to:

- the economic and strategic benefits to South Australia associated with the proposal;
- the proposed purchase price and details of land to be acquired;
- the basic details regarding the indicative structure of the transaction; and
- confirmation that the proposal did not require any direct state government funding.

However, Renewal SA, as with any responsible government agency, and to ensure that the proposal represented good value for money for the state, initially evaluated Adelaide Capital Partners' proposal with a view to determining whether an even greater level of detail was required to reach a considered conclusion as to the merits of the proposal and to determine whether the proposal should be progressed.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (4 June 2014).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been provided with the following advice:

A strategic assessment of an off-market transaction occurs more broadly within Government (including Cabinet). Renewal SA's Real Property Marketing and Pricing Policy contemplates that Renewal SA's primary concern is achieving an appropriate value for the land. Mr Hansen's evidence before the Select Committee confirmed that significant value was achieved.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (4 June 2014).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier):

Adelaide Capital Partners' initial proposal contained detailed information. ACP was not provided with any information that was not publicly available.

INDONESIA TRADE

In reply to **Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey)** (19 June 2014).

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): I am advised that Mr Suryo Sulisto, Chairman Kadin, arrived in Australia Wednesday 4 June 2014 and departed Thursday 12 June 2014. I am told that his program in Australia was prepared over a three month period in the lead up to his visit and that the itinerary involved business and private activity in Canberra,

Melbourne, Brisbane and Sydney. Mr Sulisto did not travel to Adelaide during that time. The agency is not aware of any request to meet with the SA government Minister for Trade.

Nobody can be found to support the imputation in the question, that a meeting was sought.

If visitors do not advise the South Australian government of their travel plans, and do not travel to South Australia and do not seek a meeting with the ministers, it is unlikely that ministers will meet with them.