

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 28 October 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.

Condolence

WHITLAM, HON. E.G.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (11:01): By leave, I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Edward Gough Whitlam AC, QC, former member of the House of Representatives and prime minister of Australia, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service to the nation, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Gough Whitlam, by any measure, was an outstanding prime minister. My recollection of Gough Whitlam and his government is limited, given my tender age. The overwhelming first memory was of actually being in a classroom when the teacher announced to the class that the prime minister had been sacked. Of course, this caused an immediate outbreak of conflict within the classroom.

I can remember the sons and daughters of obviously Liberal supporters were mocking him, calling him 'Egghead Whitlam' because of his name E.G. Whitlam—not highbrow humour; nevertheless, it was a mark of, I think, some of the conflict that children had actually bought into the divisions that were occurring within society at that time. There were very strong feelings.

I had a sense of injustice. I probably did not quite know why at the time, but there was a great sense of injustice that my team had been peremptorily dismissed—that was my first recollection. A second recollection was listening to the radio and hearing the chants in the campaign that followed of 'We want Gough! We want Gough!'

It was a very passionate but divided time in the life of the nation, but I think many have observed that that should not be the enduring memory of such a great prime minister because so much in a positive way was achieved for our nation and so much of it endures today. I think no truer words were spoken than those spoken by another former prime minister Paul Keating when he said there was 'before Whitlam and after Whitlam' and that really the history of our nation can be effectively divided into those two epochs.

Of course, there was a larger than life quality to his public persona that matched his height, his booming voice, his towering intellect, his encyclopedic knowledge and his quick and devastating wit that many said placed him above mere mortals. His signature style, I think, was really captured in the title to this book, *A Certain Grandeur*. There was a certain grandeur about the prime minister Gough Whitlam. This, of course, was his speechwriter, Graham Freudenberg, who wrote a glowing tribute to him. I do not know how many of us will have our speechwriters writing glowing tributes to us at the end of our careers.

My only personal interaction with Gough Whitlam was when I asked him to sign his book, *The Whitlam Government*, that he proudly paraded as a very complete record of the Whitlam government. If you read this book—and it is a task, because it is very detailed and meticulously compiled—it tells you something of his care. I think, without being critical, that he was a very pedantic man in respect of every single detail.

I will give you one anecdote of how pedantic he was. I asked him to sign this book, which he signed in the front: 'Jay Weatherill, with all good wishes, Gough Whitlam.' As I was leaving, he said, 'Can you come back here?'

The Hon. J.R. Rau: 'Comrade'.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: 'Comrade'. What he did was, he grabbed the book and he flicked through the pages and he put a comma in that was missing on one page and he put an 'and' in that was missing on another. Then on the back he put a little number—it was 530. He kept in his head the number of personalised copies that he had. This is the 530th personalised copy of *The Whitlam Government*, and it is a treasured memento.

Mr Picton: He is not related to the Speaker, is he?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, that's right. Some of these traits have actually passed down the generations to other great Labor figures. I refer now to the honourable Speaker of our house. That was certainly a trait that he had. If you were to listen to one of his speeches on a pet topic, such as the—

The Hon. J.R. Rau: Rail gauge.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —rail gauge, he would never cease to take an opportunity to reinforce his position that there should be one standardised—

The SPEAKER: Meat inspection: a commonwealth or state responsibility?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. Yes, meat inspection or any number of his pet concerns. You would expect to be going to hear this magnificent speech from Gough, because we are just so in awe of his wit, and then you got this rather long and rather dry exegesis in some pretty inane area of public policy. In a sense what that showed to you was that he never ceased to be anything other than committed to the project of high-quality public policy and he advanced it on every available opportunity. There was a seriousness about the way in which he pursued public policy which I think nobody—his supporters nor his detractors—could deny him.

His substance, however, was based not only on a vision for this country that would make us the most advanced nation in the Southern Hemisphere but a detailed and rigorous range of policies covering every major portfolio of government that he had personally researched and written in the 20 years preceding his election as prime minister in 1972. It was a prodigious body of work, which renovated the whole of public policy and the thinking of the Labor Party, and of course he presented that to the nation.

He was born in July 1916, the first child of Martha and Fred Whitlam, into a home filled with books and encyclopedias, where the emphasis was always on education, knowledge and development of their children's individual talents. From his early teenage years, Gough's development marched hand in hand with the development of the new capital of Canberra, where his father was crown solicitor. As he grew into maturity, so did Canberra. He witnessed how a federal government, through centralised planning, would construct the best possible urban environment for all its citizens.

A belief in equal opportunity meant that every new suburb was supplied with a school, sporting facilities, roads and underground sewerage. Long walks with his father were wonderful opportunities for him to explain to his son how good government could directly improve the lives of its citizens. His mother's pride in him instilled a firm belief that he would grow up to be a force for good in the world, and a deep desire to help those who were less fortunate.

Young Gough was fiercely proud of being an Australian, a feeling he was later to inspire in a nation still bound with a cultural cringe towards its British forebears. A poem written by him for his school magazine expresses his excitement for living in a country so full of new and powerful possibilities. He wrote:

We have the verdant vista of the New;

New skies to scale, new paths to pioneer.

He spent the rest of his life doing all he could to communicate to us the endless new possibilities awaiting our nation if only we were bold enough to grasp them. For me, that was his extraordinary contribution: the way in which he opened up the possibilities for each of us to express ourselves, to be more than we were, and for our nation to be more than it was. This incredibly expansive vision of possibility, the world being a world of possibilities, and that problems were not things that would

conquer us, but just opportunities to apply our minds creatively to find new solutions and new ways forward for ourselves and our nation.

Boldness was the mark of this man, but it was never boldness for the sake of it. His crash or crash through approach to reform, particularly of the ALP, was because he knew it was essential if we were to ever break free from the decades of opposition. As leader of the South Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party, I want to thank him and pass on the gratitude of our party for the way in which he modernised the Labor Party in partnership with another great moderniser of his time, the Hon. Don Dunstan, and allowed us to be the successful party which now presents itself for government consistently in this nation.

He knew he had to seize the day and when his time came to enact the laws that would forever change our lives—laws that focused on a universal national health system; state aid to all schools on the basis of need; free university education; land rights for Aboriginal people; the removal of all forms of discrimination regarding race, religion and gender; the beginning of no-fault divorce; and the beginning of environmental protection, just to name a few—he did not dither around.

After years of what has been described as the Menzies torpor, it is no wonder that many Australians were in deep shock. It is only now when he is gone and we look back at his legacy with awe and realise the depth and breadth of what he achieved in such a short time, that we can understand how profound his contribution to this nation has been. What motivated him always was a burning desire for every Australian to have an equal opportunity to develop their skills regardless of where they were born, where they went to school, which country they came from, or whether they were male or female. He wanted all of us to have all the opportunities that he had enjoyed. What were once only the rights of the well-off and the entitled, Gough wanted to make available to every single Australian.

He lived for 98 years and his passion for Australia was only matched by his passion for his dear wife, Margaret, the woman with whom he shared his life for 70 years, the woman he described as his best appointment, his prima donna, his equal in all things and the love of his life. He may have written and passed the laws that changed the nation, but she made it possible for him to do so. Through every major political change, every election campaign, every triumph and every loss, they were always together side by side and it is impossible to think of one without the other.

Long after he left the Lodge, their mere arrival at Opera in the Domain in Sydney caused thousands of people seated on the lawns to spontaneously stand up and cheer them. These two extraordinary people led the Australian nation into an exciting and turbulent new era and their legacy lasted long beyond it.

How do we explain the public outpouring of grief and celebration of all that he contributed that followed the news of his passing? In an age of increasing cynicism, mistrust and disengagement regarding politics, the political process and our political leaders, the response to his death is proof that we need our own heroes. We need to remind ourselves that there was a time when we did believe in politics and political leaders like Gough.

We thank him for the generosity of his vision. We thank him for the excitement and the humour that he engendered. We thank him for the strength of his belief in us and his country, and its people of all ages, races and religions. We thank him for making us proud of our country, proud of our culture and proud of our individuality. He projected this pride—this self-belief—on the international stage, and we thank him for his inspiration; his inspiration to allow us to choose opportunity over privilege, progress over tradition and, most of all, hope over despair.

Gough never lost his belief in the political process as a means of achieving it. He inspired a generation of young people to involve themselves in politics. He made the pursuit of public service something magnificent—a worthy purpose in life.

Our thoughts are with his children, Antony, Nicholas, Stephen and Catherine, who will all miss him as a loving father, and his sister, Freda, who knew him the longest of anyone. We will all miss him, but he will leave an indelible mark on our party and on our nation. Vale Gough Whitlam.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (11:16): I rise to second the Premier's condolence motion. One week has passed since the passing of Australia's 21st prime

minister, Edward Gough Whitlam AC, QC. I think it is fair to say that the tributes to Gough in the last week have been overwhelming. All sides of politics have reflected on a man who, apart from his policy legacy, is universally remembered as a brilliant politician with remarkable talents of oration, debate and, most importantly, one of the most spectacular wits of our time. In his tribute to Gough the Prime Minister commented:

Nineteen seventy two was his time, and all subsequent times have been shaped by his time. His government ended conscription, recognised China, introduced Medibank, abolished university fees, decolonised Papua New Guinea, transformed our approach to Indigenous policy and expanded the role of the Commonwealth, particularly in the field of social services. These were highly contentious at the time; some of these measures are still contentious; but, one way or another, our country has never been quite the same. Members of his government displayed the usual human foibles, but, support it or oppose it, there was a largeness of purpose to all his government attempted—even if its reach far exceeded its grasp, as the 1975 election result showed. He may not have been our greatest Prime Minister, but he was certainly one of the greatest personalities that our country has ever produced. And no Prime Minister has been more mythologised.

History is open to interpretation and can sometimes be a reflection of the author. However, Gough Whitlam will be remembered as much for his personality as his policy. Members of parliament will come and go through our Westminster system representing all sides of the political divide. What is important to note on this day of condolence is the motivation and purpose that brings all of us here to serve.

Gough Whitlam's brush with fate came at the end of his first tour of duty as a flight lieutenant with the No. 13 Squadron in the Royal Australian Air Force. When flying bombers in the Northern Territory he also began distributing literature for the Australian Labor Party to promote a referendum in 1944 which would help to extend the powers of the commonwealth post war. Defeat of this referendum dashed all his hopes at the time but would be the motivation that drove him into politics and delivered him to Canberra. A referendum was the trigger, and a brush with the Westminster system, that changed the course of his political life, and ours, forever.

Persistence and determination helped him overcome minor political setbacks, and in 1952 he became the member for Werriwa. My peers in this place can all relate to the individual honour that we feel when introduced as a local member for our respective electorates and the responsibility we have to serve the people who entrust us with their hopes for a better state and for a better country. It is these qualities that we have in common, regardless of political persuasion, that encourage us to be adversaries of policy and politics.

As a product of World War II, Gough Whitlam was trained to be combative. Already committed to serving his country in wartime, he was to continue that service in another capacity by representing the people of Werriwa for over 20 years. An articulate and intelligent man, his entry into parliament was driven by a determination to modernise and reform the Labor Party after 23 years in the wilderness, a legacy from another giant in politics, the founder of our party, Sir Robert Menzies.

Set with an agenda to revitalise Australia at the same time, Gough Whitlam and his government ended conscription and released draft dodgers from prison. He created an international pathway that led directly to communist China well ahead of other world leaders, while in 1973 becoming the first Australian prime minister to visit.

Ever the reformist, he also left his footprint on the electoral system by lowering the voting age to 18, out of respect for all the young men who were conscripted, and pushed for women's rights through equal pay, single mothers' benefits and no-fault divorce.

If the speeches of the past week are of any measure, there is no shortage of anecdotes to be told about a man who dedicated his life to his country. It is fitting that Gough Whitlam's story is entwined with the legacy of our diggers, as every year on 11 November Australia will reflect on that infamous day in 1975. I read with interest the comments from Rome of our former premier of South Australia, the Hon. Mike Rann, who, of course, was a good friend of Mr Whitlam. He said:

But Whitlam was much more important than any individual policy or achievement. Many people serve their country; Gough Whitlam changed ours. He lifted our individual horizons as people and made Australia more confident and more independent as a nation.

He was a Colossus, a big man in every sense who helped all of us and our country walk taller.

I would also like to reflect on the comments made in federal parliament in recent days by the Hon. Malcolm Turnbull, in his tribute to Gough. He stated:

We recognise that all prime ministers capture the attention of the Australian people. Not all prime ministers capture their imagination, and even fewer capture their imagination and retain it for so long. Gough Whitlam was able to do that because of his presence and his eloquence but, above all, because of that generosity of vision. He was an enhancer, an enlarger.

Edward Gough Whitlam is survived by his four children, and I take this opportunity to pay my respects to his family. On 21 October 2014, a massive figure of Australian politics passed away aged 98. Gough Whitlam, vale.

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) (11:22): I will be reasonably brief in my contribution because I know that other members wish to say things about this great man.

Gough Whitlam, as everyone knows, was a great reformer of the Labor Party, and he undertook tasks which those of us who have studied the Byzantine history of the Labor Party will appreciate were herculean tasks to change the party from the inside and make it a different organism than it previously was. I have some passing knowledge of the extent of that task and of the people and characters involved in it; it is recorded in many books in part, although perhaps not entirely accurately, but now is probably not the time to go into it in detail.

I had the privilege of actually knowing Gough Whitlam. I had an association with Gough and his family through relatives of mine. I really had the privilege of seeing him on and off pretty well for most of my life until the last few years. He was, as everyone has remarked, and will continue to remark, a remarkable individual—a man of great wit and a man of great intellect. I thought I would give you a couple of very brief anecdotes because I have had a little bit to do with him.

In 1992, I was preselected for the then highly marginal federal seat of Hindmarsh as a result of a very unsatisfactory redistribution. For the next year, I spent time campaigning for that contest which occurred ultimately in March 1993. That was a very good election for the Labor Party in every place around Australia except for South Australia, unfortunately. In the course of the preparation for that election, I did ask Gough whether he would come over and do a fundraiser for me, which he did agree to do.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: At the Grand.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, the Hellenic Club in Sturt Street. I recall being quite nervous about this event. There were some hundreds of people there and I was expected to make a speech in front of these people, which I found an extremely intimidating proposition. I was waiting at the top of the stairs for the great man to arrive.

He did arrive. He came up to me, shook my hand and said to me—and I am not going to do the often-repeated impersonations—'Hello, comrade, how are you?' I said, 'Good, thank you.' He said, 'How old are you now, comrade?' I said, 'Thirty-three.' He said, 'Well, do you realise that by the time he was your age Alexander had conquered the world and Jesus had saved it? What have you done?' I had to reply, 'Well, not very much.' He then turned, saw Andrew Collett holding his young son and said, 'Ah, a baby—I must kiss him,' and walked over.

That was the style of the man. He was a really great personality, a great figure. That evening, incidentally, he gave a speech which, fortunately from my point of view, did spend quite a bit of time going into the nuances of rail gauges and international covenants, which meant that my speech appeared to be, by comparison, almost interesting. That was probably something he did out of some generosity to me as a young aspiring candidate.

The other thing I would like to put on the record is that the great initiative of free university education was something that definitely changed my life. Were it not for that, I am absolutely positive that I would not have been in a position where my family could have afforded to send me to university and pay fees, although I may or may not have been able to secure a scholarship: we will never know. What I do know is that, by the time I came to go to university, the fact that my parents were of modest means did not make any difference.

I was amongst an increasingly large, at that time, cohort of people who were coming out of the public education sector into the tertiary university sector probably for the first time in any real numbers. That has had an enormous levelling effect, and it has caused, I think, a very constructive churn in the group of people who are passing through the universities. I personally would like to express my thanks for that opportunity which I may well not have had but for his efforts.

Gough Whitlam inspired a generation of Australians and, as everyone has remarked, has changed the place entirely. Also, from the position of Australia as a place in the world, before Whitlam and, to be fair, John Gorton as well, Australia was a place that was a little Britain or a little United States and we really did not have an international profile of our own. We were the lap-dogs out there, really. It started with John Gorton, but certainly after Whitlam's time the idea of Australia having an independent foreign policy, albeit one aligned with the Western alliance—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I'm talking about the way Australians saw themselves. Unfortunately, the member for Dunstan may not remember how angry Australians were when, for instance, the mother country joined the EU and we could not sell apples from Tasmania to Britain any more. This is the time space we are talking about. My grandparents told me about that.

I just wanted to say that Australia owes a great debt to this man. All of us in my generation certainly owe him a great debt, particularly those of us who had the opportunity of taking advantage of a university education, and I extend my condolences to his children and family.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:29): With the passing of Gough Whitlam, I acknowledge the contribution of both Mr Whitlam and Margaret Whitlam to public life and service in the federal parliament. Whilst he achieved high office of Prime Minister of Australia, and his contribution in government was and remains controversial, he remained active in academic and public affairs, the development of public policy and the like.

Tempted as I am, given the Deputy Premier's contribution, to talk about the Hindmarsh election in which he was a candidate, I will say that much has been said about Mr Whitlam's political endeavours, some praising and some pillorying. I have my view. Most members in this house have a view of that political period, and I will leave it for others to consider and reflect on that. My view is not positive, so I adopt my mother's abiding principle: on matters on which you have no positive contribution to make then do not say anything at all.

Today I do wish to recognise another side of Gough Whitlam, and that is to reflect upon his wisdom and wit. Can I start with his contribution to the Australian conversation and debate in respect of the severance of Her Majesty and her heirs and successors, as was proposed, as our head of state—the great Australian referendum and debate on Australia to become a republic in the 1990s. I mention this period because Mr Whitlam was active in public policy. He was a strong contributor to this debate. In respect of the affirmative of the proposal for a republic, it was led by none other than the Hon. Malcolm Turnbull, now a member of the Abbott government, and a very successful contributor in that government.

I found myself on the side of Mr Whitlam, so I simply recount to this house his visit to South Australia during that conversation and the establishment of a roundtable conference—perhaps one of the earliest of summits, as we now have them fairly commonly—in which South Australians were invited to participate. I found myself on a table of 10 with Mr Whitlam, Mr Wayne Goss (a former Labor premier from Queensland) and other luminaries in the academic, legal and political world.

Some might find it hard to believe, but my contribution was not significant at this conference. In fact, I pay tribute to Mr Whitlam's contribution, not only for the general debate but in the summit in South Australia, and that round table was a great learning experience. Whilst I was and remain a great supporter of Australia becoming a republic, following the principle of Her Majesty that 'if you love her, let her go', he did make an outstanding contribution to South Australia's contribution to that debate, exercised our minds and really did stimulate that debate considerably. He was a passionate debater and he provided wise counsel. Whilst the referendum in the affirmative ultimately failed, I will remember that period and thank him for his contribution to the debate.

As to his wit, many have referred to his part in the passage of the Family Law Act in 1975, which ultimately came into effect on 1 January 1976, to abolish the Matrimonial Causes Act, and that had repercussions around Australia. Perhaps the most controversial aspect at the time was the removal of the grounds of adultery, desertion, cruelty and the like as bases upon which a divorce could be granted. It transferred to 12 months' separation identifying an irretrievable breakdown of the relationship as the basis upon which a dissolution of marriage could be granted.

It was controversial, but he remained active in that space. It was not a perfect piece of legislation. It did require and has required significant amendment, but the concept of starting the dissolution of the partnership in a manner without accusatory evidence from one party to another as to their conduct or behaviour I think did usher in a significant advance in that area of the law. Mr Whitlam remained a significant contributor to the amendment of that legislation. I can recall in the 1980s that he attended a national conference here in Adelaide and addressed the gathering. In this regard, he did retain a sense of humour. Of course, he always made passionate speeches about this important area of reform and was committed to it, but he opened the convention dinner with the address, 'Mr President, judges, dignitaries and happy couples'. He was never far from being able to identify the social impact of whatever legislation he was involved in. I cannot now remember the rest of the speech but I will always remember that, and I thank him for his contribution in that regard. Now I have a confession to make, about my first meeting with Mr Whitlam.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: No; fortunately, unlike the interjections I am hearing, I was far too young to vote at this time. I was a young teenager at the time of the world premiere screening of the film *Sunday Too Far Away* here in South Australia. It was a great film. I was the handbag for my father, the Hon. Ted Chapman, on that occasion, and the embarrassing aspect of the night was that I was sitting between my father and the Hon. Jack Wright—who both had a history in shearing, both knew about the fifties' strike, both knew everything about what was happening on this film—when they burst into laughter while the rest of the thousand or so audience remained silent. I was, of course, a typical teenager, wanting to shrink with embarrassment at what one's parents do.

However, my great opportunity that night was to meet Jack Thompson, the star of the film. As some members would remember, he had been a centrefold in *Cleo* by this stage.

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: That was very controversial at the time; the whole magazine was controversial, actually. He also lived with two sisters, which was very risqué then—I am not sure they were twins, but they were definitely sisters—and that opportunity of his got the blood of most males in Australia very excited.

My great opportunity that night was to meet Mr Thompson, and it was going to be magnificent. We were in the Railway Station (this is pre Casino days). Everyone was there in their long dresses and gloves, the usual array of elegance, and in comes Mr Thompson—overshadowed, on this occasion, by the presence of the then prime minister. In came Mr and Mrs Whitlam. She was by far the tallest woman I had ever seen; both of them were a foot taller than anyone else in the room. Their presence was incredible, and it reminds us of the importance of when prime ministers, or indeed premiers, take those positions. They take those positions to represent the whole country or state respectively. We were all in awe of this couple, who came on that very special occasion.

Of course, undaunted, I still wanted to meet Mr Thompson, and I have to say that I was not particularly interested in any chitchat with the prime minister but more in meeting Mr Thompson. If members have seen the film they will remember that he was the swashbuckling shearer hero of the film and of the strike, and when he arrived at this very grand occasion he had long hair, his shirt open to the navel, with the big bouffant sleeves (purple, I think it was) in satin. It was suitably tacky, when we reflect on it. Nevertheless, he was there. I simply cannot repeat what Mr Wright and Mr Chapman said on this occasion. It would be totally politically incorrect in this day and age, and is unrepeatable. Nevertheless, I was in awe of meeting the great Mr Thompson and, I have to say, at the entrance of Mr Whitlam, which really did impress all those present.

With that confession, I can say that it was a very interesting era in public life for Mr Whitlam, but he did make an outstanding contribution in a number of areas of public policy and debate, and I thank him for that. I also acknowledge, on his passing, his late wife, Margaret Whitlam, and her outstanding contribution in representing women in public life. Vale.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (11:39): I will be very brief, sir, because I know the Treasurer is very keen to make a contribution to the debate. Can I just quickly talk about the enormous effect that Gough Whitlam made on the Labor Party in terms of making the Labor Party ready for government in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Basically, from the death of Ben Chifley the party was pretty much unfit for government. It was dominated by those, particularly in the Victorian branch, who were more committed to what they perceived as being ideological purity than making constructive policies which would place the party in a fit state to make it electable and take government. Whitlam took on these people, famously telling a Victorian state conference, to many boos, that he did not aspire to be the leader of Australia's largest pressure group.

Gough Whitlam was instrumental, along with Clyde Cameron, in the intervention by the national party into the Victorian branch to basically reform that branch so as to put the party in a position where we would be electable. He also played a key role in opposing the expulsion of my late friend Senator Brian Harradine from the party. When the national executive made the decision to expel Brian from the party, Gough famously referred to the national executive as '12 witless men'. He played a very important role in reversing the party's opposition to state aid for Catholic schools. There were many Catholic schools in predominantly working-class areas that were not, under Labor Party policy, able to receive state aid, and Whitlam played a key role in overturning that sectarian policy, for want of better words.

On a personal note, when Cyclone Tracy hit Darwin, the national government responded in sorting out the evacuation of Darwin, which, of course, in 1974 was far more remote than it is today in terms of communications and the ability to get lots of people there and to quickly move large numbers of people out. My mother and father-in-law and my wife were in Darwin in Cyclone Tracy and they had to be evacuated, and came down to Adelaide. I remember my father-in-law was always enormously grateful for what the Whitlam government did for the victims of what was then and may still be Australia's greatest ever natural disaster. The smooth evacuation of people from Darwin was something that they were certainly very grateful for.

I might just finish off with one quick story. Many people in the parliament may know personally, or may know of, the Hon. Johnno Johnson, formerly president of the Legislative Council in New South Wales—a great man. Johnno has spent most of his time fundraising for the Australian Labor Party, generally through selling raffle tickets, but when he was not fundraising for the Labor Party he was fundraising for the Catholic Church. Johnno had been given a job by the archbishop at the time of raising money to restore St Mary's Cathedral in Sydney. Johnno knew that, while he was not a Catholic, Gough certainly had enormous respect and admiration for the beauty and heritage value of St Mary's Cathedral and that he might take up some official part in the campaign to raise money for it.

So, Johnno rang Gough and spoke to him about it, and they discussed the matter. In the course of the conversation Johnno and Gough talked about the fact that there was a crypt in St Mary's Cathedral where deceased archbishops of Sydney are buried. Gough hinted, or suggested, that in exchange for his having a part in this fundraising campaign perhaps Johnno could subtly suggest to the archbishop that it would be an appropriate thing for Gough Whitlam to be buried in the crypt of St Mary's Cathedral. Johnno said to Gough, 'Look, this is only for deceased archbishops of Sydney; you're not even Catholic let alone an archbishop. I don't really think that's going to go very far.' Gough's reply was (in my best Gough voice), 'Don't worry, comrade, I'll only need it for three days.'

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (11:44): The reason my father is Labor is because of Mr Whitlam. He is held in high reverence within the Greek community in South Australia because he was the first Australian leader

to actively pursue not only their votes but also their culture, and for that I am eternally grateful to the great man.

There are many stories about Mr Whitlam that we could talk about today, about his prime ministership, about policy reforms that he made. I want to talk about what he has done for the Australian Labor Party. When the Labor government was elected in 1972, they had lost previously nine elections in a row. We had become accustomed to losing and, quite frankly, a lot of the party enjoyed that: there was comfort in lost, there was no responsibility, we could remain pure. The party spent a lot of time bickering amongst themselves, at national and state conferences, about things that just did not matter, and the public knew it.

What Gough Whitlam did was bring about a level of professionalism to the Australian Labor Party. He has many legacies—free education, no-fault divorce, the way he changed Australia's foreign engagement, his engagement with minorities and, of course, he gave us multiculturalism—but what he has given all of us as a party is a desire and a burning ambition to always win.

Why did he want us to win? Because, as he famously said at that Victorian conference, 'only the impotent are pure', and we can only aspire to work for those working people who put their faith and trust in us from government, and that is his greatest legacy to me: the burning ambition to always defeat our opponents, to push anyone who is in our way out of the way to get the right outcomes for the people of South Australia and the people of this country, because the Labor Party exists to win.

We exist to win to deliver for the people whom we represent, whether it be free education, health care, adequate law and order, decent roads or a fairer tax system. Whatever it might, it is always about delivering for those who put their faith and trust in us, and that is what Whitlam's legacy is to me. It is many things to many people.

When I was elected in 1997, I think the former prime minister rang a number of backbenchers who had been successful in that campaign, and I was lucky enough to receive a phone call from him. He rang me, and my trainee at the time said, 'There's a Mr Whitlam on the phone,' and I thought it was either you, Jack Snelling, or Michael Brown. So I answered the phone and said, 'Giddy, prime minister,' and the undisguisable, booming voice of our former prime minister came through the phone, and I felt this urge to stand up—I do not know why.

We had a long conversation. He said that the party had done a remarkable job after such a crushing defeat four years earlier, that it had done such a remarkable job coming back, that it was always important that Labor wins at every election, and that we do what we can to try to implement our programs. I said to him, 'Prime minister, what advice would you give a young backbencher?' He said, 'What you probably want to hear is that only the impotent are pure, but what you really should be doing is winning, because you can't implement your programs from opposition.' Like the health minister said, we are not a pressure group, we are a political force and a political movement, and it is our responsibility to do all we can to protect those who put their trust in us.

He changed the way we thought about politics, he changed the way we thought about our country, he changed the way we thought about our migrants. I am a child of that generation, I am a child of that migrant movement, and we have so much respect for Gough Whitlam. It is fair to say that in my household, my household is split. My mother was a committed Liberal up until I joined the Labor Party.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: More a royalist than a Liberal.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: More a royalist than a Liberal, mainly because communist rebels executed her godfather in front of her when she was a little girl. But my father is a committed Labor voter. When Gough's passing was announced, I saw a little bit of a tear in my mother's eye, which surprised me. She confessed to me later that she had voted for him not in 1972 and not in 1974 but that she had voted for him in 1975. I thought, 'Why did you do that?' I did not understand. She said, 'I didn't like him, but he was trying to change things and the people that he was trying to change got rid of him unfairly.' I thought, 'That's another aspect that will always remind me of the importance of the Labor Party always being in a winning position so that democratic values are always espoused.'

So, Mr Speaker, my deepest condolences to the family, but like prime minister Keating and prime minister Hawke said, this is not a time to mourn, it is a time to celebrate his life, and I thank him for his contribution.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:49): I doubt it is a coincidence that the celebration of Gough's life will be held on Guy Fawkes Day, because perhaps there is no more fitting day to remember how parliament changed forever, particularly in Australia. Just as the member for Bragg has made a confession this morning, I want to confess that I was a Gough groupie. Swept up in the promise of redemption from the years of the political wilderness of opposition, as an almost 20 year old I found myself in Canberra, surrounded by the euphoria of the 'It's Time' campaign. So, it is no surprise, I guess, to any of you here that, even though I was not as much into politics as I am now, I was covered in badges and all sorts of goodies—T-shirts, you name it, I had it. But I found, on the particular day where Billy McMahon was walking through the mall, I had not a single thing on me and waved furiously at him, to which he waved back and said, 'Thank you, dear', which of course was not why I was waving at all.

Many others have spoken this morning on Gough's amazing contribution to parliament. In particular, I would like to mention his reforms in the area that affected Aboriginal Australians—that iconic picture with Vincent Lingiari and the sands being handed back—and of course in health reform. On Remembrance Day in 1975, I found myself working in the cash payment centre of Medibank on Grenfell Street, which was perhaps the busiest office, I thought, in Australia at the time, in the days when a visit to the doctor was \$5.75 and the refund was \$4.85. It is a long story and a lot has happened since then. That, of course, was the day I actually joined the Labor Party, or the day after, at the mammoth rally that was held in Victoria Square.

Like the member for Bragg, when I first met Gough and Margaret, they were enormous people, particularly to me, standing a step below them. I remember it was at the Norwood Town Hall, though I do not remember the exact occasion, but we were certainly there for Don Dunstan, who was more at my eye level but stood beside Gough and Margaret in much the same way: they were giants and he was a giant as well.

I had many close encounters with Gough. He has signed more books than I care to remember. He and Margaret were both really kind on many occasions by supplying things for fundraising. Just like the Treasurer, I had a phone call from Gough, but no-one passed on the message. In fact, the person in my office who took the phone call is lucky that they are still breathing, because he had rung to tell me how much he appreciated his copy of my icons calendar, in which Gough is very much the star as Mr July. If anyone wants a copy of that calendar, I still have some.

It would be fair to say his wit, as we all have noted this morning, is legendary and will remain so forever, not only in his lifetime but for many years to come. Both he and Margaret have been giants in my life. On behalf of the people of Florey and the Florey electorate office staff, I send my condolences to his family.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:52): I know there are many other people who wish to speak, so I will be very brief. There are two things I would like to mention about Gough. Firstly, I will mention his very longstanding marriage to Margaret. I am always in admiration of people who can remain married for a very long period of time, and I think—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: I just think it takes a lot of work to maintain a marriage, and to have been prime minister in such a tumultuous time, to have been such a figure in so many people's lives over such a long period of time and still maintain that marriage over that time is an achievement in itself. Obviously, that is not just him but Margaret as well, so I think that should be remarked upon, especially with her recent passing.

Secondly, I am fortunate to have two degrees, and my father was the first person in his family to have a degree, which he did at Flinders University. We came from a poor family, and that would not have been possible without those reforms. That time at university has shaped me and I have used it throughout my career. It just would not have been an option open to me without that reform, so very briefly I would like to thank him for that and the government at the time. Even though things had changed by the time I got to university and we accrued a debt, it was still accessible and it just

would not have happened without that. I offer my condolences to the family and will obviously remember that for a very long period of time.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (11:54): I would like to pay tribute to Gough Whitlam. I am a little younger than the Premier and so my memory of him contemporaneously and his government was that my parents were upset at the sacking and I had very little understanding of why, but it did shape me in some way. Politically, in that sense, I am more a child of the Hawke/Keating government, having been a teenager then, and yet, on reflection, we are all the political children of Gough Whitlam. He represents a point of modernity for our country, which was the magic gate that we went through and from which we have been altered for evermore.

As a personality, he was the very opposite of a measurer and a straightener. He was an enlarger, as was referred to earlier, and a reviver of our party as well as of our country. The cultural change he made to Australia was extraordinary: the embracing of migration, the rights for Indigenous people, the rights for women. The social infrastructure that many have referred to was similarly extraordinary. Universal health care, which then took the Hawke/Keating government's longevity to embed truly in Australian culture but, nonetheless, the introduction of universal health care; the universal accessibility of higher education, as has been referred to; the embracing of the protection of the environment; the family law reforms; tackling cities as an important social matter; these have all shaped who we are and will do so evermore.

One area that has not been discussed so much is economic reform and that is because it is a difficult topic in relation to the Whitlam government. We know that there are reasons why he was referred to as a crash through or crash government and that ultimately the Australian people did not return him in 1975. What he did do during that period was start to tackle the tariff walls that had kept the Australian economy in a state of complacency and false comfort. The fact that he had the courage to do that and that it was subsequently followed up, particularly by the Hawke/Keating government reforms, has left us in the strong position that enabled us to go through the global financial crisis and that has made us a more efficient economy, but it was done—both under Whitlam and later Hawke/Keating—in a way that respected that you had to have an industry policy, that you had to work with industry to help them manage those changes and not simply say, 'We have no role to play here.' I think that is something we have benefited from and that we could currently learn from.

Ultimately, he was a man who represented pride in Australia, with an enormous sense of humour, and who has made us a country that regards itself as independent and one that we can be proud of. I thank him most sincerely for that and I pass on my deep condolences to his family.

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) (11:57): I rise briefly to also offer my condolences to the family and to point out that when we go doorknocking, when we ring constituents and they say, 'Which party are you?' and you say, 'The Labor Party,' still so many people say that they vote Labor and they have always voted Labor because of something Gough Whitlam did when he was the prime minister of Australia or that he promised to do in that 1972 campaign when he offered so much change for Australia.

One woman in particular in Woodcroft, who I doorknocked probably five or six years ago, said that she remembered doing the ironing when Gough Whitlam came on the television and said that he would end the lottery of death, the compulsory conscription for (I think) people who were turning 20 to go to Vietnam. She had a son who was only a month away from turning 20. They used to pull marbles out of a barrel and the date that came up, everyone who was born on that date had to go and do active duty. So, that was a real change for so many people in Australia, but it was just one example. Others have mentioned the free university education which gave people, for the first time ever, for generation after generation, the chance to get a tertiary qualification, which was a great thing for all Australians.

I met Mr Whitlam a few times. I remember that in 2006 he was at the Mick Young race day at Randwick. It was not long after the state election here and he knew all about Nick Xenophon and what he had done to get two members into the upper house. So, he showed a keen interest in politics, not just at the federal level but at the state and territory level as well. I think we were lucky in that

period in the seventies, during the Whitlam government, that we had strong representation with Mick Young as the member for Port Adelaide, who was also a keen member of the machinery of the federal Labor Party, but also Don Dunstan as premier. I know that the Whitlams were here for the opening of the Adelaide Festival Centre and also for the opening of the ABC building. It was a time when a lot of things changed in South Australia, with a lot of thanks to both Don Dunstan and Gough Whitlam.

The Premier pointed out, I guess, the pedantic nature of Mr Whitlam and his attention to detail. I remember asking him to sign a book for my son, Conor, at one stage, and he said, 'Is it with two n's or one?' I said, 'It is just with one n,' and he said, 'Yes, the traditional way. In the 1890s some Irish decided to get trendy and put two n's in it, but one n is the correct spelling.' It did not matter what you put to Mr Whitlam, he seemed to be an expert on nearly everything. A huge intellect, a huge reformer and someone who will go down in history as one of the great Australian leaders of this nation.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 12:02 to 12:12.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (12:13): I seek leave to move the motion standing in my name in an amended form.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the report of the Auditor-General to be referred to a committee of the whole house and for ministers to be examined on matters contained in the papers in accordance with the timetable as distributed.

Motion carried.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SUPERANNUATION) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 September 2014.)

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (12:15): I rise and indicate to the house that I will be the lead and only speaker on this Statutes Amendment (Superannuation) Bill. I understand that this bill includes a number of technical and non-controversial changes to the Police Superannuation Act 1990, the Southern State Superannuation Act 2009, the Superannuation Act 1988 and the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974.

Very briefly, the amendment to the Police Superannuation Act 1990 arises as a result of the latest SAPOL enterprise bargaining agreement, concluded in 2011, which provided for a flexibility allowance of 5 per cent of annual salary which, for superannuation purposes, would only be applied with a prospective effect. The amendment will prevent members from receiving a retrospective windfall gain in benefits, especially if the member has only received the allowance for a short period of time in comparison with the period of service. I understand that the Police Association supports this amendment.

The second act that this deals with is the Southern State Superannuation Act 2009. One amendment deals with formalising current practice amongst agencies where they have made superannuation guarantee payments to employees earning less than \$450 per month, even though employees were not able to be members of the Southern State Superannuation Scheme. The amendment makes it clear that these members are members of the Southern State Superannuation

Scheme. The second amendment allows for the exchange of data between state super and Southern State Superannuation.

The third aspect that this bill deals with is essentially amendments that allow the appropriate superannuation board to release a portion of a member's superannuation for the purpose of funding a division 293 tax debt incurred by the member. As I indicated before, the opposition will support this bill, as we do all sensible legislation put forward by this government, and we hope that by passing it this morning it will be able to progress and be put in place as soon as possible.

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) (12:18): I very much appreciate the contribution and support of the Leader of the Opposition.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

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) (12:18): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 September 2014.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:19): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) Bill 2014. This bill was introduced by the Attorney on 23 September 2014 and, as he stated in his contribution to the parliament, it is to remedy 'minor errors, omissions and other deficiencies' as identified in various acts. Usually, when I see words such as those it sets off alarm bells and they usually deserve of further inspection. However, it is true that governments do, from time to time, identify aspects of legislation which is deficient in some manner. Often, it is new legislation that is introduced and in its practical application it is identified that there is some error, some curiosity or some aspect of inconsistency which needs to be remedied.

My understanding is that, rather than always rushing back into parliament with a bill with an individual provision to identify each item, there is sometimes an accumulation of these things, and at timely periods the Attorney-General comes in with a statutes amendment bill such as this, often named the Attorney-General's portfolio bill so that it is clear what is occurring.

I think the last one was in 2011, when a bill was introduced which dealt with a number of aspects, including the provision for permission for Community Corrections officers to be extended under the correctional services legislation. There were also significant reforms required in respect of fines in the capacity for conversion to community service, and there were also amendments in respect of the Director of Public Prosecutions Act; as I recall, significant aspects needed to be upgraded in that legislation.

I mention this previous bill because not only were there subject matters that I would call the usual list of things for review but there were some questions raised about auxiliary judicial officers and their appointment, and there was provision in respect of the Youth Parole Board and the eligibility for consideration by the Parole Board for adult parole.

I mention these because I think there is a startling omission of one matter which is now the subject of this bill, and I am still concerned as to why we had not dealt with this matter a few years ago and why, by the time this matter was resolved in 2012, we had not done something earlier. I refer to the proposal in this bill to amend the description of child pornography.

I raised this during a briefing that was provided by the Attorney-General's office, and I thank members of the office for their advice on all of these matters in the briefing provided. It did seem curious and a little concerning to me that this was an issue that had not been picked up until 2014 and that the academic support for the notion that we would contemporise, modernise and more appropriately have a descriptor for child pornography had not been followed up in that earlier legislation, which was only a few years ago. The crux of the amendment is to remove the child pornography terminology from the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and, as I say, to give it a more contemporary descriptor and strengthen the recognition of what we were really talking about to 'child exploitation material'.

Sometimes, a particular word can, with the effluxion of time, acquire a certain interpretation or a certain aura as to its meaning. The classic example, really, in that category was the word 'juvenile' which is really a description of someone who is at a certain stage of development in the human and animal world and has a very benign and, I think, inoffensive meaning. But, because it was a word that was commonly used in the 1970s and 1980s rather than the words 'child' or 'youth', it rather attracted a connotation that 'juvenile' was always associated not with an age but with a level of delinquency.

The term 'juvenile delinquent' developed and it was seen in a very narrow and negative way. Therefore, during this evolution of a descriptor that had attracted such a negative view, there was legislative change to remove that word when dealing with offences of persons under 18, when dealing with reform and when dealing with the rehabilitation, for example, of our young people who offend. I think that is a good thing, and it is important that we do that from time to time.

The government says, in respect of the child exploitation amendment, that this is the modern terminology. It has been picked up by other states and I think we are now the last. It is a bit disappointing that even in New South Wales they dealt with this matter back in 2010, and why did we not then capture that in the legislation when we were last in the parliament on the Attorney-General's portfolio? Perhaps in the response from the Attorney he could give some explanation, because I think we need to have it.

It just seems to me that it is important and reasonable for governments, when they are pioneering in a certain field, to take some accolade and be given recognition if they take up the challenge, particularly if it is in an envelope of controversy. In this instance, this issue has been canvassed in the academic world, traversed in judgments and dealt with in other parliaments, and we are really the tail-end Charlie on this—and in an environment where governments just could not be forgiven for thinking that this would be some oversight, because it has been such a topical issue in the last 10 years. In fact, I think in South Australia it has had very high prominence since the 1980s and, of course, it has captured the attention of leading academics in this field.

We had reports, for example, which were effective in stimulating the discussion at the political level and implementing reform such as the paper from 2008 titled 'Aggression and Violent Behaviour' on the particular topic of 'The internet and child sexual offending: A criminological review', co-authored by Anthony Beech, Ian Elliott, Astrid Birgden and Donald Findlater. The issue was clear, and it was a matter which, as I say, had been taken up by other parliaments around the country but South Australia had the opportunity to do that and did not, and I think we do need to have some explanation for that.

That early paper also dealt with what was already a major problem in dealing with the management and containment of image production and dissemination, particularly as a result of the internet. The availability of abusive images of children was widespread and it was necessary for there to be a high level of work done to work out how we were going to manage it. At that stage, the definition was raised in that paper as to the appropriateness of the term 'child pornography'. It was reported in that 2008 presentation:

There has also been much debate as to the appropriateness of the term 'child pornography'. Many professionals within the field argued that the term trivialises the material and lends credence and legitimacy to the meaning that offenders bring to the phrase while also drawing unwarranted comparison to adult pornography and thus minimising the material's inherently abusive nature and suggests that images of an abusive nature are not pornography in any real sense, simply the evidence of serious sexual assaults on young children.

It was certainly clearly out there. Jeremy Prichard co-authored with Caroline Spiranovic from the law school at the University of Tasmania a paper presented in September this year entitled 'Child exploitation material in the context of institutional child sexual abuse'. It was a report for the current Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. Again, much commentary was presented as to what is child exploitation material and which they acknowledged generally involved child pornography, but they argued again that the word 'pornography' treats the material as a legitimate sub-genera of adult pornography, again quoting back to the 2008 report.

I thank the Attorney-General's office for providing this material. It is worth a read for those who are interested in the development of how we might codify and deal with the prosecution of child exploitation material but also to expand our own understanding of what this comprises and the importance of us as a parliament acting to try to stem the ever-increasing exploitation of children in this way.

The thing I think is most important for us to appreciate is that, even if images are created which are not of a child in a nude or semi-nude state, for example, and in which a child's face is superimposed on the figures in the material, it is still an exploitation of children as a class. It denigrates children as a class. Even if the children are not directly involved in the photographing or distribution or publication of this material, they are being denigrated as a class. Ultimately, even if the offending contribution to make it child pornography is a feature or a photograph or a part-photograph of a child which is completely acceptable on its own, once superimposed it becomes child exploitation material. That is something I think we can all learn from to appreciate the significance of what is occurring out there.

Another area which I think is significant is the use of young persons over the legal age for being photographed in an act of exploitation and/or abuse. This is when someone is over the age of consent but is depicted as someone who is under the age of consent. This includes wearing childlike clothing—school uniforms, pyjamas, etc.—or childlike behaviour or visual cues included in pictures of this kind, such as teddy bears, etc.

These are all circumstances in which, even if the person who is in the pictures is over the age of consent and is able to be photographed quite lawfully, it is unacceptable to me and I think to most academics that we allow this situation to prevail where descriptors of children are used in that exploitative way. It just seems to me that this is a circumstance where we are mindful that we have got a problem, we are repeatedly told that we have got a problem, we see many court cases in which there are prosecutions stemming from this yet, in South Australia, we are so far behind. I have made the point, and I hope that the Attorney addresses it, because I think the South Australian public needs some explanation as to what has happened there.

Another aspect of this bill provides for amendments in respect of the Burial and Cremation Act 2013. This was a bill which actually took quite some time to get through the parliament, but it did last year with the consent of the opposition. There was quite a bit of amendment required. Some of it was because some errors had been discovered along the way or things that were likely to cause some problem, so there needed to be significant amendment to the bill on the way through.

Nevertheless, it went through the parliament, but we are advised that it was discovered that there would be an obligation under the new act for two doctors to certify the death of a person before a cremation permit could be issued, one being the deceased's consulting doctor immediately prior to the death. It is worthwhile remembering that this legislation last year—the new Burial and Cremation Act 2013—provided for a comprehensive consolidation and upgrading of our law in relation to this area and, as part of that, the old cremation act was repealed.

We had several pieces of legislation that dealt with the management and disposal of bodies. I do not think we have quite worked out chemical cremations and all the things that are yet to be advanced in the next chapter of this area of—I am not quite sure what you call it—what is obviously a specialty in relation to funeral directors and persons who are involved in that space. Nevertheless, it has built up over time, so there was a consolidation and an upgrade of legislation. This appears to have been missed. It now imposes, inadvertently it appears, an obligation which is impractical and is beyond what had been intended and what used to apply under the old cremation act where only one doctor's signature was required.

It is worth remembering at this point that it was not long before that that we were here in the parliament trying to deal with the events of the bodies in the crypt case up in Glen Osmond where a building site was being trawled in preparation of the soil and so on and a crypt was discovered. The development had to stop, and there had then been, I think as respectfully as possible, the recovery of bones from the crypt.

Considerable effort was put into identifying the deceased. There was some controversy over whether there were two bodies or three bodies, but ultimately there was sufficient identification that two of the bodies were traced to the extent of who they were. They then needed to be held at a funeral parlour until we could sort out the problem of how they could be reinterred, buried or cremated, because the cremation rules at the time said that you were not allowed to cremate any bones or human remains without a doctor's certificate.

These bones had been there for over 100 years and there was no death certificate. We had that problem. The then Attorney-General, now the Speaker, had it under his consideration, and there was generally agreement that we had to deal with the issue that was before us, namely how to allow the relatives who had been traced from the identified remains permission to cremate them, then obviously have some place in the world.

It was resolved ultimately by an amendment to the cremation act to enable the Attorney-General in certain circumstances to grant approval and to cover that situation. That is what occurred. It had a happy ending. The bones were cremated and put to rest. Those cremation remains are in Glen Osmond. There is a special little memorial there provided by the Burnside council.

From time to time there is nothing we can do to think that we have covered every aspect of potential enforcement or application. Something comes from left field and it has to be dealt with. As best as possible, a whole new regime came into place with the Burial and Cremation Act. We are back here to remedy a small part, and the opposition will support that.

There is the re-sentencing for subsequent cooperation with law enforcement agencies by offenders. In essence, this allows for an interpretation to be clear as to what law is to apply when an offender is re-sentenced in these circumstances. The law currently allows that when someone is being sentenced for certain offences, if they cooperate with the police and other agencies they are actually able to receive a reduction in their sentence.

This is consistent with a number of initiatives, some of which we have been happy to support when the attorney has brought to the parliament opportunities for incentives to be built into the sentencing law to encourage people to confess early—enter a plea of guilty early, for example. At certain stages of the dealing of a criminal matter, if someone enters a plea of guilty at the earliest opportunity, then some of the sentencing law allows for up to 40 per cent of the sentence to be reduced to cover that.

For example, if they go past the early initial hearings of a criminal matter and reach the committal and more expense is outlaid in either the police prosecution or the DPP's office, it reduces the opportunity to have something less. This particular area that is seeking some amendment today relates to getting the benefit of a reduction in one sentence if you provide information that is going to help the police, usually in another offence.

That is controversial, I must say, in the general public. Sometimes people think, 'Well, why should you be getting a reduction in penalty just because you are squealing on someone else?' Sometimes the public do not fully appreciate the importance of that, but one of the most important aspects of it is catching someone else who might be more culpable or more deserving of punishment and who would otherwise have alluded the police or the prosecuting forces. We think it is not unreasonable that there be an offer for a reduction in sentence in these circumstances. Sometimes it is called the supergrass amendment, where the hopeful expectation is that in offering this reduction you are likely to catch the bigger fish involved in criminal activity.

I wish to thank the Office of the DPP for providing a briefing in respect of how that particular reform has been going. That was provided in confidence and, of course, I respect that, but it is fair to say that there is, in fact, to be a formal review now that two years has passed since its operation. We will be looking forward to receiving that review here in the parliament. In the meantime, it appears that an aspect needs to be cleared up and, without disclosing what has occurred in the confidential

briefings, it might help not only to ensure that this is a medium which can be accessed both by the defendant, or ultimately the offender, in their sentencing but also ensure that there is some upgrade to the DPP being able to maintain the threat of a loss of reduced sentence if someone indicates that they are going to provide information and then withdraws it.

There is a twofold benefit to this reform. One is that it can encourage people to squeal on others who are involved in activity, and that can be done prior to the sentencing and have the benefits as I have explained. The second is where, for example, the DPP in negotiations prior to the sentencing receives a statement confirming the information about the person who they are informing on and then after they have had the benefit of the reduced sentence refuses to attend court to give evidence to support that assertion. What position is the DPP left in to be able to withdraw that and to be able to apply for the offender in those circumstances to be resentenced because they have subsequently withdrawn from the promise to provide support?

Sometimes, of course, there can be circumstances where the withdrawal of consent may be entirely unaided or uninfluenced other than the fact that the offender thinks that they have got away with a reduced sentence. They think, 'You beaut. Now I will sign the statement, but so what? I am not going to go along and give evidence,' and generally become uncooperative. They have received the benefit of getting a reduced sentence really under a false pretence. We think on this side of the house that, in those circumstances, it is quite reasonable that that be tidied up and obviously allow the right for that to be withdrawn, otherwise how could it possibly be an example in the future for people to then honour their commitment to be the informant and to follow through with the giving of evidence?

Of course, sometimes the change of mind on behalf of the offender may not be their fault. It may be they have subsequently received a threat from someone (or a supporter of someone) who is going to be caught by the information provided and they issue some threat against the offender. Then, out of fear that there may be some repercussion, they indicate to the prosecuting authorities they are withdrawing their consent to give evidence. For whatever reason, though, even if it is in the circumstances where someone has had the benefit of getting what they should not have—and they have not honoured that with their follow-up—then that needs to be taken into account.

One of the issues which has been raised and which we are here to deal with is the problem of being sure in the legislation about whether, at the time of resentencing, there is going to be an application of the law that applied in respect of the sentencing at the time of the offence, or whether the law should apply at the time of resentencing. This is potentially an acute problem in attempting to encourage anyone to support the authorities or provide information to the authorities who has been convicted of murder.

Members will probably recall that in recent years we changed the law in South Australia in respect of murder cases where a minimum of 20 years imprisonment was part of that penalty regime. A life sentence is still the maximum, of course, but we do not have executions—although I was recently reading that next month is the 50th anniversary of the last person executed in South Australia who was Valence, from memory. I let myself sidetrack here and now get back to the current murder cases.

We have a bit of a dilemma in how we encourage someone who was convicted of a murder, say, 10 years ago, and for whatever reason they come forward or are encouraged to come forward and provide some information to someone else—whether they have heard information in prison which might be helpful in solving another crime or in getting another person arrested who might have been involved as another party in the same offence as the offender. Whatever the reason is, some years later they come by this information, or decide it is time to confess, and they go off to the authorities to provide this information. That is done on the understanding that it might help them in a resentencing opportunity with a reduction only to find that, if they were to do that, the dilemma for them is that they would be potentially exposed to the risk that the new sentence would apply under the contemporary law, that is, as of today, and to find that their 10-year life sentence with seven years nonparole is suddenly subject to legislation which would impose the 20-year minimum.

Clearly, this needed to be sorted out and we needed to make provision to clarify that. The bill, I am told, will resolve that potential problem, and it will have the effect that, at the time of

resentencing, the law that applied at the date of the offence will prevail and the law and principles applicable at that time will be invoked. The provision for notification of suspension of interstate legal practitioners is also a matter which the opposition supports, but I do have a question in relation to it and I would ask the Attorney to consider this matter.

At present, under the Legal Practitioners Act, if a legal practitioner from interstate is suspended in South Australia, the court is required to notify interstate regulatory authorities—whether it is the Law Society in another state or the like—if he or she is a director of an incorporated legal practice. Apparently it was identified as being unclear whether the court is required to notify the authorities of an individual legal practitioner's suspension, and this amendment secures the same.

The question I have for the Attorney is that, whilst we accept whether the legal practitioner is practising individually or in a partnership or in a corporate enterprise, clearly, the information about their transgression/suspension needs to be identified in the other forums. We do not have an issue with making sure that we cover the field with legislation on that and that it is important to do. What is unclear to me is why the court must necessarily have that obligation and why would it not be the regulatory authority here that would have that responsibility to convey that to others.

Presumably, it is not too much of a cost. I made some inquiries and it seems that the material is emailed at present. The relevant authorities are known and the court undertakes that function. However, it does seem a little unusual to me that the court should be obliged to do that and not the enforcement agencies, whether that is a legal practitioner body or a representative from the DPP's office or someone from the Attorney-General's office, so I simply raise that question.

I come now to what our side of the house considers to be the more controversial aspects of this bill. The first is the amendments that are proposed to the Magistrates Act, to make provision for the appointment of the deputy chief magistrate as the acting chief magistrate in the event that the Chief Magistrate is absent or unable to carry out his or her duties.

As members may be aware, the general governance in respect of the magistrates in our courts is covered by this legislation—that is, the Magistrates Act—and the arrangements for the appointment and, indeed, the dismissal of members of this level of the judiciary are quite different to the judicial officers and judges in the District Court and Supreme Court which have their own acts and where, in fact, this parliament plays a role, not only because they have a very distinctive role in the appointment by the Attorney-General as a member of the government, but also this parliament is responsible in certain circumstances for the removal of a judge from office in a superior court. A superior court includes the District Court and not just the Supreme Court of South Australia.

There are exceptional circumstances when the parliament is called upon to act in regard to these superior courts. It is extremely rare, thankfully, because it is very important in any event that the government of the day have responsibility for the formal appointment and ultimately the taking of an oath in the presence of the Chief Justice, when they are sworn in as such, but that they have a role in dealing with dismissal in those exceptional circumstances.

The Magistrates Court has an extra provision—and I say 'extra' because within it is section 7(2) which states:

The Deputy Chief Magistrate may, if the office of Chief Magistrate is vacant, or the Chief Magistrate is absent or unavailable to carry out the duties of the office, exercise any of the powers or functions of the Chief Magistrate.

I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

PASTORAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION (RENEWABLE ENERGY) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

AUSTRALIAN CRIME COMMISSION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (EXAMINATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I welcome Yalari students from Scotch College who are guests of the Leader of the Opposition.

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—Kimba, District Council of Annual Report 2013-14
Police Ombudsman—Annual Report 2013-14

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

Adelaide Cemeteries Authority—Annual Report 2013-14
Attorney-General's Department—Annual Report 2013-14
Classification Council, South Australian—Annual Report 2013-14
Electoral Commission of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14
Equal Opportunity Commission—Annual Report 2013-14
Guardianship Board—Annual Report 2013-14
Legal Services Commission of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14
Privacy Committee of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14
Public Trustee—Annual Report 2013-14
State Records Act 1997, Administration of the—Annual Report 2013-14
Rules made under the following Act—
Magistrates Court—Amendment No. 51

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

Renewal SA—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Industrial Relations Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2013-14
Mining and Quarrying Occupational Health and Safety Committee—Annual Report 2013-14
SafeWork SA Advisory Council—Annual Report 2013-14
Senior Judge of the Industrial Relations Court and the President of the Industrial Relations Commission—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Police Superannuation Board—Annual Report 2013-14
Regulations made under the following Act—
Public Finance and Audit—Public Authority

By the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Mining Act 1971—Notice of Extension of Declaration of Exemption of Land

By the Minister for Disabilities (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Fair Trading—Related Acts
Liquor Licensing—Dry Areas—Adelaide—Basham—Goolwa

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. L.W. Bignell)—

Fishery Management Plan, South Australian Commercial—
Marine Scalefish Fishery
Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery

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

Local Council By-Laws—
District Council of Peterborough—No. 7—Cats

By the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Gawler Ranges National Park Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2013-14
Lake Gairdner National Park Co-management Board—Annual Report 2013-14
Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park Co-management Board—Annual Report
2013-14
Witjira National Park Co-management Board—Annual Report 2013-14

Parliament House Matters

PARLIAMENT HOUSE SECURITY

The SPEAKER (14:03): The member for Bragg raised with us in the house, by way of a point of clarification, that Police Security Services officers were wearing firearms in parliament, and I have sought a report about that. In 2007, the South Australian parliament was identified by the State Emergency Commission to be a critical infrastructure high-risk site. There are six other sites in that category. A determination to this effect was made in April 2011 pursuant to the Protective Security Act 2007.

The parliament engages the services of the Police Security Services Branch in providing entry, perimeter and chamber security management. These officers are trained and equipped in incident management and, in effect, they are the first point of response should an incident occur. These officers are trained in the use of operational equipment, including baton, handcuffs, OC spray and firearms. The carriage of firearms by these officers provides a rapid response in mitigating any threats at critical infrastructure sites before a police response arrives.

On Friday 12 September this year, both the terrorism threat level and public alert level were raised from medium to high, that is, a terrorist attack is assessed as likely. I presume that came from the federal level. On 18 September, the SAPOL commissioner authorised that firearms commence being worn by protective security officers, including those situated at Parliament House. This authorisation was given pursuant to the Protective Security Act 2007. Since that time there has been an attack on the Canadian parliament by a gunman who entered the precincts, and I believe that gunman was dispatched by a pistol-packing Serjeant-at-Arms.

This authorisation of the police commissioner has no effect if the Speaker or President does not concur, since the parliament by convention is the master of its own destiny. The presence of firearms in the House of Assembly gallery is at the discretion of the Speaker, and removing this would only create a minor logistical inconvenience for the security officers concerned. However, removing this would also lessen the degree of protection offered by these officers, so I do not propose to order them to disarm unless the house so instructs me.

As an aside, in the Palace of Westminster and located in the basement of the House of Lords, there is a 25-yard small bore rifle range for the use of the parliamentary Sports and Social Club.

Ministerial Statement

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:07): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: On becoming Premier, one of my first acts was to move to establish an Independent Commissioner Against Corruption. It was my view that an ICAC was necessary so that confidence in our public institutions could be strengthened and so those who seek to wrongfully exploit their positions of power within the community are brought to justice. In establishing the ICAC, I would like to acknowledge the member for Heysen, who had long campaigned for the existence of ICAC and worked constructively with the government on this important reform.

On 14 October, the Attorney-General tabled the first annual report of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption. The commissioner made a number of recommendations and, in the context of this report, the government has resolved to take the following steps. The Attorney-General will give notice today to introduce a bill to amend the ICAC Act in the terms requested by the commissioner. Included in the bill is an amendment to clarify the offence of publishing information and evidence.

It will be made clear that permission is not required from the commissioner before the fact of the making of a complaint to the Office for Public Integrity can be disclosed by one person to another in a private setting. This will allow, for example, a public sector employee to disclose to his or her employer that they had made a complaint to the Office for Public Integrity about a co-worker. The government supports this practical reform.

Also, noting the concerns raised by the commissioner about a code of conduct for members of parliament, I will today give notice to introduce a statement of principles by a resolution of the house. This will be the statement of principles developed by the joint committee on a code of conduct for members of parliament. This was an issue close to the heart of the former member for Fisher, the late Dr Bob Such, and I would like to formally acknowledge the work that he has done to progress this important issue.

In addition, following further recommendations made by the commissioner, the Attorney-General will introduce legislation to regulate the conduct of lobbyists. Whilst some details will require further consideration and discussion with the commissioner, I can confirm to the house that the government has already taken an in-principle decision that success fees will be banned.

The commissioner also makes comments about the use of private email accounts and anonymous social media accounts, as well as concerns about the role of the Police Ombudsman. In regard to these matters, the Attorney-General will meet with the commissioner to discuss them in more detail and report to cabinet on how best to address his concerns. This government thanks to the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption for his report—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The education minister is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and we will provide a further update to the house on the progress of these foreshadowed changes at a later date.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order. All those who have been called to order should be reminded of the house's powers of arrest.

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION (COVERT OPERATIONS) ACT

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) (14:15): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: In April 1995, following the High Court's decision in *Ridgeway v The Queen* (nothing to do with our friend here) in favour of the accused, parliament passed the Criminal Law (Undercover Operations) Act 1995 with the support of all sides of politics. This ruling on entrapment by police of drug dealers and other criminals had created uncertainty for the police and the courts. The object of the legislation was to place police undercover operations on a legislative footing and to ensure certainty in the law.

As honourable members may be aware, one of the safeguards that was built into the legislation that significantly extended police powers was the requirement that the Attorney-General be notified of and authorise any undercover operations. The Attorney-General is further required to table an annual report detailing such operations in the parliament.

The Criminal Law (Undercover Operations) Act 1995 was incorporated into and replaced by the Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009. That new act added reporting obligations about other legislated aspects of covert operations. The current statutory provisions have not been the subject of any noteworthy comment by any court. I table the report.

MENTAL HEALTH BEDS

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:17): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: There has recently been an increase in mental health service demand and this has placed pressure on our emergency departments and acute units. Over the past five years, mental health emergency department presentations in our metropolitan hospitals have increased by an average of 3 per cent per annum, which is in line with the increase in general emergency department presentations. While this is a complex problem, I am determined to continue to find improvements to ensure we improve the service for vulnerable mental health patients, as well as ease pressures on our valuable staff.

It is completely unacceptable to me that we have mental health patients waiting for days at a time for an admission into an acute bed. An emergency department is not, in my view, an appropriate setting for ongoing care of people experiencing an acute episode, and concern has been expressed to me, and raised publicly, that this could further stigmatise patients.

We are taking action, but getting new mental health beds up and running has been slower than anticipated. My department tells me they have had difficulty recruiting psychiatrists so that new beds can be opened. However, I can advise the house of the government's plan, which will see an overall increase in 30 adult mental health acute beds, and these arise from the creation and opening of new services. These changes comprise:

- The Lyell McEwin Hospital will open four additional beds within its mental health unit next month.
- The Flinders Medical Centre will open an eight-bed short-stay unit adjacent to the emergency department. This is in addition to the five extra beds currently operating at the Margaret Tobin Centre. This will also occur next month.
- Mount Gambier will open a new six-bed inpatient unit in April 2015. This is in addition to the recent opening of 12 beds in Whyalla and Berri in April and June this year respectively.

We are also preparing for the transition to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital by making changes to the current 20-bed Ward C3 unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Eighteen beds from Ward 3C will transfer to Glenside Health Services, and the two remaining beds will boost the Royal Adelaide Hospital's existing five-bed short-stay unit to seven beds. This change will enable a direct admission service to be established at the Royal Adelaide Hospital so some mental health patients will bypass the emergency department. This direct admission will also operate at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital when it opens in 2016. There will also be an additional 10 forensic beds when the new James Nash House redevelopment is completed in May 2015.

I have spoken with many clinicians and I know that the system lacks the agility to move quickly to transfer all mental health patients from emergency departments to appropriate care. We need much greater flexibility in the use of our existing beds, and these changes are a step in that direction. In July, we opened 24 crisis respite beds and began a service that will enable 10 people to be cared for at home. These 10 people who are in crisis would normally have attended an emergency department for assistance, but instead are able to receive care at home.

We have also implemented a project designed to enable patients who have long stays in hospital to move into more clinically appropriate environments. This has been possible due to a review of intermediate care centre beds, resulting in greater flexibility in the use of those beds by psychiatrists. This has resulted in four long-stay consumers in in the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, moving from an acute to a subacute environment, and one consumer being discharged to community-based accommodation with Disability SA.

This successful project is being translated to other regions so that mental health clinicians have more options available for addressing long-stay patients. More long-stay and complex patients will be admitted to intermediate care centre beds when psychiatrists indicate it is safe to do so. Providing safe and effective care in an appropriate environment is a priority, and these proposals are expected to benefit both mental health consumers and staff.

During the debate on mental health beds, let us not forget that South Australia's mental health system treats approximately 34,000 people with a mental illness each year. Our community mental health teams provide an invaluable service by supporting these people through more than 500,000 contacts in a year.

I also announce today that Chief Psychiatrist and Director of Mental Health Policy, Dr Peter Tyllis, has advised me he wishes to take up a clinical position in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network mental health service. I wish Dr Tyllis every success in this new role.

SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY

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) (14:25): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Recent incidents on the South Eastern Freeway involving heavy vehicles have caused considerable concern for South Australians. I would like to take this opportunity to update the house on the government's actions to increase safety on the South Eastern Freeway.

Following a fatal road crash on 18 August 2014 that occurred at the intersection of Cross Road, Portrush Road, Glen Osmond Road and the South Eastern Freeway, the deputy coroner initiated a coronial inquest and issued a number of preliminary recommendations on 22 August. The deputy coroner recommended that steps be immediately undertaken to ensure that all heavy vehicles, defined within the Australian Road Rules as being a vehicle with a gross vehicle mass of 4.5 tonnes or over, be subjected to a 60 km/h speed limit on the down track of the South Eastern Freeway.

In response to these recommendations, the Minister for Road Safety announced on that same day that the state government would give effect to the speed limit change for all trucks and buses to come into effect from 1 September. As a result of the likely increased speed differential

between heavy vehicles and light vehicles, the minister also implemented a reduced speed limit for cars from 100 km/h to 90 km/h on the down track. Furthermore, from 1 September 2014—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —all heavy vehicles were to remain in the left lane only from the Crafers interchange until near the Measdays Bridge. The deputy coroner also made recommendations regarding the current legal requirement for heavy vehicle drivers to adhere to Australian Road Rule 108 on the down track of the freeway. This legally enforceable road rule requires the driver of a truck or bus that is driving on a length of road to which a truck and bus low-gear sign applies to drive the truck or bus in a gear that is low enough to limit the speed of the truck or bus without the use of a primary brake.

The Coroner recommended that measures be introduced to place on conditions of licence that heavy vehicle drivers which use the South Eastern Freeway demonstrate competence in complying with Australian Road Rule 108. I am advised that, while current training requirements require a driver to demonstrate the ability to descend a hill in the appropriate gear, this issue has formed a key part of the consultation that the government has undertaken with the industry. There is significant support from industry for improved training requirements, and I have asked my department to investigate improvements to the current scheme.

The Coroner also recommended that heavy vehicle drivers be reminded by a public ministerial statement, immediately and prominently, of the legal requirement to comply with Australian Road Rule 108 and that contravention of this requirement attracts sanction. Both the Minister for Road Safety and I, as well as South Australia Police, have continually reinforced this message publicly, to industry and to the media about this legal requirement.

Since 18 August fatal accident and subsequent incidents involving heavy vehicles on the freeway, the government has been working with industry to develop a range of measures to improve safety on the South Eastern Freeway. Central to this has been the further promotion of the message about the legal requirement for vehicles to adhere to rule 108.

As an initial measure, the government has updated the key industry publication 'The right gear', outlining the requirement of adhering to rule 108. This document was distributed to 35 industry stakeholders, including the South Australian Road Transport Association and the Livestock & Rural Transporters Association, in early September to remind operators of this legal obligation. Furthermore, this document has been distributed to drivers at the Monteith heavy vehicle checking station during operations conducted there since 1 September.

Following consultation and feedback with industry regarding the communication to drivers of the rule 108 requirement, the government will be sending information out to all South Australian heavy vehicle licence holders outlining their legal requirement to comply with rule 108 and the sanctions involved for noncompliance. Information will also be provided at heavy vehicle rest stops along the Dukes Highway to target interstate drivers, some of whom may not have used the freeway before.

In addition, I have written to federal and state transport ministers requesting that information be provided to their relevant government departments for distribution to licensed heavy vehicle drivers, operators and industry associations. I will also be writing to interstate industry associations asking that they communicate to their members this information through their communication channels.

The government has also improved existing signage on the South Eastern Freeway which outlines this requirement for trucks and buses to use a low gear. On 8 October these signs were enhanced to increase visibility. Further, an additional sign was installed near the Mount Osmond overpass bridge to remind drivers that the descent continued towards the city.

Finally, the Coroner recommended that the Australian Road Rule 108 requirement for trucks to use an appropriate low gear be extended to a further section of the freeway beyond its current operation. Road signage providing for this requirement was installed by 1 September 2014 to extend the full length of the descent from the crest at Crafers and for seven kilometres to the approach at

the Portrush Road/Cross Road intersection. This extended the previously signed requirement by one kilometre.

Following consultation with industry, stakeholders and the community, the government now has a list of 22 prioritised items to improve safety on the South Eastern Freeway. These reach across the areas of infrastructure (including investigations into intersection upgrades and the feasibility of a third arrester bed); regulation of the heavy vehicle industry (including driver licensing, education and training, and more stringent national regulation of the heavy vehicle industry); and communications (including fixed and variable messaging signage, and the distribution of information advice to heavy vehicle drivers).

The government will now finalise measures to implement in the short term and progress investigations into further medium and longer-term measures. What is clear is that a series of improvements across all three areas is likely to be necessary.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I would like to take this opportunity to thank the shadow minister for transport, the member for Mitchell—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —on his bipartisan approach to efforts to increase safety on the freeway. The Minister for Road Safety and I have briefed the member on the government's actions and appreciated his attendance at the recent industry forum and community consultation.

I would also like to acknowledge the federal Assistant Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development, the Hon. Jamie Briggs MP, for the willingness of the commonwealth to participate in measures to improve safety on the freeway. Both the Minister for Road Safety and I will continue to update the house on this important safety issue.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg is warned a first time.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned a first time.

Parliamentary Committees

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:32): I bring up the 86th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2013-14.

Report received and ordered to be published.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:33): I bring up the 75th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2013-14.

Report received and ordered to be published.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:33): I bring up the 99th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2013-14.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND
COMPENSATION**

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:34): I bring up the 18th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2013-14.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The SPEAKER: Questions. The leader, yes. It is a long time since anyone other than the Leader of the Opposition asked the first question at question time. It's my mistake.

Question Time

KERIN, DR PAUL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): That may be so, sir. My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier now apologise to the taxpayers of South Australia and their families for using their water bills to prop up this government's budget, as evidenced by Dr Paul Kerin's resignation letter?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:36): After the state election there were a lot of very upset people, but Labor was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There were a lot of people who were disappointed with the result that the Liberal Party achieved at the election by not winning the majority of seats, but MacKillop did not fall. The resignation of Mr Kerin—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —was one of disappointment—

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —but he wasn't the only person to resign after the state election. The former leader of the opposition resigned from the Liberal Party and joined the government. The member for Davenport has announced his resignation because he is bored; he didn't win the election so he is quitting. Mr Kerin's resignation is a political statement—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is not a statement about the function of the government or its policymaking; it is about the outcome of an election. The government respects the independence of ESCOSA. We are the ones who wanted to have an independent Essential Services Commission, and it is a very important function that the independent regulator has; some of that function used to be in price setting in energy. The government deregulated, in an important economic reform in the last parliament, the regulated pricing of electricity, and that was a good thing, and it has seen prices drop.

What Mr Kerin was attempting to do was not just be the regulator but the policymaker also. There is a very important distinction also when it comes to policymaking that is done by elected officials, not appointed individuals.

The reality is that the opposition, the government and every parliament in the country from the commonwealth down maintain this principle that it is elected representatives and elected members of parliament who set policy and appointed individuals regulate. That is how it has always been and that is how it will remain, and any independent regulator who attempts to set policy will be frustrated by governments that want to express the will of the people. This is a question about who should own SA Water. Should it be private interests who take those profits elsewhere, or should it be the public?

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir. The question was, 'Will the Premier apologise to the taxpayers of South Australia for using water bills to prop up the government's budget?' The Treasurer has strayed a long way from it and is entering into debate.

The SPEAKER: No, I think it is—perhaps to use an overused word—germane that the Treasurer is explaining what he thinks the hidden meaning or purport of the question is. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As I said today to the media and to the public, this government believes in the public ownership of our water assets. Do they return a dividend to the government? Yes, they do. What do we do with that dividend? We spend it on our hospitals, we spend it on our schools, we spend it on our institutions and on our roads and on our police. We spend it on the essential services—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —that the public of South Australia demand. If SA Water was privatised, those dividends and those profits would not be socialised: they would be sent offshore or interstate to the private company that owns them. This is a debate that we have had. I can assure you, Mr Speaker, that immediately after the election, at the first Treasurer's conference, Joe Hockey was well schooled on the value of SA Water, almost as if there was some sort of secret plan in place ready to go had there been a different outcome—perhaps the outcome that Dr Kerin was looking for at the election but that the Leader of the Opposition could not deliver.

Mr Pisoni: You rob them blind and it's everyone else's fault.

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

Mr Whetstone: Always someone else's fault, Tom.

The SPEAKER: And so is the member for Chaffey. Leader.

KERIN, DR PAUL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): My question is to the Premier. What does it say about this government when the Premier's own self-confessed Labor-voting CEO of ESCOSA reveals that the government has, and I quote, 'No interest in genuine reform, nor in serving the long-term interests of consumers'?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:41): To quote John Olsen: only believe the ones who are telling you they are voting against you; don't believe the ones who are telling you they are voting for you.

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No doubt, Mr Speaker, this is a lesson that the Leader of the Opposition will learn in the coming months. This is a lesson that he will learn very soon. That letter was a political statement, not the statement of an independent regulator. He was making a political statement on the outcome of an election. I have to say this: this is a reformist government—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Who was it who deregulated electricity pricing? It was this Labor government. We are the ones who established ESCOSA. We are the ones who reformed our energy market, giving South Australians more contestability in the energy market—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and we have seen those prices come down. No longer can the Liberal Party—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned a second and final time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —claim that we have the highest electricity prices in Australia. Why? Because of reforms that this government has made. That letter speaks to Mr Kerin's issues, not the government's.

KERIN, DR PAUL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Supplementary, sir, and I would like my supplementary taken by the Premier, if possible. Has the Premier investigated the claims made by Dr Kerin that Dr Kerin is 'appalled by the behaviours that both ministers and senior bureaucrats have engaged in to stymie those efforts of reform'?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:43): I look forward to Mr Kerin providing evidence of any interference from the government. I look forward to Mr Kerin providing evidence of bureaucrats acting inappropriately. I will also remind you, Mr Speaker, that the CEO of ESCOSA has responsibilities under reporting if there has been any inappropriate behaviour at all. It is unfair to bring bureaucrats into question without evidence. If you have an accusation, make it.

KERIN, DR PAUL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Given that the Treasurer has admitted on radio this morning that he has been in possession of this letter of resignation for almost six months, can he outline to the house today exactly what steps he has taken to investigate the allegations made in the resignation letter?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:43): First and foremost, Mr Speaker—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Are you finished?

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned a first time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Kerin is not an employee of the state government: he is an employee of ESCOSA. His selection process was carried out independently of government by ESCOSA. That letter was to Pat Walsh, the chairman of ESCOSA. It was not to me as the Treasurer, it was not to me as the energy minister, it was not to the Premier as the Premier; it was—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just calm down. Calm down.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Like I said, Mr Kerin was making a political statement, devastated, it seems to me, at the outcome of the election. There is an interesting article today in *InDaily* which talks about some of the published views of Mr Kerin about his political preferences, which, I have to say, are in marked contradiction to the letter that was published in *The Advertiser* today.

I have complete confidence in the South Australian Public Service. I have complete confidence in the bureaucrats who answer to me. I have complete confidence in the board of ESCOSA. I think the government has an excellent working relationship with ESCOSA. We do good

things for the people of South Australia. We have seen water prices drop by over 6 per cent in the last 12 months.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We have seen water prices cut to below CPI over the next two years.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are seeing electricity prices drop on the back of deregulation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is not my fault that the opposition don't know how to campaign under the current Leader of the Opposition and that some bureaucrats were upset he couldn't pull off a victory.

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before a supplementary is asked, I warn the Treasurer for wilfully engaging in debate, and I will not pull up opposition members who are breaching the standing orders while they are being hectored by a minister himself out of order. I will just let the melee go. Leader.

KERIN, DR PAUL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Thank you very much. My supplementary is to the Premier. Will the Premier be making any inquiries into the comments contained in Mr Kerin's resignation letter which specifically refer to ministers and senior bureaucrats who have engaged to stymie the efforts of reform. Will he be finding out who those ministers and senior bureaucrats are and what stymie-ing activities they have presided over?

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:46): Mr Kerin offers no evidence whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Okay, let's just conduct an investigation because you say so? The reality is that Mr Kerin has made allegations about the government that, quite frankly, the government rejects. We reject them. We reject the criticisms of Mr Kerin. The reality is this: Mr Kerin is making a political statement—

Mr Marshall: No, he's not.

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —by resigning the day after the government secure a majority in the House of Assembly. His mentioning his apparent voting intentions in his resignation letter speaks to a political statement that he is attempting to make. Mr Kerin was frustrated by the election result. I don't know what conversations the opposition had with Mr Kerin in the lead-up to the election. I don't know what the Leader of the Opposition told Mr Kerin about his plans for SA Water. I do know that Joe Hockey was well schooled on the value of SA Water and plans to—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir. Standing order 98—this couldn't be more 98.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the member for Morialta's point of order. Leader.

WATER PRICING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): My question is to the Premier. What does the Premier say to South Australian families who are now paying almost \$600 more each year for water, given that the government promised that its water price watchdog, ESCOSA, would keep water bills under control?

The SPEAKER: Well, it's not the classic formulation of a question seeking information, but Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:48): No—more, sir, a desperate man clinging onto power with all his hope. What we would say to the people of South Australia is: we have ensured our water security into the future. We have built a desalination plant that guarantees our water—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You're looking a little bit desperate—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —a little bit hysterical and a little bit desperate. I know you're having a bad year. It's nearly over, and we're going to finish it for you soon, no problems. What I would say to the people of South Australia is that we are securing our water future. There was a time when water reserves in this state were becoming dangerously low and the drought was impacting on the very viability of our ability to run our economy. We have waterproofed this state from the next drought. Future generations will look back on that decision to build a desalination plant with pride. They will say, 'That was the right thing to do. It was a bold decision to build that desalination plant.'

The Leader of the Opposition has form on infrastructure: he opposed Adelaide Oval, he opposed the hospital and he opposed the desal plant. There is not one piece of infrastructure we have built where the Leader of the Opposition has said it was a good idea—but he's happy to take tickets to Adelaide Oval, he will be happy to use the hospital and no doubt he drinks our desalinated water.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, the member for Morialta.

KERIN, DR PAUL

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:50): Does the Treasurer believe that members of parliament should act with civility in their dealings with the public, ministers, other members of parliament and the Public Service?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:50): All my dealings with Mr Kerin have been courteous and civil.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I treat you the way you deserve to be treated.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I treat you all with everything you deserve, especially the Leader of the Opposition—my favourite member of all.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, what is it I deserve?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You deserve nothing but high office, sir.

The SPEAKER: Correct answer. The leader.

WATER PRICING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): Supplementary to the Treasurer: how much of the 236 per cent increase in the average water bills under this government is due to the double-sized desalination plant and the fact that it has now been mothballed?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:51): This cup holds desalinated water, Mr Speaker. I have to say, whenever this government embarks on building infrastructure the first person to criticise us is the Leader of the Opposition. When he first became Leader of the Opposition, he gave a very important speech about his vision for South Australia. He said that every time we spend money on infrastructure it is a false economy spending; it is not real economy because the money will eventually run out.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr PISONI: The minister is not responsible for the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Over the last 12 years, this government has been investing in upgrades to pipelines, we have invested in the desal plant, we have invested in better infrastructure. We have invested in infrastructure to make sure that we can maintain a level and standard that we are all accustomed to, to make sure that businesses have access to water when they need it.

We have also spent money on saving the River Murray. We have also spent money on buying water allocations. We have also spent money, through the dividends we have received, on our hospitals and our schools. I understand that every time we spend money on public infrastructure a little part of them dies. A little part of them gets upset when we spend money on hospitals, on schools, on infrastructure and on water security, but I will get a detailed breakdown for the house.

WATER PRICING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): By how much will the mothballing of the desal plant reduce water bills then in South Australia?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:53): The former treasurer announced in the last price determination that there was an over 6 per cent decrease in water costs to the consumer last financial year. Going forward the next two years, from memory, it is capped to no more than inflation. Currently, ESCOSA are working with the government for the next round of price determinations and they will be published some time around 2015, I think, but I will get back to the house on a more accurate date.

WATER PRICING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): Supplementary: does the Treasurer agree with Dr Kerin's assertion that the mothballing of the desal plant will save households just \$6 a year on their water bills?

The Hon. P. Caica: You should be mothballed, Steven.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:54): I don't know what Mr Kerin is basing that assertion on. Mr Kerin left ESCOSA more than six months ago and, in that six months since he left, the opposition was so concerned about his departure that they asked no questions about it at all.

Ms Chapman: You hid the letter.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I hid no such thing. First and foremost, the letter of resignation of Mr Kerin is not to me; it is to Mr Walsh because he is not employed by me—and I see

the member for Goyder nodding—he is employed by the Essential Services Commissioner. The resignation was to him. As far as I am aware, I played absolutely no part at all in Mr Kerin's resignation. I played no function in that at all.

I was notified by ESCOSA that Mr Kerin had resigned and that they began the process in the search for a new chief executive. People come and go. The former leader of the opposition, the member for Davenport, is leaving; he is bored; he has had enough of the six months he has been here since the last election and he has decided to go off to greener pastures. No doubt there will be more by-elections: Isobel, I am sure she will be going soon—sorry, the member for Heysen.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned a second and final time for referring to the member for Heysen by other than her electorate name, and the leader is warned. The deputy leader.

KERIN, DR PAUL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): Supplementary question: could the Treasurer explain to the house when he first became aware that Mr Kerin had resigned and when he first read the letter of resignation to the board? I understand he gets monthly reports from it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:56): Mr Speaker, I can't remember the exact date, but it was very soon after I was sworn in as Treasurer. The Under Treasurer informed me that the chief executive of ESCOSA had resigned. He had written a very colourful letter in response, and when I read the letter I thought it was a cracker, myself. I thought, 'That's quite a swing on the way out.' Obviously he was upset about the outcome of the election. There are many people upset about the outcome of the election. The member for Davenport was upset about the outcome of the election, so much so he's quitting. People have an emotional response to politics.

Mr Kerin was hoping that there would be a change in government. As we saw in the *InDaily* today, he was a very big fan of Jeff Kennett and his Liberal government in Victoria, and he was hoping there would be similar reforms. If I extrapolate that further, that's privatisation. Like I said, sir, at my first Treasurers' conference, with the federal Treasurer, he knew all about SA Water; he knew every single detail about SA Water, almost as if there was some sort of plan in place to privatise SA Water.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order. The Treasurer is defying you, sir. He's repeating the same debate you previously ruled against him.

The SPEAKER: Yes, but it's a different question. Further supplementary, deputy leader.

KERIN, DR PAUL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:57): My question is to the Treasurer. Could the Treasurer, then, explain to the house when he first became aware that an application under freedom of information had been served on the board of ESCOSA for the purposes of the disclosure of the letter and, under the rules which require the minister responsible to be given notice of a determination for disclosure or rejection, when he first became aware of that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:58): There's a letter from Mr Walsh to me on 26 June telling me that Mr Kerin's letter of resignation was the subject of a freedom of information application, and it was subject to an internal review. I said, 'Okay, it's a process for ESCOSA; nothing to do with me or the government.' I pointed out this morning on radio, and I've pointed out at a press conference, and I'll point it out to the parliament, that the process here is that ESCOSA is independent of government.

Mr Marshall: Not according to the letter in the paper today.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, Mr Speaker, we don't appoint the chief executive of ESCOSA; the board do. We play no role in his appointment.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If the member for Unley wants to ask me a question, get up and ask me a question and I'll answer it.

ESSENTIAL SERVICES PRICING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): My question is to the Treasurer. Has the Treasurer issued any pricing orders or draft orders for the next regulatory period commencing in 2016?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:59): I refer the Leader of the Opposition to the *Government Gazette* published on 2 October 2014. We've kept it so secret, sir, we published it in the *Gazette*.

ESSENTIAL SERVICES PRICING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): Can you just outline to the house whether or not you have released any pricing orders in this area?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:59): The Leader of the Opposition is asking questions which are on the public record, easily accessible.

ESSENTIAL SERVICES PRICING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): Supplementary: why was it that when the Treasurer was asked this question this morning he was unaware, but somehow, miraculously, we should be aware?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:59): That's a very good point, sir. I will read out of the *Government Gazette* that no doubt you've read already: 'By command, Jay Weatherill, Acting Treasurer.' I was on leave when the Premier signed the order as Acting Treasurer. Now, this is a process that is going to take a long time. What I said on radio was that I would check and get back, so we are being so open we published it on the *Gazette*—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and you haven't got the good sense to check.

The SPEAKER: Would the Treasurer please be seated. I am reluctant to put out of the house the leader under the sessional order, but I do warn the leader a second and final time. Further questions? The member for Goyder.

WATER PRICING

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Why does the minister still support the government, given that the Premier has failed to reduce water prices for primary producers, as per the minister's agreement to form government?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:01): Water prices have come down. They have come down by more than 6 per cent in the last financial year is the advice that I have, and for the next two years they will be capped to CPI increases. At the last election, which was the most recent time the opposition had to espouse policies about water pricing, we heard nothing. All we heard were apparently secret plans to privatise SA Water—secret plans to sell SA Water.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Debate?

Mr GARDNER: Sure.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Sir, supplementary if I may?

The SPEAKER: No—the member for Napier. We will come back to you, member for Goyder.

FORESTRY FORUM

Mr GEE (Napier) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Forests. Can the minister inform the house about the recent public forestry forum in the Mid North?

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) (15:02): I thank the member for Napier for the question. I also thank the member for Stuart and the Minister for Regional Development, member for Frome, for attending in Jamestown last Wednesday, along with about 200 locals—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: And the Hon. Kyam Maher.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, and the Hon. Kyam Maher, Parliamentary Secretary for Forests—who were concerned about the future of the area. It was a forum that we called to listen to community feedback after the terrible fires that swept through the area in the past couple of years. It was the Bundaleer forest last year that was hit and the Wirrabara forests that were hit this January and February, wiping out about 80 per cent of ForestrySA's forests.

There was a report done, commissioned by ForestrySA, which I received in July or August. It was pretty pessimistic, saying that it was going to take until 2044 for the forests to return a dividend to the taxpayers. The report was suggesting that we should not replant the forests, and I thought we actually need to go out and listen to what the locals have to say, because I had spoken to Ed Morgan who runs Morgan Sawmill up there, a third generation sawmill. Ed and his son Luke and daughter Candice have some very good ideas of how the forest could be sustainable into the future, but I think everyone agrees, and it was great to hear so many different points of view last week at the meeting, that whatever we had before is not going to be what it is in the future.

The area, if it is to be replanted, will not be 100 per cent replanted, because it has been identified that a lot of that land and the forests there go back to 1876. They were the first commercial forests planted anywhere in Australia and there were some there that were planted on land that is certainly not suitable for forests. But we might end up with 40 per cent, we might end up with 50 per cent, and we might actually end up with some different ownership arrangements of those forests. These are all discussions that we need to have, and it is part of getting involved with the community and speaking with the community about what the future would look like.

As well as having ForestrySA people, we also had Tourism people there, we had the head of the Office for Recreation and Sport and we had Primary Industries people there to talk about economic businesses that could be run in the area, whether that is other agricultural pursuits as well, because we need to have a diversified economy in the Jamestown area. The Morgan Sawmill either directly or indirectly employs about 106 people; that is one in 10 working people in Jamestown, so it would be a massive hit on that town and that region if we did not have that level of jobs there.

What we need to do is take a wider look at forestry plus. We could replant 100 per cent of those trees tomorrow, and if we had a fire in five years' time—I note that there is a fire around the Wilmington area, which is the hometown of the member for Stuart, and I hope and pray that everyone up there, including your colleagues in the CFS, are all safe and can bring that fire under control—before we had a chance to take out any new plantings, then we would be back to square one.

We actually need to have an answer that involves all of the community—it needs to have as much feed-in as it can—and we need to be open to all sorts of ideas, not just around forestry, but around everything else that can be done in that tremendous part of the world. Again, to the community of Jamestown, thanks for turning out in such big numbers. We hope we can find a solution

so that little Marcus Morgan, who is only six months old, can be the fourth generation involved in the Morgan Sawmill. We will be working with the Morgans, the member for Stuart and the member for Frome to come up with the best possible solution we can as a government.

FORESTRY FORUM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:06): Supplementary, sir: when will the minister respond to the community with an answer to their requests from the town meeting last week?

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) (15:06): When we have some decisions. There is no point rushing things; we need to actually examine—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Look, if I took the advice I got in July, I would have said, 'We are never going replant them again,' so do you want that answer, member for Heysen?

The SPEAKER: I don't want any answer.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No, I was talking to the member for Heysen, who interjected with a laugh. This is not a laughing matter; this is a very concerning matter for the people of Jamestown and the Mid North and the Southern Flinders Ranges. I am in here working in a bipartisan way—in fact, a tripartisan way, because we've got the Independent on board as well—and we are all working together to try and come up with a solution.

Do not try and force me into making a rapid response or you might get a response that you are not happy with, and a response that the people of Jamestown, the Southern Flinders Ranges and the Mid North certainly won't be happy with. I am going to leave no stone unturned as we go through and work with every government department we possibly can to come up with the right solution, so do not try and rush me into anything at all, member for Heysen. Again, member for Stuart, thank you for your question; I think you asked it in the best possible way, with the best intentions.

WATER PRICING

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Has the minister received feedback from primary producers that water bills are too high and, if so, does he agree?

Members interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Tom, you can't—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Yes, I can.

Mr GRIFFITHS: You are not linked with him. You are not telepathically linked with him; you don't know!

The SPEAKER: Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:08): Sir, when people complain about their water pricing, that comes to the Treasurer or the Minister for Water. No doubt, Mr Speaker, there are a number of people who are unhappy with whatever price they pay for water. But, I tell you what is worse than paying a lot for water: not having water to pay for at all.

What we have done is invested into the future of our water security by making sure that our desal plant is up and running and that it has capacity to maintain a level of service for the people of this state to make sure we can maintain agriculture, that we can maintain industry, and that we can keep the prosperity in this state growing. Why the opposition who first called on the government to build a desal plant is now so violently opposed to it is beyond me.

WATER PRICING

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:08): Supplementary, sir, and this has to be to the Minister for Regional Development: what representations has the minister made to the government about water prices, and what feedback has he received, not—

Members interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Come on, sir!

The SPEAKER: Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:09): Mr Speaker, we are a cabinet; we are a collective, and we discuss these matters in the cabinet. I have to say this, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel! The member for Kavel is at the very centre of that melee, and I call him to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand that unity is a foreign concept for members opposite, but we are one organisation in the cabinet. Any representation that the cabinet is having about water pricing is done in a budget process and, of course, in the price determinations.

I have to say this: regional members—Labor, Liberal, Independent—cabinet ministers and all members of the house, with the community, are constantly talking to the government about what we can do to ease the cost of living, and to ease the cost of doing business in this state. The government is actively pursuing those options, and the people who are leading the charge for the regions are two Independents in our cabinet who care deeply about the regions. To quote prime minister Whitlam: 'The impotent are pure.'

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, deputy leader.

WATER PRICING

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Having listened carefully to how the Treasurer said you had actually responded in your letter, did you say anything else?

Mr Treloar interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders is called to order for beating the tabletop.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:11): As I have said in this place before, as a minister, when there is solidarity in cabinet, you do not divulge what is discussed in cabinet. Now, the other side—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Yes. As the member for Frome, on behalf of the constituents in my electorate, we have had discussions and correspondence with the relevant ministers.

The SPEAKER: The member for Ashford.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the Treasurer moves his lips once more out of order, he will be departing the chamber, which would be a pity on Ochi Day. Is it Ochi Day?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Yes, it is, sir.

The SPEAKER: Indeed. Member for Ashford.

SAFE WORK WEEK

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:12): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Can the minister inform the house about Safe Work Week?

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) (15:12): Yes, I can.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: You don't need to start; it's not there.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Just let's wait and see. You read quietly to yourself, and I will read to everybody else and, if we have said the same thing at the end, we will have a chat about it, but I think you are going to find it's quite different.

Mr Marshall: Do one paragraph each.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am prepared to do that. Providing advice and education about workplace safety is a key priority for the state's work health and safety regulator, SafeWork SA. I am pleased to advise that Safe Work Week—South Australia's annual major work health and safety event—commenced on Monday and concludes this Friday 31 October.

Safe Work Week forms part of the national program to promote effective work health and safety practices. It provides free information sessions to improve knowledge and practice across workplaces as well as to address key and emerging issues. This year, more than 40 events are being held across multiple venues including Tonsley TAFE, Mercury Cinema Adelaide, Sunnybrae Function Centre at Regency Park, and GM Holden at Elizabeth. A diverse range of topics are presented by SafeWork SA personnel in collaboration with individuals and organisations from complementary fields of expertise.

Mr Knoll: Don't forget the awards Friday night.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will come to that eventually. Information sessions will address the myriad social issues affecting work, such as drugs and alcohol, workplace bullying and work-life balance. They will also consider hazard and risk management, creating a responsible safety environment, and workplace safety laws. The full Safe Work Week 2014 program is available on SafeWork's website, which might be what the gentlemen were looking at, with sessions filling quickly.

People can also improve health and safety outcomes in their workplace by hosting their own event in Safe Work Week and taking advantage of SafeWork online resources. At the risk of using a cliché, we all know prevention is better than cure, and so improvements in reducing the level of injuries will not only assist in providing a safe and productive workplace but will also contribute towards achieving a sustainable return-to-work scheme, which is something I am sure everyone is interested in.

Safe Work Week concludes on the 31st with the presentation of the prestigious Safe Work Awards at the Adelaide Convention Centre which have had a record number of entries this year. Safe Work Week provides an excellent opportunity for people to improve what they do and how they do it to make their workplace as safe as possible. As work health and safety is everyone's responsibility, I encourage everybody to get involved in Safe Work Week.

SAFework SA ADVISORY COUNCIL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): A supplementary to the Minister for Industrial Relations: could the minister explain why SafeWork SA Advisory Council's annual report hasn't got any financial statements attached to it?

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: The question might be in order, but it is hardly a supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Well, let's treat it as a separate question. Would anyone like to answer it as a separate question?

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) (15:15): I would love to answer it as a separate question. Obviously, the member for Bragg has been studying the report, for which I commend her. She is very hardworking

in this particular regard and, I might add, in her contributions to debate in this house she is nothing but thorough.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Some might say obsessive.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I prefer to call it thorough.

Mr Marshall: It's better than tardy and slow.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I would never accuse the honourable member of being tardy in her responses. They leave absolutely nothing to the imagination and they cover everything with great thoroughness. Indeed, I am reminded of the debate about Kangaroo Island a while ago: the thoroughness of that was breathtaking. For those of us who enjoyed that, it is sealed in our memories as an exemplar of thorough parliamentary exposition.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay, fair enough. You had me at hello.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: You had me at one hour. If I was Patrick Star, I would start bidding down, but I'm not so I will move on. The answer is that I will have to find out whether or not it is conventional for a statement of account to accompany that report and, if it is, I shall also try and ascertain why it is that in this particular report it is not accompanying it.

Mr Marshall: Doesn't it strike you as odd as the minister responsible?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I assume nothing, and when the probing forensic mind of the member for Bragg is combing through the entrails of my portfolios I am very careful that I don't get tripped up and so I will take counsel.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:17): My question is to the Treasurer. Have emergency services levy remissions been removed for government-owned land and, if so, what is the additional cost to government of their removal?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:18): That is a very good question. I don't have it here with me, but I can get it for the Leader of the Opposition very quickly.

CARERS WEEK

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion. How is the government supporting South Australia's carers?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for that question because our government has a proud record of supporting South Australia's 250,000 carers.

As members of the house may be aware, last week was National Carers Week, which celebrates and recognises the outstanding contribution of our carers right across Australia. During the week, a range of events took place across South Australia—from Mount Gambier to Port Lincoln—to recognise that one in eight South Australians provide unpaid care to a family member or friend who is frail, lives with a disability, has a mental illness, or suffers from a chronic condition.

I was pleased to hear that the Minister for Regional Development was able to officially open Carers SA's new Port Augusta office which will deliver a major improvement to the services and facilities that Carers SA will be able to offer carers in the local community and across the region. We also saw the SA Carers Excellence Awards held, which recognise businesses, government agencies and other organisations who demonstrate excellence in supporting carers while engaged in paid employment. The South Australian finalists in the National Carer Awards were announced which

recognise outstanding South Australian carers. I was honoured to join the finalists and winners of the National Carers Awards and hear their incredible contribution as carers.

Of course, all our carers are remarkable in their efforts each and every day, but these carers were particularly special. Two such carers were Sally and Samantha, who are aged 12 and 11 and who care for their mother, Anne, who has lupus (an autoimmune disease) and their father, Darryl, who had a heart attack in 2013 and has early onset dementia, and assist their parents in caring for their younger sister, Rebecca, who has autism and chronic epilepsy. These two young girls are responsible for caring for their entire family, which is an incredible responsibility in and of itself without taking into account their young age.

Without a single thought for themselves, Sally and Samantha have sacrificed their spare time and, instead, have dedicated it to their family. It is with Sally and Samantha in mind that I was pleased to launch our government's new strategic plan for carers, 'We care—our plan for South Australian carers'. The strategy builds on our longstanding commitment and support for South Australian carers and recognises that our carers have their own needs and that more can be done to support and empower them. The priorities of the plan address the need to:

- support carers working in government agencies;
- support carers' social, emotional and physical needs;
- increase choices for carers;
- understand the unique needs of Aboriginal carers, young carers, and carers from culturally and linguistically-diverse backgrounds; and
- assist carers who are transitioning from a caring role.

Our government recognises the vital role carers play in our community, and we will continue to support them. I hope all members will join me in thanking all of our 250,000 carers for the selfless work they do to assist other South Australians.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:22): These are supplementary questions to the previous question I asked the Treasurer. With the removal of remissions will government agencies have to find the extra funds from within their existing budgets to pay their ESL bills?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:22): I can't remember that detail offhand and I don't have it here with me, so I apologise to the Leader of the Opposition. What I will do is get an answer for him very, very quickly.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:22): Just to clarify, is the Treasurer saying he is not sure whether or not there will be some additional payments made to each agency—he's got no idea?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:22): I just can't remember off the top of my head whether we increased our allocation in the budget process or whether we are asking agencies to come to us at the end of the process. You can shake your head all you like, but I can't carry all that information in my head the whole time.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, you're right. People sometimes forget things, sir; it is like standing at Menz chocolates the day before the election telling everyone to vote Labor: sometimes things get stuck in your head that are a mistake. I don't have the numbers here in front of me and, rather than give you the wrong information, Mr Speaker, or the wrong information to the house, what I'm doing is going away to give you a detailed answer tomorrow.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:23): My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. What is the additional cost to the Housing Trust of the removal of the emergency services levy remissions?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for a second and final time, which puts him in the same category as the Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:23): I find that offensive, sir. I could make jokes about day one of the campaign when he couldn't even mention his own name without stuttering the whole time or use it to great effect, or I could use other examples of his bumbling.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: His friends can shout at me all they like. What I will do is get a detailed answer to the house to make sure the information the opposition has is entirely accurate.

GOVERNMENT DIGITAL STRATEGY

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (15:24): My question is to the Minister for the Public Sector. Can the minister inform the house about the development and implementation of the state government's digital strategy?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:24): Members will be aware that we have a strategy known as SA Connected, which is the digital strategy for this government to address the changes in the world that we all have to deal with in the form of digital developments. We have a number of activities and strategies that sit within that, and I would like to bring the house up-to-date with some of those in answer to the question.

For example, we have an annual Open Data Day, where we invite industry and digital entrepreneurs to showcase their work using publicly available government datasets. The recent Unleashed awards night, which I was very delighted to be a part of, is a national celebration of open data which demonstrates what South Australians can do when we come together to share knowledge and collaborate to innovate, with our participation being the largest in the nation. So, being less than 8 per cent of the population, we had the largest participation in the GovHack, which is known in South Australia as Unleashed. We had more than 155 participants entering with 38 projects. We also had a presence in the regions.

There are many examples of standout digital initiatives available, such as the successful rollout of real-time passenger information for buses, trams and trains. For businesses, the My Invoice website has been launched so that business people can track the payment status of an invoice they have lodged with government. The yourSAy consultation website invites the community to let us know what data they want released, and to collaborate on the development of open data principles for the SA government.

The South Australian iAwards acknowledge outstanding productivity and innovation in ICT. SAPOL was recognised this year for its innovative use of ICT, winning the inaugural Premier's iAward for its mobile fingerprint scanning solution that verifies the identification of 'persons of interest' at a crime scene.

Through the focus of SA Connected on developing mobile apps and open data, we are shifting from an e-government model that focused on updating websites to a strategy that makes government services digital by default. By continuing to open up non-sensitive government-held data, we are also giving local digital entrepreneurs the opportunity to build and commercialise their own applications. South Australia is well placed to lead the new digital agenda.

An important point of difference with other states lies in South Australia's detailed consultations with business and communities and the way South Australia actively collaborates with the federal government, other state governments and industry on digital service delivery.

NEC Australia was recently awarded a nearly \$70 million contract to manage, maintain and support the central and local data networks of all state government agencies. These services are being delivered from NEC's recently established control centre here in Adelaide, ensuring that those jobs will stay in South Australia.

This whole-of-government arrangement will help to underpin our broader objective of delivering better ICT outcomes for all South Australians. We are also developing a cloud technology policy that focuses on providing stronger advice to agencies. This policy will underpin our ICT strategy and play a central role in our approach to digitising government services.

The policy will go out to state government agencies for consultation at the end of this month. It will then go out for industry consultation in late November. In the meantime, the Office of the Chief Information Officer will continue, as it always has, to support agencies to take advantage of the various cloud-based solutions.

MENTAL HEALTH BEDS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:28): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given the minister's statement today and given that currently there are 22 patients waiting for a bed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital emergency department, how will closing Ward C3 at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and transferring 18 beds to Glenside improve direct admissions for mental health patients at the Royal Adelaide, or is the government going to establish an emergency department at Glenside?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:28): It is wonderful to get a question. I have not had a question since the opposition came in here and made the false assertion that a woman had died at the Noarlunga Hospital. So, it is wonderful to at last get a question after the opposition so seriously blundered. But a good question it is nonetheless.

What will happen with Ward C3 is that it will basically become a short-stay ward for mental health patients. It means that instead of a large number of mental health patients having to go through the emergency department, they will be able to be admitted directly and treated directly in a dedicated mental health environment. One of the worst places you can be if you have an acute mental illness is an emergency department. There is enormous stimulation and it is just not an appropriate place for someone who is mentally ill.

There are 20 beds at the moment in the C3 ward. Eighteen of those beds will be transferred to the Glenside campus, so there will be an increase of 18 acute mental health beds at Glenside and those 18 will be taken from the C3 ward. At the moment in the emergency department at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, there are five beds. They are funded mental health beds but they are actually in the emergency department. Those five beds will be transferred to C3, plus the two beds that were always at C3 will remain there, basically creating a seven-bed ward at C3.

No, we will not be creating an emergency department at the Glenside campus. We do not think that is appropriate. My advice from clinicians when we were speaking is that that is not appropriate, that it is appropriate for people suffering an acute mental illness to go straight to one of our major hospitals and not to a dedicated mental health site, so that is what we would be doing.

Essentially that will mean that patients will not have to spend significant periods of time in the emergency department. There will be some mental health presentations that will still have to go through the emergency department to make sure there are no other underlying non-mental health conditions that they need to receive treatment for, in particular if there is intoxication involved, so they will need to be assessed in the first instance, but generally speaking mental health presentations will be able to go straight to C3.

We hope to have that up and running either late this year or early next year, but with the creation of eight extra beds at Glenside campus—so there is a ward there that at the moment has capacity for 20 but is only funded for 12—they will go up to 20 and that should happen next month.

MENTAL HEALTH BEDS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:31): Supplementary to that, given the minister's statement today to the house: are the five extra beds currently open at the Margaret Tobin Centre flex beds or are they fully funded; and if they are only flex beds, will the government fully fund them?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:32): They are flex beds and they are unfunded. We will continue to keep them open as long as we have the demand for acute mental health beds that we currently have. They will remain open as long as we have people waiting in emergency departments as a demonstrated need to keep those beds open but, no, they are not funded and keeping them open is certainly creating a cost pressure that my department has to manage.

MENTAL HEALTH BEDS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:32): Is the government establishing any forensic beds for mental health patients with disabilities at the James Nash centre?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:32): I will get back to the member for Morphett with a full report of that. We are in the process of constructing 10 new beds at James Nash, and those beds, as I said in my ministerial statement, will be open, I think, next year. I realise it is an issue that we have been grappling with about patients at James Nash who, rather than having a mental illness, have an intellectual disability. It has been an issue of the appropriateness of having those patients at James Nash and we are moving to deal with that, but I will get a full report back to the member for Morphett.

BAROSSA VALLEY HEALTH FACILITY

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:33): My question is also to the Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Is this from the internet?

Mr KNOLL: Actually, it is on the internet, because in 2003, minister Stevens stated in a letter to the Barossa area health service chairman that the Barossa will continue to receive consideration in relation to a new health facility. Eleven years later, in 2014, can the minister update the house as to when such a facility will be built?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:34): I have had some interesting conversations with the member for Schubert about the creation of a new health facility, and the member for Schubert has put some very interesting ideas to me about how we might expedite that. I will not reveal what those are here but, nonetheless, he had some excellent ideas about how we might accelerate that process. I am very attracted to the idea of consolidating services. I know the previous member for Schubert had talked about this previously and I will happily continue to work with the member for Schubert on this particular issue. I know it is something he is very keen to progress and it is something I am keen to progress as well.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:34): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Did the process that led to the agreement to sell 400 hectares of land at Gillman to ACP without a public tender follow the state government's existing unsolicited bid policy?

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) (15:35): Let's get a few things clear. The government, as I understand it, has published a draft unsolicited bids policy for the purpose of attracting public comment. That unsolicited bid policy is a document which has been formulated, I think, after regard was had to New South

Wales and Victorian models. There was an attempt, actually, to have a model here which had a lot of similar features to those, so that people who might be doing business in those states would find it equally convenient to do business here.

I have not been, personally, through the exercise of ascertaining whether each and every element in that draft policy was exactly the same—or in the same order, in the same process or using the same processes—as might be applicable, assuming the draft document becomes the official policy. What I can say is that, in the case of the original decision in relation to the Gillman proposal, I understand that the appropriate probity oversight was undertaken. I do not think I can really take that much further, because I gather there are some people having a bit of a contest about this matter down in Victoria Square at the moment.

Ms Chapman: What about the current policy?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The current policy—it is implicit in what I am saying that the government thought that the current arrangements were not as obvious, transparent and accessible as we would like them to be. For that reason, we decided, 'Let's get out there on the front foot and—'

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: the minister is clearly referring to a new draft of a policy that he is about to do—some hypothetical. I have asked the question: are the arrangements in relation to the sale to ACP consistent with the existing policy?

The SPEAKER: This is highly disorderly, but as an indulgence I have allowed the deputy leader to do it.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you, sir, because I am sure you will be interested in the answer, too.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: In relation to that, it is my understanding that there was compliance with the then existing arrangements. I will check that, but that is my understanding. The point I am trying to make to people is that we have considered this matter of unsolicited bids. It is potentially a complex ongoing issue for government and we thought it best that there was a publicly published transparent set of guidelines that anybody could acquaint themselves with so that they could use that as a blueprint to engage with government in the future. That is why we put that out there.

Parliamentary Committees

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:38): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Ministerial Statement

WHITLAM, HON. E.G.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:38): I table a copy of a ministerial statement regarding the late Gough Whitlam made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Gail Gago.

Grievance Debate

MITCHELL ELECTORATE

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:39): I rise today to speak about a busy period in and around the electorate of Mitchell. There has been plenty happening and numerous great people giving so much to their community. I will start with Sunday 26 October at Wigley Reserve down at Glenelg where I joined a number of people to support the JDRF. JDRF is an organisation devoted to improving lives and curing type 1 diabetes. The day involved a five kilometre walk to help promote awareness of type 1 diabetes and to also celebrate fundraising efforts. The walk started at 10am and

there was entertainment, food and activities for the kids afterwards. Plenty of people turned out. Despite some inclement weather at the start, it was an outstanding day for all involved.

I have done the walk on a few occasions now in support of a family friend of ours, a young man named Adam Beaumont who has type 1 diabetes. I have been lucky enough to watch him grow up into a fine young teenager and he has been remarkable in the way he has dealt with his diabetes. On Sunday I also met another young family from my local area whose son Jacob is close to starting school, and he and his mum and dad, Jillian and David, are finding their way with balancing young Jacob's blood sugar levels as he battles with diabetes as well.

I was there to meet the Murray Fingers team. They were there to support Ruby, a four year old with type 1 diabetes. The Murray Fingers wear red shirts in honour of Ruby's favourite Wiggle, being Murray. When she was diagnosed at 22 months of age, her parents had to find a way to help settle her from her finger pricks, and they came up with the team Murray Fingers—Murray because of her favourite Wiggle and fingers because she had to have her fingers pricked—and that name stuck with the group that support her. Her family are so proud of her bravery and the way that she has handled every needle, finger prick and hospital stay. Ruby's mum, Kelly Culbertson, and her family are now peer support helpers for JDRF, working with other families who are going through a similar situation. Ruby is one of 122,300 Australians living with the illness, so I must commend the JDRF for the work they do and compliment the Culbertson family and all the Murray Fingers.

Secondly, it was down to Reynella and the Reynella South Primary School, which had their garage sale over the weekend. A big driving force behind the garage sale is principal Barb Hall. She is an outstanding worker for her community and absolutely wonderful in the work she does around her school. Karen Know, the deputy principal, and the fundraising committee with Crystal Dodson and Glyndon Gale also did a marvellous job in getting the day together and engaging so much of the community. The day was supported by various class parents, governing council members and all the staff at Reynella South Primary School. Approximately \$1,300 was raised.

I also visited this school a little while ago to attend their Book Week celebrations and witness a school play by the older students. It was wonderful to see the parent and teacher involvement and so many of the children coming dressed up as their favourite characters. This is a school with great spirit and I commend all those involved who are working hard and having great success strengthening the school's bonds with the local community.

Then there was the Cove Fair. Dennis Connor and the entire team at the Hallett Cove & Districts Lions Club did a marvellous job again. It was a pleasure to be there with the member for Bright. We set up a stall and interacted with a lot of the local community. They came to have face painting at our stall, which was wonderfully organised and brilliantly done, and the interaction, as I said, was outstanding. It was amazing to see the number of people who wanted to talk to either the member for Bright or me about the rising cost of their ESL and the anger at these bills, the prices these families are having to pay and the cost of living that is going through the roof for them in and around the electorates of Mitchell and Bright.

There were plenty of food stalls and other community groups. It was wonderful to see a new community group into the area, the Trott Park Fencing Club, which is based in the Sheidow Park Primary School. They were working hard to promote themselves and garner new members. I recommend you get along and give fencing a try. In fact, I will be, as will the member for Bright. We have been invited along to have a go. The member for Bright is a little more nimble than me, so I am going to have to be wily if we have a bit of a joust.

The Cove Sports and Community Club, led by Keith Noble, again helped facilitate the day, and they really did a marvellous job. Keith's son played in one of the bands and they were highly entertaining. In fact, a lot of people hung around late into the afternoon to listen to the bands play. The Cove Cricket Club was also very supportive of the day and I thank them for their continued support for this great community event. Keith's son's band was Filthy Lucre—an interesting name, and it means 'dirty money'. Garuda and the Hallett Cove School R-12 rock band also were there. Can I take this opportunity to commend all involved with the Lions Club in raising money to go back into the local community. It was an outstanding day.

CARERS SA AWARDS

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:44): Over the past few weeks, South Australia has participated in Mental Health Week, Carers Week and Anti-Poverty Week and, during that time, we also marked World Homelessness Day and World Mental Health Day. I had the pleasure of attending numerous events during these weeks: the Mental Health Coalition launch breakfast, the World Mental Health Day Festival of Now, Grow's Speak Up events, the Carers SA awards ceremony, the Hawke Centre's Anti-Poverty Week debate, Lutheran Community Care's Vision for the Future Breakfast, and the opening of Shelter SA's Homelessness, Health and Housing Expo.

At each of those events, I acknowledged the deep interconnectedness between mental illness, unemployment, homelessness and poverty, and the selfless role that family carers play and the role played by dedicated workers employed by the organisations represented in making a real difference with and for our community, particularly those community members affected by mental illness and their carers.

This year, Mental Health Week focused on breaking down stigma associated with mental illness and asking community members about their mental health, with three key themes underpinning the week: thinking about how we can help one another; encouraging people to seek assistance; and asking ourselves what we can do to look after our own mental wellbeing. Being successful in each of those areas requires all of us to talk about mental health with others.

The Grow SA's event theme of speaking up was a powerful one and one I hope we continue every week of every year, and I strongly believe that we must. To remove stigma, to encourage everyone to speak about mental health and to improve our community's mental health, we must speak up and, in doing so, empower the voice of those in our community who are disenfranchised through mental illness.

We must speak up because last year 3,303 Australians took their own life. One in five people now experience mental illness and 489,000 Australians experience severe mental illness. The vast majority of those people access the disability support pension and are far less likely than other Australians to access secure employment, more likely to be homeless and consistently find it difficult to connect with services. Their family carers, without doubt, have the toughest job in the country. They are anywhere in age from 10 to 100. They are tough, resilient and courageous, but they often struggle with their own wellbeing and levels of stress.

When thinking about carers, I thought about two very special women I know who have undertaken caring responsibilities for decades. One is my mum, who is 73 and who has been the principal carer for my younger sister for the past 25 years. The other is my dear friend Olive, who lives in Reynell, who is 90. She has cared for her 60-year-old son, who is affected by a disability, for his entire life.

I thought about these women because, as well as showing incredible generosity and endurance through caring, they are fierce advocates for people affected by mental illness, people affected by disabilities and for other carers. As well as caring for their children, they have fought for decades for the rights of fellow community members and those who look after them. They are a tough duo who, in their time, have left many public figures quaking in their boots. They are extraordinary but not invincible. Sometimes things are hard. They are able to continue to do what they do because of organisations such as Carers SA and others which proactively care for carers. These organisations give these two and thousands of others respite, empathy, support, encouragement to carry on, and the ability to be part of a strong group of advocates whose collective voice can be heard.

The Carers SA awards were about acknowledging 250,000 South Australian carers and those who care for them. They gave recognition to the many individuals and organisations which make a positive difference to the life of carers every day across every area of our great state. Carers must be provided with support so that they can lead the life most of us take for granted, whether it is about working in paid employment, having a sense of independence, time to do things for themselves or having a social life.

We know from listening to carers that the caring role can often overtake just about everything else in their life, but we also know that organisations, employers and community groups, such as those represented at the carers awards, do much to enrich their life and to give them hope. Congratulations to Carers SA and their CEO, Rosemary Warmington, on these important awards and on their enduring leadership in supporting carers in South Australia.

ALMOND CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:49): I rise today to speak about a very important initiative that I would like this current state government to support; that is, the Almond Board of Australia has put a business case to both the South Australian and Victorian governments to establish an almond centre of excellence. The project cost is expected to be around the \$10 million mark, and there will be significant industry investment.

The board is seeking state government funding to help construct what is believed to be the first purpose-built facility that incorporates all aspects of development for the almond industry. The Minister for Agriculture has previously told the board to apply for the South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program, but at this stage it provides no guarantees. Given the scope of this project and what it could provide to the South Australian almond industry, the South Australian economy and the Riverland, I am calling on the state government to provide concrete support for an investment in critical research and development.

The Riverland has a very high unemployment rate of above 7 per cent, and with vacant properties as a result of the Small Block Irrigators Exit Grants coming back onto the market there is an opportunity for this project to help grow jobs and boost our economy. Almond demand is growing at nearly 10 per cent per year in Australia and globally, this year producing 70,000 tonnes of kernel. It is the largest horticultural export industry in the nation and worth approximately \$450 million.

The board believes that an opportunity exists to develop advanced production systems that will provide a move forward in terms of crop yields, water use efficiency, reduced fertiliser inputs, harvesting efficiencies, disease and pest management, product quality, and diminished food safety risk. The establishment of the almond centre of excellence will develop a field laboratory to conduct trials on varieties suited for both large-scale and smaller orchards. It is planned to look at new concepts to develop highly efficient and sustainable production systems that will be available to the new industry entrants looking to adjust from less viable crops, and for when the existing orchards require renewal.

The facility will not only be focused on production but will also assist in market development by showcasing the industry, its product and production practices to export buyers from key markets. Not only would it be a state-of-the-art facility offering training and research facilities for the industry but the centre is expected to attract researchers and scientists from across the world.

South Australia produces 20 per cent of Australia's almonds, and the Riverland has the majority of almond growers in the state. An almond centre of excellence would continue to enhance the Riverland's reputation as a premium food bowl of South Australia and provide important long-term research and development in the nut industry.

The Premier, the Minister for Regional Development and the Minister for Agriculture have all been briefed on this initiative. I am urging the state government to invest in a project like this, and I warn the government that we cannot afford to miss this opportunity. The proposal has been put to the South Australian government and it has been put to the Victorian government. If the state government misses this opportunity, Victoria is waiting in the wings to take it on.

This project is something that could help grow this very buoyant industry. I am led to believe that current prices for almonds are around \$8 per kilogram. With droughts and the forecast of upcoming water shortages in the United States, which is the world engine room for nut production, we could see those prices go over \$10 per kilogram. That is music to any nut producer's ears, but it is also music to the ears of this state government, which is looking for winners in our state's economy.

It is about this state government investing in an industry that is on the boil; it is looking to grow, and there is plenty of opportunity for the nut industry—not only in almonds but in pistachios, walnuts and macadamias—to be a powerhouse in the horticulture industry here in South Australia.

WALK TOGETHER

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:53): On Saturday, along with my wife, Annabel, and many thousands of other South Australians, I attended this year's nationwide Walk Together event, from Elder Park to Rundle Park. Walk Together is a public walk of solidarity to send a message to asylum seekers and refugees that they are welcome in our country. It is also to send a message to all Australians that each of us—every one of us—has a role to play in welcoming and supporting those who have come to Australia from across the seas. After all, excepting for our first peoples, we are all the sons and daughters, grandsons and granddaughters and great-grandsons and great-granddaughters of people who have come to Australia from all parts of the world.

It was fabulous to see so many people in Adelaide committed to welcoming all those who have travelled across the seas to seek a home in Australia. Annabel and I had a terrific day walking alongside members of our emerging communities and the many who are committed to welcoming and supporting these beautiful people wishing only to forge a new life in and to contribute to our great country.

I would like to express my thanks and congratulations to the staff and many volunteers from Welcome to Australia, as well as to all the community members who assisted in coordinating this year's Walk Together event. In particular, I wish to acknowledge Brad Chilcott, Welcome to Australia national director; Kate Leaney, the manager of the SA Welcome Centre; and Megan Lamb, the South Australian director. I also wish to acknowledge again the many volunteers who help out Welcome to Australia in supporting our refugees and asylum seekers.

For those members who do not know, the Welcome Centre is located in a beautiful old church on Hawker Street and is interestingly and well called the Activate SA building. Members here may wish to visit this outstanding centre. There are gatherings every second Thursday, and all you need to do is bring along a plate of food because there is a dinner for those people who attend. You learn more about the role the centre plays, and you can even volunteer in providing some support to those who visit the centre.

Support can come in many ways; it might just be conversational English. You will learn about the trials and tribulations and the background and stories of some of these refugees and asylum seekers. You can assist, if you like, in writing letters on their behalf in their own words, given the difficulties they might have in writing in English. There are a lot of roles can be played by people who wish to support these very good people who are in the category, at this stage, of refugees or asylum seekers. You can help out in many ways.

This morning, we also paid a tribute to Gough Whitlam during the condolence motion. I know we were limited to an hour and many people did not get the opportunity to speak during that hour this morning. I just want to highlight one of the many things that Gough Whitlam, that great Australian prime minister, was responsible for—and that was enacting the Racial Discrimination Act in 1975, making it illegal to discriminate in Australia based on ethnicity or country of origin.

Wherever Gough might be, looking at Australia today, he would say, 'Australia is a different place from when I became prime minister.' It is a better place with respect to cultural tolerance and the very many different people from different national backgrounds who make up Australia today, but he would also be looking down and saying that there is still lots more we can do. Each and every one of us can assist in not only making people who come from across the seas welcome to Australia but in supporting them making that transition from the country they have come from to the country they wish to call home.

Gough Whitlam left great legacies for the people of Australia—legacies that will exist for many years. The Racial Discrimination Act was just one of them, but there is more that we can do to make sure that we, each and collectively, turn Australia into a better place than it is today. Already today, it is the best place in the world to live, but we can do a lot more with respect to our place in the world by making sure that we continue not only to tolerate but to support those people from different cultural backgrounds.

BRIGHTON AND HALLETT COVE ROTARY CLUBS

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:58): I rise today to pay tribute to the good works of the two Rotary clubs within my electorate: the Rotary Club of Brighton and the Rotary Club of Hallett Cove. I have had the opportunity to interact with both of these clubs in the past week and, in doing so, I am prompted to acknowledge the great value they bring to my community. Last Monday, 20 October, I had the privilege of being the guest speaker at the Rotary Club of Brighton, and on Tuesday I welcomed the Rotary Club of Hallett Cove to a tour of Parliament House.

The Rotary Club of Hallett Cove (previously the Rotary club of Kingston Park) was chartered in 1982. The club is well known and very active in the southern suburbs, meeting weekly at 6.30pm in the House of Jade Chinese restaurant at Sheidow Park—a venue which is actually in the member for Mitchell's electorate. In 2014, the Rotary Club of Hallett Cove is being ably led by Grant Sibly, supported by past president Margaret Vade who is now secretary, and John Myers who is treasurer. This year club directors include:

- Irene Healey, president-elect and director of community service;
- Jeanette Hodgson, director of club service;
- David Roberts, program director and youth service;
- Shirley Skurray, international director;
- Kerry Sutton, vocational service; and
- Rima Haddad and Kerry Sutton, looking after fellowship activities.

It was a pleasure to attend this club's changeover dinner earlier this year and see Irene Healey, David Roberts and Josie Lee all receive Paul Harris Fellow Sapphire Pins for their dedication to the club's service. These office bearers and the other club members diligently serve our community, raising funds for both local and international projects and using their contacts to identify projects to support. Their regular fundraising events include their sausage sizzles at Harvey Norman and their much anticipated quiz night. I am pleased to say that my table is a past winner of that event.

The club is involved in a range of international and local projects: contributing towards Rotary's mission to eradicate polio; working to support children who need to come to Australia from overseas for medical treatment; supporting local students to attend a range of leadership programs; and supporting safe driving among young people by coordinating Rotary's driver education program for Hallett Cove R-12 school students.

A highlight of the club's year is their partnership with the Lions Club to put on the must attend foreshore Australia Day Breakfast at Hallett Cove beach. In 2013 I had the pleasure of working with the club to take over the Nannigai Tennis Club shed on Nannigai Drive, Hallett Cove. I hope that this will give the club a stake in the ground in the local community and be a launch pad to additional community outreach activities in the future.

The Rotary Club of Brighton meets on Mondays at 6.30pm at Club Marion, which is also in the member for Mitchell's electorate. Brighton Rotary is led this year by president Meredith Beaston, assisted by immediate past president Elizabeth Garrigan, vice-president Carole Walker, and secretary Alison Rogers, who I was able to see receive a Paul Harris Fellow Sapphire Pin at the recent changeover dinner. I should take this opportunity to also mention longstanding Scottish members, Alan Lawrie and Marjory his wife, who are also fantastic members.

Like their Hallett Cove counterparts, the Brighton club is incredibly active, and in the past year internationally they have provided financial support for an overseas school and hospital to help provide clean drinking water and for the funding and assembling of prosthetic hands. At a local level the club is also very active, providing mentorship to Brighton Secondary School students during Australian Business Week, and supporting students to attend the National Youth Science Forum.

They have provided support for the local LifeLinks program, a body focused on providing support for people of high social needs with social barbecues. They provide a barbecue for the Mother's Day Classic and have an ongoing role in supporting the Brighton Meals on Wheels, with many members involved in both the kitchen and meal delivery. Meal preparation is also provided for

those enjoying Cara camps for the disabled. These activities are supported through regular barbecue fundraisers and through the club's popular garage sale held on the third Saturday of each month at the club's shed at the rear of Brighton Oval.

The 2014-15 Rotary year began with Rotary International president Gary Huang challenging Rotarians to light up Rotary and to let their light shine by strengthening their networks, fellowship and service impact. I congratulate the Rotary Clubs of Hallett Cove and Brighton for what they do in our community and encourage them to continue to light up our communities with their personal warmth, spirit and generosity that they have shown to me and our wider community.

MARY, LADY DOWNER

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:03): I am grateful to have the call today: the 106th anniversary of the Grille protests at Westminster gives me the opportunity to speak about Muriel Matters, the heroine that night, and another famous South Australian-born woman who spent many years in London and was significant in many ways, but especially to the Muriel Matters Society, as its first life member.

News of the sudden death of Mary, Lady Downer, on 14 October reached me almost straight after the news broke, and the sad loss of our esteemed life member is felt by all in the Muriel Matters Society. For Mary's life story is entwined in Muriel's history because one of Mary's brothers was married to Faye Matters, the earliest collector of Muriel's history, whose work has made it possible to restore Muriel to her rightful place in history. Mary very kindly gave the society early encouragement and support, and I am grateful to Jane Lomax-Smith and Elizabeth Thomas for alerting me to Mary's important connection to Faye, who I never met, because she passed away a few weeks before I knew of her association with Mary.

Mary took part in the Muriel Matters Society's very first TV interview with Ian Henschke on the *7.30 Report*, and was the special guest at an event held in Rundle Mall where she was interviewed by Pat Mickan for our first balloon commemoration in 2009. Her recent back operation did not stop her attending the inaugural Muriel Matters Society life members' lunch in June this year, and I am particularly grateful for the happy time that we all shared with her before what was to be her final trip to London.

Mary Isobel Gosse was, as Paul Starick wrote in *The Advertiser* on 16 October '...a member of the closest South Australia comes to aristocracy.' She was born on 13 December 1924. Her father, Sir James Gosse, was a successful businessman with links to Adelaide Steamship Co. Ltd., the Bank of Adelaide and the Norwood Football Club. Her great-great grandfather was Robert Barr-Smith, a legendary philanthropist and joint partner in Elder Smith & Co.

Mary attended Seymour College between 1936 and 1942 when it was known as Presbyterian Girls' College. When the time came, like her brothers, Mary enlisted. She was 18 when she joined the Searchlight Battalion and became a truck driver in Western Australia. In July 1946 she met her future husband at a cocktail party in the marvellous building that was the South Australian Hotel. According to Alick Downer in his book, *The Downers of South Australia*, published by Wakefield Press, he knew 'instantaneously she seemed different from any girl I had ever met', and in December that year, three days after her 22nd birthday, they became engaged. Sir Alick went on to say in the following paragraph, 'And we lived happily ever after.'

Later in the book I was interested to learn that in Scotland, in September 1965, Mary launched HMAS *Oxley*, the first of the Oberon-class submarines built for the Royal Australian Navy. Submarines remain an issue of interest to all South Australians to this very day. Mary also launched the first of the express container ships for the Australian trade. She named the *Encounter Bay* in 1968. Perhaps this explains Mary's interest in navigable craft.

Mary spent her life doing good works and supporting her much-loved family and was tireless in her enthusiasm and support. I quote again from the book where Sir Alick said:

Three of our four children were born in election years; the youngest, Una, was conceived in another. Despite our increasing family, and their extreme youthfulness, Mary gave me unstinting support both in the constituency and in Canberra. Her easy manner, personal charm, ability to mix readily with every section of the community, assisted me, and the Liberal Party, in ways which can never be sufficiently applauded. She also emerged as a frank and honest critic of my endeavours, a difficult but necessary role for a wife to play in the advancement of her husband's career.

Twenty-five years later, she was to be acclaimed by a leading British Labor Cabinet Minister as the most outstanding diplomat's wife in London.

Catherine Murphy from the Mary Potter Foundation acknowledges Mary Downer's contribution as an active patron from 1994 and tells us that she would often tour the hospice and speak with staff and patients. She was a generous supporter and sponsor of race day each year from 2000. Mary was also the primary patron of the Barossa Valley music festival until its final festival in 2005.

Mary's life motto has been quoted as 'Do your best...and enjoy.' I quote from a 2008 article in *Barossa Living* where Mary said:

It's most important to have a sense of humour. It's a great mistake to take oneself too seriously. Alexander shares my quirky sense of humour. Unfortunately, it has proved on several occasions to get him into trouble—a fact which he is keen to point out is all my fault.

In the later part of her life I am sure she was living this motto. She was visiting her son, Alexander, in London in his current role as High Commissioner, with history turning full circle by the time of her death as her husband had been High Commissioner between 1964 and 1972 after his service in the House of Representatives, commencing in 1950. Mary became Lady Downer in 1965 when her husband was knighted.

In their time in London they were part of the expat community, and I am told Mary established the Chicken and Chablis Club. She was cremated in the UK, as was Muriel Matters, but not at Hastings—rather, at the Mortlake Crematorium on 22 October after a service officiated by the Dean of Westminster.

Mary will be remembered tonight by members of the Muriel Matters Society as we gather to commemorate Muriel becoming the first woman to speak in the House of Commons. Mary Downer will continue to be remembered well into the future by all who knew her, and particularly by her extended family to whom we send our sincere condolences at this very sad time.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

The CHAIR: The first half hour is dedicated to the Premier. Do you want to make a statement?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Just to announce that with me is Mr James Hallion, the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Steven Woolhouse, Director of Finance, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and Mr Jake Loulas, Manager of Finance, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: Leader.

Mr MARSHALL: My question relates to Part B, Volume 4, page 1378, Overseas travel. The Auditor-General highlights:

A review of overseas travel found that the Department had not prepared any monthly returns for the Minister detailing overseas travel undertaken, as required by Commissioner's Determination 3.2.

Why didn't the department complete its monthly overseas travel returns?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The travel to which this observation is directed, I am advised, is travel that was undertaken by the Agent-General in London. The department is advised that Commissioner's Determination 3.2 does not require the preparation of monthly returns by the Agent-General, and that is confirmed by crown law advice. But we are waiting for further advice from the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment in relation to that matter. It refers to a commissioner's determination, so we are seeking clarification from the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment.

Mr MARSHALL: Why does the Premier assert that this matter raised by the Auditor-General is related only to the Agent-General? It states quite clearly:

A review of overseas travel found that the Department had not prepared any monthly returns for the Minister detailing overseas travel undertaken...

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: As I said before, the overseas travel in question largely relates to the Agent-General, although a process to prepare monthly returns required by the commissioner's standard will be established by the business performance and strategy unit for the upcoming financial year.

Mr MARSHALL: Is the Premier advising that the reason he knows that it relates only to the Agent-General is that there have been discussions? I am not trying to be difficult but it is very unclear. It seems to me that the Auditor-General is quite clear that the department had not prepared any monthly returns for the minister detailing overseas travel. What is it that makes the Premier think that it is related only to travel relating to the Agent-General?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The advice is that it is largely due to the travel of the Agent-General, but it is worth bearing in mind that the travel is reported in the annual report. What is now going to occur in the future is that the process of preparing monthly returns as required by the commissioner's standard will now be put in place.

Mr MARSHALL: Does the CEO sign off on all overseas travel?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, the chief executive does, but for all travel except for the travel engaged in by the Agent-General.

Mr MARSHALL: Has DPC since completed returns, given the Auditor-General's advice?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That goes to the answer to the earlier question. We are still awaiting the advice from the commissioner for public employment about the scope of that return so, for instance, if the advice comes back, which is consistent with our crown law advice that the Agent-General is not within the scope of the monthly return, then obviously they would not be included, but if they are, then they will need to be included.

Mr MARSHALL: Why has the Premier appointed his own international relations adviser, Andrew Hunter? What is the cost to government of this position?

The CHAIR: Is that still under overseas travel?

Mr MARSHALL: Yes. What is the cost to government of this position and what is the expertise of Mr Hunter relative to this position?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Hunter is a ministerial adviser. He is an adviser just in the same way as I have advisers for all of the areas of responsibility I have as Premier. Obviously one of the particular responsibilities I have is engaging in the international relationship, so he supports me in that role.

Mr MARSHALL: Wasn't the international office transferred to the Department of State Development? Is this a new position in DPC?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, Mr Hunter is just simply a ministerial adviser. It is no more or less than the ministerial office complement I have, including chiefs of staff and various policy advisers. He is a policy adviser, not a public servant.

Mr MARSHALL: My question relates to Part C, page 17. The dot points mention procurement reform and I would just like to ask some questions there. The government signed a contract with Carlson Wagonlit for a three-year period commencing 1 February 2014 for across-government travel management services for \$22.5 million. The government also has a one-year contract for across-government airline services also commencing on 1 February 2014 for \$56.2 million. How do these two contracts compare with the equivalent previous contracts?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is a question that falls in the area of responsibility of the minister for public employment, so I will invite you to direct your questions to her about that matter.

Mr MARSHALL: I have some questions with regard to the caretaker period. My reference there might be Part C, page 60, which refers to the state election in paragraph 3. What was the meeting hosted by your office in March 2014 on which \$488 was spent?

The CHAIR: Can you just help the table, leader: we can't find your page 60.

Mr MARSHALL: We are talking essentially about expenses. There are a number of references I could give you.

The CHAIR: We are looking at Part C, page 60, and we cannot see what you are talking about, if you could assist us.

Mr MARSHALL: There are many references I could give you but that is certainly one that refers to the state election.

The CHAIR: This talks about five public-private partnerships.

Mr MARSHALL: I am happy to find another reference for you.

The CHAIR: I'm sorry, we just can't see it.

Mr MARSHALL: Let's choose one of the expenses areas. If you look at Part B, page 1386, my question is: what was the meeting that was hosted by your office during the caretaker period in relation to which \$488 was incurred?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I will take that question on notice and bring back an answer.

Mr MARSHALL: In a similar vein, who was being farewelled in March 2014 at the Wakefield Hotel at which \$400 was spent?

The CHAIR: We cannot see that either. We are in Part B. Where are you looking in Part B?

Mr MARSHALL: Expenses.

The CHAIR: Yes, which bit? Those figures, of course, are contained in another figure. Which figure are you looking at? Supplies and services?

Mr MARSHALL: Are you seriously asking me that question? This is an expense incurred by the government during caretaker mode. It is not disaggregated in any further detail than that. I think it is a pretty easy reference, quite frankly.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I will take that question notice. I understand the member is referencing the proactive disclosure website where we publish items of our credit card expenses. What they have to do with the Auditor-General's Report I do not know, but I am more than happy to bring back an answer.

Mr MARSHALL: On the matter that the Premier has just raised in regard to credit card expenses, we note that the CEO, Mr Hallion, was on official business in Sydney staying at the Radisson on 7 March, again in caretaker mode, and at the Sofitel on 28 February, at a total accommodation cost of \$653. Can you advise the house what he was doing on that visit in caretaker mode?

The CHAIR: To help us, is that actually mentioned in here anywhere, or is it just in a figure that you have information about separately?

Mr MARSHALL: Yes, that is right.

The CHAIR: It is in information you have separately?

Mr MARSHALL: It is under 'other expenses'.

The CHAIR: I know, but you have information on that particular detail.

Mr MARSHALL: It is published on the Premier's website.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: During the caretaker period the government still operates. Senior officers attend Canberra, attend senior officers' meetings and carry out the business of government, consistent with caretaker principles. I am advised that, to the best recollection of the chief executive, he was there on a senior officers' meeting concerning COAG.

Mr MARSHALL: Part B, Volume 4, page 1376 refers to the population and migration policy unit being transferred to the Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy, and it gives us a date for that. What does the Premier believe should be done to increase South Australia's 3 per cent share of the 457 visa program?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is not germane to this and it is a matter for the relevant minister. I ask you to direct your questions to him.

Mr MARSHALL: On page 1396 of the same volume, the second line under 2.6 mentions the emergency services levy. Can the Premier outline to the house what the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's ESL liability in 2013-14 was?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We will take that question on notice and bring back an answer.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the Premier advise what is budgeted for the upcoming year, and can the Premier advise whether DPC has had the remission on the ESL removed?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Questions were asked of the Treasurer in question time about that very matter. He took the questions on notice and he will bring back an answer.

Mr MARSHALL: In the Auditor-General's Report Part C, page 24, under 'Concluding observations', the Auditor-General refers to commonwealth budget reductions. I would be keen to ask the Premier about the state government's campaign against these commonwealth budget reductions. Can he advise the house what the total budget for this program is?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, the Federal Cuts Hurt campaign is directed at resisting the \$898 million budget cuts from the commonwealth and the \$5.5 billion in cuts over the next 10 years. We said during the last election that we would campaign against these cuts. We warned about them; even we, I do not think, could have anticipated their severity, but we certainly warned cuts were on the way. Once they emerged, we committed to campaign against them, and so we budgeted \$1.105 million for this campaign, and the campaign was launched on 24 July this year.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the Premier outline to the house how much of that budget has already been spent and how much remains?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I have to take that question on notice. I do not think we have that number with us.

Mr MARSHALL: Could the Premier at least outline whether there is any further expenditure in that area and whether there is any future media placement schedule in place.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, we fully expect there will be further expenditure. I do not think we have fully exhausted the campaign budget to this point. It certainly is our intention to recommence the media campaign. I took the decision that it was not proper to pursue it during the period in the lead-up to the by-election and, should there be a further by-election, in the lead-up to any further by-election, but we certainly will be getting back onto that at an appropriate time.

Mr MARSHALL: Will that be additional money to the \$1.105 million budget the Premier has previously outlined to this committee?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, I do not think there is any intention to spend more than the budgeted amount, but I also do not rule out the possibility of doing that, given the nature of the ongoing cuts and the threats that are emerging to South Australia at the hands of the commonwealth. We have an unprecedented attack on South Australia from the commonwealth—something in the order of \$900 million in relation to cuts to automotive assistance, which bear dramatically on South Australia.

Obviously, the \$898 million in cuts are shared across the whole nation, so not particularly separating out South Australia, but then there is a very dramatic threat to South Australia's interests which may emerge because of the decision to breach a promise to build 12 submarines here in South Australia. There are many threats on the horizon. We have to defend ourselves. I said I would stand up for South Australia and I am delivering on that promise.

Mr MARSHALL: Can you outline to the committee what the requirements are for approval of government advertising, if any, that the Auditor-General or other bodies need to approve before the government goes ahead with government advertising?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: There is a committee called PCAG—I would love to know what acronym means but, take my word for it, that is what it is. It reviews government advertising in accordance with standards that are set by various agencies within government.

Mr MARSHALL: Do they review government advertising or do you need to seek approval from PCAG before the advertising proceeds?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am advised that it is an advisory body to ensure that proper processes have been established for the placement of government advertising.

Mr MARSHALL: You are not sure, Premier, what their process is. Do you take a suggestion for advertising to PCAG and they approve it, or do you, once a year, provide a report, and they review that report? Have you taken anything with regard to this current campaign that we are talking about to this committee, and what has their response been?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is called the Premier's Communications Advisory Group, so any campaign like this would be taken to that group for advice about whether it needs proper standards. It routinely does things such as giving exemptions for schools that might be wishing to promote a new brand from the common branding. It supervises, if you like, standards and policies in relation to government advertising or the way in which the government represents itself to the broader community.

Mr MARSHALL: Who sits on the PCAG at the moment?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I will take that question on notice and bring you back the answer.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the Premier advise whether the current program we are talking about did go to the PCAG and on what day they provided their approval or review?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I will have to bring back an answer to that question.

Mr MARSHALL: Are there any further reviews, or is there any requirement for the Auditor-General to look at the suitability of any government advertising?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The Auditor-General is entitled to look at whatever he wants to look at in terms of government expenditure and, this being an item of government expenditure, it is within his remit to ask questions and make observations about it.

Mr MARSHALL: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 1406, where we have a list of the remuneration of people in your department: what was the value of the termination payment received by the employee in the \$531,000 to \$542,000 salary bracket, and what was the reason for the termination?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The relevant employee occupied the position of Chief Officer, Field Services, SafeWork SA, an ASO8 position. The employee was 59 years of age, with 42 years of service. The TVSP component was \$265,000, leave entitlements were \$125,000, remuneration for 2013-14 was \$150,000—

Mr MARSHALL: And the reason for the termination?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and the total remuneration was \$540,000. The reason, being a TVSP, must have been a voluntary separation.

Mr MARSHALL: What is the name of that employee?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I do not think that we generally provide the names of employees to protect their privacy, so I would be loath to do that unless it was germane to the observation.

Mr MARSHALL: My next question relates to Part B, Volume 4, page 149, towards the bottom of the page, under note No. 19. Why was there an advance of \$18.7 million received by the Governor's Appropriation Fund?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Can you repeat the reference?

Mr MARSHALL: Page 1409.

The CHAIR: Page 1409? We thought you said 149. So, Part B, Volume 4, page 1409.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am sorry, we are going to have to take that question on notice.

Mr MARSHALL: When you are doing that, if you could also just explain how that Governor's Appropriation Fund operates, what it is used for, and whether or not that money needs to somehow be repaid to the fund.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We will take the second part of that question on notice.

Mr MARSHALL: I will move on to the next question, which relates to Part B, Volume 4, page 1421, where it lists the members of boards and committees. What annual saving has been locked in from the abolition of boards and committees as proposed by the government?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The Mid-Year Budget Review boards and committees savings target is \$1.3 million in 2013-14, the same for 2014-15, \$1.4 million in 2015-16. The last two years of the forward estimates is \$1.4 million. So, \$1.3 million, \$1.3 million, \$1.4 million and \$1.4 million.

Mr MARSHALL: When you say 'locked in to the Mid-Year Budget Review', that is the one that will be released in December?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, I'm sorry; that is the 2012-13 Mid-Year Budget Review, which first mooted this savings initiative.

Mr MARSHALL: Okay, so you worked out in 2012-13 what the savings would be. What did you base that on, considering that the review into the efficacy of those boards and committees had not been done?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We made an estimate about what we thought we could achieve by way of savings through the rationalisation of boards and committees.

Mr MARSHALL: How accurate was that estimate, given that it was done two years before your investigation into this area?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Chair, it depends on the Leader of the Opposition's attitude to our bill that we will be promoting to the parliament, in how much of it is successful. We think we should exceed that target if we are able to get the legislation through in the fashion that we are promoting it.

Mr MARSHALL: The Premier refers to it as a target; is he saying that he set a financial goal for the review of the boards, rather than an efficacy scope?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, the two things are different. The first thing is that we had a boards and committees savings target. The twin motivations for choosing, really, if you like, a day on which all the boards and committees may disappear unless they could justify their existence was, firstly, to try to drive that process to make sure that we did achieve those targets, but we also then added to that an additional ambition because we could see some real benefits in terms of renewal.

After the election, we had been renewing obviously our cabinet and our Public Service, and we also thought it was appropriate to review some of our structures. In a sense, the ambitions about the exercise had grown out of a simple savings exercise into a more thoroughgoing review of boards and committees. While the original purpose was a savings purpose, it really morphed into a broader purpose about the renewal of the governance arrangements of our various boards and committees.

So, it is both things. It is obviously a savings exercise, but we think we will exceed that. That is not the principal motivation for the additional rationalisation of boards and committees, because some of those boards and committees obviously create expenses in the way in which they do their work and the abolition of them will save some money, but we cannot leave behind some of the tasks that they were performing, which is essentially communicating and giving advice to government, it is just that we may wish to get our advice in different ways. We might go out to the community in different ways, which itself will incur its own expense.

Some of the boards and committees were advising government in one way but, rather than a small group of select people getting an ear of government, we want to get a broader group of people engaged in different ways using social media and other techniques to engage a broader cross-section of people. That will itself cost money, but it will—

Mr Marshall: Citizens' jury.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Of course. A citizens' jury is a good example of a different way of engaging with the community which also costs money, but there will be savings regarding some of these more old-fashioned ways, if one likes to put it that way, of providing advice to government.

The CHAIR: The time having expired for the Premier's examination, I thank the Premier and his advisers and call the Attorney-General and Deputy Premier to begin the examination of his line.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am here with Mr Swanson and Mr Persse.

Ms CHAPMAN: In opening, I thank the Attorney for his Attorney-General's Report which was also filed today. I notice that page 57 says that the measure on SACAT is 'substantially complete'. Thank you for that report; I will have a good look at it.

Back to the Auditor-General's Report, the Attorney-General's division is page 152 of Volume 1. This sets out the first part of the report in respect of the department. As you have your chief executive next to you, I notice that one of the aims of your department is to 'be a high-performing organisation', then I read the next three pages which tell me what lack of diligence there has been in the application of management of a number of processes.

It is very disappointing, firstly, Attorney, that there has not been some response to the repeated failure to comply with Treasurer's Instructions 2 and 28 particularly which, as you know, require the documentation and review of policies. It does not appear that the Auditor-General has identified any form of maladministration as a result of that; nevertheless, it is rather sloppy. I would have thought that, if you are aiming to be a high-performance organisation, there would be some significant improvement next year.

I go specifically to page 155 first. I will miss the first few pages of criticism, but come to the review of the fraud and corruption policy and plan. This tells us again that there has been no approval of the fraud and corruption framework since October 2012. It was due again for review in September 2013 and, as for the fraud and corruption plan, that had not been updated since 2010. The response published indicates that by December 2014 you are going to have the plan and the program updated, but I will just go back to the preceding paragraph which refers to the fraud and corruption framework. At the time of this audit it was with the chief executive who is here today. Can you tell us whether, in fact, it has been improved and is it implemented?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that the department believes it is on track to comply with the December 2014—

Ms CHAPMAN: That is not what I asked you. What I asked you was regarding the preceding paragraph. The Auditor-General was telling us that at the time he did his audit that framework, as distinct from the fraud and corruption plan, was with the chief executive for approval, and I am asking you if that framework has now been approved and is it operational?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will take that on notice and get an answer.

Ms CHAPMAN: As the Attorney has the chief executive sitting next to him, could he ask him whether or not he has actually approved this framework even if it is not operational? I appreciate him taking that on notice, but has it been approved?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that the chief executive has not approved it because there were some questions about the matter that he thought needed to be answered and it has been referred back to the Audit and Risk Management Committee.

Ms CHAPMAN: Has there been any correspondence and communication to the Auditor-General that it has not proceeded to approval?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We will have to check.

Ms CHAPMAN: If, in fact, there has been some communication and it is available, will you make it available to the committee?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I do not know what that communication is if it exists but, as I said, I will get you an answer to the question. As to the communication, I am not sure what the situation about that is, but I will get an answer to your question.

Ms CHAPMAN: It is an ongoing concern because, as I now move to the victims of crime fraud, which has a special fund for fraud of the fund and which was given special attention at page 160, again as part of the process of reviewing how presumably the fund would not be ripped off with another million dollar fraud you have implemented certain policies, or your department has. The Auditor reports, notwithstanding significant delays in implementation of a number of plans, at point 5:

Since March 2014, different staff are required to approve the assessment and payment in Basware, in addition to the segregation of duties with regard to other internal processes.

I am assuming from that that the way to manage this and to protect against a future fraud is to make sure the person who is approving is not the same person who writes the cheque out of the account and that there is a segregation of duties. Could you just explain what that situation is?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, I thank the member for Bragg for that question. Just to put it into a bit of historic context, we need to remember here that this fraud was actually detected by AGD itself. It was not something detected by an external agency. It was one of AGD's own staff who was vigilant enough to pick this up and blow the whistle on this thing.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I am just saying I think we need to pay tribute where it is due. The people within our AGD—and one staff member, in particular—showed a great deal of commitment and courage in taking this matter up. Anyway, that is historic now.

Since the discovery of this back in August 2012, the Crown Solicitor's Office began implementing alternate procedures for processes relating to victims of crime claims, and I am advised that these procedures were made in consultation with PwC and were progressively implemented and finalised in March this year. The instances noted by audit would appear to be part of the old process, I am advised.

It should be noted that since August 2012 there have been a significant number of separate controls implemented in the CSO other than segregation controls. In relation to the new procedure finalised in March 2014, audit identified two instances where the checklist form had been completed but not signed. Staff have been reminded to sign the checklist form as evidence of the check, and audit did not raise any other aspects of the checklist and new procedure.

Independent CSO staff members not involved in the VOC processes are currently reviewing a number of randomly selected VOC payments. The internal review will examine payments made against the new VOC procedure. It will focus on key control points and general compliance with the policy, such as segregation of duties within the process. The review will be finalised by the end of the month, meaning October.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is the review that is occurring where it states, 'The first internal review will occur in September 2014.' That is not finished yet, is that correct?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Correct.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is due at the end of the month?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Correct.

Ms CHAPMAN: Will you be reporting to the Auditor-General as to what the outcome of your review is?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Certainly, that information will be available. There is no reason to conceal whatever comes out of that. On reflection, it might not be a bad idea if perhaps not me but

the department dropped him a note saying, 'Here is what we have done and here is what the outcome has been.' I do not see any problem with that.

Ms CHAPMAN: Apart from the segregation of duties, which is the specific control that has been put into place in March this year, what else has been implemented? You say that there have been a number of other processes implemented, but there is nowhere that is identified. You have responded to the fact that the Auditor-General thinks you have only done this new segregation of duties initiative since March, and you are suggesting it predates that. In any event, what else is there?

You might remember, Attorney, that once this had been exposed you commissioned a report from Pricewaterhouse to help with an understanding of what happened to make sure it would not happen again. We have asked a number of questions about that report—it has never seen the light of day, it has never been tabled, it has never been produced, and it has never been sent to us. Yet each year since this has occurred—and we are talking another two years down the track—it is still a mystery as to what else you have done in your department to make sure this does not happen again.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I appreciate the question being raised. I am advised, basically, that the specific nature of the new controls is, in the opinion of the Crown Solicitor, something in the nature of checks and balances that are in place to reduce the risk of fraud, and the nature and matters covered. The recommendations are such that to make them public would, in effect, make it easier for somebody to get around those controls. It is one of those things that, if you identify every weak spot in a secure premise and put a big spotlight on it, then presumably they are the places people go if they wish to get in without being noticed. It is the same thing with this.

I say to the member for Bragg that it may be that there is more information that I would be able to share with the member for Bragg on an in camera, confidential basis, to satisfy the member for Bragg personally. I am not saying the question is unreasonable. It is just that there is a material difference between a confidential conversation with the member for Bragg and a public disclosure of what might be very clever and shrewd anti-avoidance mechanisms.

Ms CHAPMAN: For the moment they are secret, so can you explain to us why they were not introduced before March 2014? If any of these were actioned before March 2014, can you tell us when?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I would have to get back to you on that.

Ms CHAPMAN: Attorney, this has been going on for two years. You have the head of your department sitting next to you and you have read this report. Clearly, it has been a concerning matter for the government. You say it has been exposed, yet you cannot even ask your senior people as to what has been implemented. If you want to keep the exact details confidential at this point, I am happy to accept that, but we are two years down the track, after something has been identified, and you have had advice. That report has to have been around for at least a year. What is going on?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I appreciate the member for Bragg's question. On the surface, the question that she asks is quite a reasonable question, but let us remember a couple of things here. There are certain matters before the courts presently which are directly related to this matter; they have not yet fully resolved, as I understand it. One matter is awaiting sentencing, as I understand it. But secondly and more importantly, my inquiry of the chief executive suggests to me that he does not have at his fingertips the detail that the member's question requires, and understandably so, because the member could have asked about any number of things. This is quite a specific and detailed question about—

Ms CHAPMAN: I ask you about this every year.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I know. We were hoping that things might have changed this year, so we prepared for something else. It is terrible, is it not, that you prepare for the wrong thing.

Ms CHAPMAN: Tell me what you prepared for and I will ask something about that.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am not going to tell you; you will have to find out. To be serious about it just for a minute, the position is that I would like to be sure that the answer I give to the parliament is as accurate an answer as possible.

Ms CHAPMAN: I think that is what you said last year. In respect of the current fraud, in any event, what is the total fraud now identified in the sense of moneys lost?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I can answer this one. I am advised that the total sum paid from the Victims of Crime Fund in relation to the offences is in the order of \$1.06 million and involves 26 separate transactions.

Ms CHAPMAN: How much has been recovered?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I thought you were going to ask me that next, and I am going to ask whether we have that. I am advised that that is a work in progress. Some assets have been seized. Just to explain, the perpetrators of this fraud acquired various assets, presumably with the proceeds of the fraud, things in the nature of, I think, real property and perhaps very fancy vehicles. So, what has happened is that these things have been seized and, in order to recover funds, there is a process that needs to be gone through. Ultimately, those things being proceeds of crime in a direct sense, I assume, they would be capable of being realised through some process and the moneys returned ultimately back to the AGD.

I can also indicate that the South Australian Financing Authority insurance, which is SAICORP, has been notified of a potential claim for the recovery of moneys by the Victims of Crime Fund and the insurance arrangement will require the AGD to pay a maximum of \$10,000 in respect of each claim.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, but every effort will be made ultimately to recover what is available.

Ms CHAPMAN: You are satisfied that you have sufficient assets or equity in assets under injunction to be able to recover what you are owed?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I was not saying that at all. I am saying that we will do our best to recover what we are owed, but one of these miscreants has apparently departed for different climates, and is a little bit difficult to get hold of, and I am not exactly sure whether the assets that we have will be sufficient when realised to cover off the cost. We will do our best.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have some questions on Volume 6, page 2262.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Gillman?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, unsurprisingly. The Gillman site transaction is at about point 4 on that page. My question is: has the audit provided the formal management letter to the URA that was being finalised at the time of writing that report; if so, what does it say?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will have to get some instructions on that matter.

Ms CHAPMAN: Instructions from?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: From URA or Renewal—somebody who knows the answer to that question. Off the top of my head, I do not know the answer to that question, but I will find out.

Ms CHAPMAN: There are no advisers here in relation to the URA?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, unless they are outside.

Ms CHAPMAN: I know it is very unusual for the annual reports for the URA or Renewal SA to be done on time. It is a bit of a novelty, I accept that but, given that it was this year and the Auditor-General has done a report on it, it is usually appropriate, Attorney, that you have your persons here to be able to answer questions on Renewal SA. Do you want to schedule another time for that?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That is a very tempting offer, but I will just get back to you with an answer. I will undertake that.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will run through a couple of others.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Please do.

Ms CHAPMAN: What documents were supplied to the Auditor-General to allow him to reach his findings published in this report and, in particular, were cabinet submissions included? Next, the report confirms that cabinet considered the deal on 2 December. Did the cabinet consider the matter at a prior meeting and, if so, what was cabinet's decision at the prior meeting? I am sure you are the only person who can answer that question.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I may be the only person who can answer it, but I am also not allowed to.

Ms CHAPMAN: The report here suggests that there was consideration of this matter on 2 December: cabinet approved ACP's offer. That is a fact; that is there. I am simply asking whether cabinet approved the ACP offer prior to that date. That is obviously what you told the Auditor-General.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: There is a bit of a thing about not talking about what goes on in cabinet, and I honestly do not have sufficient recall of each individual meeting to be able to answer with any confidence, other than to say that, if the Auditor-General said the final decision was on 2 December, that accords with my memory, or the decision. I think that is about as far as I can take it.

Ms CHAPMAN: Why did the final deal with ACP only involve the sale of up to 407 hectares, which is referred to in the report, and not the 450 that was indicated in the initial approach to the Premier?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Just so that I can be clear on that question, if I am understanding correctly, the member for Bragg is asking me why it was that, at the point of the tentative option crystallising, it crystallised in respect of 407 and not 450. I will find out the answer to that question.

Ms CHAPMAN: Why was a probity auditor only appointed to oversee the deal in October, when the unsolicited bid was received in June and discussions were held between the government and ACP before October?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As I recall, these are all questions that have been asked in the parliament in question time, but I will review those questions and those answers and, if there is anything further I can add, I will.

Ms CHAPMAN: It will not take long, Attorney, because you did not give any answers: you took a hell of a lot on notice, so we are still waiting. In the course of the Auditor-General's assessment of this—and you may not know this, so I accept you may want to get an answer on this from your officers—was there any information provided to the Auditor-General, or did he ask for information as to why the probity adviser was only appointed, as I say, after October?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I would have to seek advice about that matter.

Ms CHAPMAN: If there was any communication in respect of that issue—that is, the appointment of the probity adviser, which I would have thought the Auditor-General would be very interested in—will you make any correspondence in respect of that available to the committee?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Again, I am in this difficult position of not knowing whether such a thing exists or what it is, if it does exist. It is not really possible for me to give a commitment of that type, but I will attempt to answer the question.

Ms CHAPMAN: Let me ask you this question: if you make an observation or are provided advice not to release any documents that are within this category of the matters I have raised today, will you at least report back to the committee to confirm that you will not and some explanation as to why not? I accept that there may be circumstances where you will have advice not to produce material, and it may be for different reasons, but will you at least report back to the committee that position?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That does seem a reasonable request, on the face of it, the member for Bragg has just made. I do not know if there is such material, if it does exist and if for some reason it is not appropriate for it to be released. I am mindful of the fact that there are still questions of intellectual property and questions of commercial sensitivity. In addition to that, there are two parties having a bit of a contest down at Victoria Square presently, which is an ongoing matter. There may be a number of reasons why that is a bit complicated, but I will certainly do my best to accommodate that request.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I refer to Volume 4, page 1350. I am particularly looking at paragraph A8—supplies and services, planning fees identified for the 2013-14 year of \$1.175 million. Do you have a breakdown of what the costs of that are? I am particularly interested in whether that includes costs that were devoted towards the Expert Panel on Planning Reform?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I have identified the item, but is the question whether that number includes expenditure in relation to the expert panel exercise?

Mr GRIFFITHS: And do you have a breakdown available that you are able to provide to me?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I do not have that with me now, but I will seek to obtain it for the member. I will also seek an answer to the other question—if you get the first, you will get the second because it will say.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Jumping just a few pages to page 1355, I note the payments made to the South Australian government and to non-government organisations. I presume that most of the non-government would probably be related to local government when it comes to the Planning and Development Fund. There has been a bit of a switch there. There was a significant increase to SA government payments of \$2.3 million—from \$8.7 million to \$10.9 million. Can you just tell me why that transfer has occurred and why more is now going to government areas instead of non-government areas?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Again, it is quite a detailed question and it deserves an appropriate answer. Inasmuch as we are talking about the P&D fund, I can say that—the comparison the member is making I gather is between the \$8.699 million and the \$10.912 million. This is subject to correction, obviously, but I read that as just saying that the net payments out of that fund in that year increased marginally over the previously year.

I can also say that there have been changes in the way that fund is used. I will be perfectly upfront about this. The object of the exercise from my point of view is: the fund could be expended on many relatively small items which make relatively little difference scattered around like confetti all over the state, or there could be some selection of quite significant particular projects which will have good value particularly if there is a partnership with the commonwealth government or a partnership with a local government agency.

There has been a bit of a shift to having more of those partnership arrangements. An example of something that might be in that space is this: there was a commonwealth, state and local government contribution to one of the roads that runs through UniSA between North Terrace and Hindley Street; a bit of money was spent to do that up. There have been various other agreements in respect of public realm, all of which has been attempting to give some added value to the development of the city and to complement the other investment in the city.

At the last election, there was an undertaking given by the government that there would be an opportunity for partnership, for example with the Adelaide City Council, to put \$5 million a year into parkland projects. It has been my intention to try to get maximum leverage out of that by putting up reasonably sized parcels of state money out of that fund, find partners either in local government or the federal government (or ideally both), and then get a really decent project out of it. That does not mean there are not still the small ones, but rather than spread the whole thing very thin, there has been a tendency in recent times, where there were opportunities to do it, to find bigger projects.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I do respect the answer given by the minister and I understand the internal dilemma is: how widely do you spread the pie for every area of expenditure; I can appreciate that. It is important, though, to still give some hope to smaller communities sometimes that might not have the capacity to put in the larger-scale funds, or indeed the population density that you are talking about too. There needs to be a balance that is struck between it. Can you provide the following on notice? I am interested to receive a breakdown—the total expenditure being some \$21.7 million—of what has been devoted to capital and what is non-capital for 2013-14?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes; again, I will do my best to get that. I think it is pretty clear that the P&D fund is not a fund which is used for current expenditures, but obviously, if there is a project to do up a particular space, some of that money ultimately would have found itself into contractors' wages or something, as opposed to buying bricks, cement or something. In terms of it being recurrent

and perpetually in there, that is not the idea of this thing. That is the other point that was made. I have not completely shut down the smaller things; quite the contrary. There is still a large chunk there, it is just that, even in regional South Australia, I have actually been looking for things which have more impact.

It might be that a regional community has something that is very important for them, and if there is a partnership opportunity, that is at least as valid as anything coming out of the CBD as far as I am concerned. I just think that when you are using these sorts of funds you need to leverage as much impact for communities as you possibly can out of them.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): Thank you, Attorney. Your time has expired, I am afraid, member for Goyder. We now have the Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts and Minister for Health Industries. Any questions? The member for Morphet.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you, Mr Acting Chairman. My question refers to Auditor-General's Report, Part C, page 72, table 8.8, at the bottom of the page. Minister, given that the 2014-15 Budget Papers gives federal cuts for the 2017-18 financial year as \$275.3 million and the Auditor-General's Report gives the total state and federal cuts in 2017-18 as \$766.2 million, doesn't the report show that almost two-thirds of the cuts being imposed are state cuts?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: There are two points I would make, one being that, with the federal cuts to our health budget, the reason they appear smaller is that half of the cuts are being offset by the removal of remissions to the emergency services levy. The government took a decision that it would be too difficult for health to absorb the full brunt of the commonwealth government's cuts, so half of those cuts were offset by the removal of remissions to the emergency services levy. That is why the federal cuts appear smaller than they actually are; that is, the state government, as part of the budget process, took a decision that half of those cuts would be offset.

The second point I would make is that, while, of course, we need to make our system more efficient, every single dollar in efficiencies we find in our state health system are reinvested back into our health system. The state government's contribution to our health budget will always continue to grow. We will never cut dollars out of health that will be returned to budget. Every single saving we find in health is reinvested to make the capacity in our health system continue to grow to meet growing demand.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I refer to the same reference. Minister, you are saying that the millions of dollars that taxpayers are now paying into the emergency services levy to top that up, that has freed up money that has offset the federal cuts. I am afraid that I must be missing something here. How can you claim that the figure that is shown is only half of the federal cuts? Surely, there is a reduction in federal spending that is a particular figure. It cannot be offset by half by topping up from state money. Am I missing something here?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: You are missing something, and it is called the state budget. The Treasurer, at state budget time, made quite clear that the government was making the decision to remove the remissions to the emergency services levy and that, from those savings, that would be put into health to offset the cuts from the federal government. That is why the federal government's cuts appear smaller than they actually are because they are being offset by basically an increase to what people are paying in their emergency services levy.

That is the only way we could deal with the scope and the size of the cuts by the federal government. They are so significant that they could not be absorbed by the Department for Health, certainly not without seriously compromising services we offer to South Australians. The only way to deal with that was by the government making the decision to remove the remissions of the emergency services levy. It was well canvassed at state budget time by the Treasurer. It is no secret; there is nothing new here.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On that same reference, minister: just to be very clear—I am a humble veterinarian, not an accountant and not an economist—in that case, the total federal cuts were \$550.1 million by 2017-18, not the \$275 million? So, it is \$550.6 million, if you add up or double that?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The total quantum of the cuts from the federal government is \$655 million over the period 2014-15 to 2017-18. That is as a result of a number of things, including: the cessation of funding guarantees on the National Health Reform Agreement; the renegeing on increasing contributions to 50 per cent; the efficient growth public hospital service expenditure and new annexation arrangements for 2017-18 to a composite of consumer price index and population growth.

Secondly, there was \$211 million comprising of funding reductions related to the termination of several significant health-related COAG agreements; \$120 million relating to the discontinuation of the national partnership agreement on improving public hospital services; \$42 million related to the discontinuation of the national partnership agreement on financial assistance for longer stay older patients; and \$50 million worth of other reductions to our health services, including the early termination of the national partnership agreement on preventative health, which includes funding for the highly successful Obesity Prevention and Lifestyle Program in South Australia.

My advice is that of all of those—these are national partnership agreements—it was not that they had expired and were not renewed; these are actually national partnership agreements that the commonwealth unilaterally terminated before they were due to expire. So, \$655 million is the total cost of the cut from the federal government for the period 2014-15 to 2017-18. As I said previously, half of that has been offset by the removal of the remissions of the emergency services levy. That has enabled, through the budget process, Treasury to offset the quantum of that cut from the federal government.

Dr McFETRIDGE: We will just move on to page 20 of Part C. In the second dot point on top of page 20, the Auditor says:

- In the past Health and Ageing has not met its full quota of savings targets and the 2014-15 Budget introduces significant additional savings for this portfolio. The achievement of the current level of Health and Ageing savings presents a very difficult challenge and poses a significant risk to achieving the Budget strategy

The question is, minister: what is the process and time frame for the determination of the savings strategy?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Everything that the Auditor-General says is completely true. It is going to be a significant challenge for the department. It is a problem compounded by the decision of the federal government to unilaterally renege on the National Health Reform Agreement—as I said, that has had a significant impact—and as well as that, unilaterally renege on a number of national partnership agreements. So, of course, even with the decision as part of the state budget to offset half of those cuts with the removal of the remissions of the emergency services levy, that presents a significant savings task.

I think we have had some success in recent years in achieving the savings that have been set out for us. We have delivered a balanced budget result for the last two financial years, we have delivered \$126 million in savings in 2012-13 and another \$108 million in 2013-14. Of course, particularly because of the decisions of the commonwealth, there is now a significant ramping up of that savings task. I absolutely agree with the Auditor-General that that is a significant risk and a significant challenge for the department.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Minister, could you give us a time frame for achieving that savings strategy?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Well, it is as set out in the budget. The savings that we have to achieve are there in the budget, and that is the time frame.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I will move on to Part C, page 21. In the first dot point, the Auditor-General says:

- the Department for Health and Ageing has reported that actual FTEs were 75 FTEs above its cap primarily due to a slightly higher than cap result in the health units

The question, minister, is: what steps are being taken to have health units operate within the caps?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is 75 FTEs out of 30,000 FTEs in the entire agency. I think 75 above is a pretty good result and, for all intents and purposes, within budget.

Dr McFETRIDGE: We are moving to the Auditor-General's Report Part A, page 34, which talks about the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. The audit says the new Royal Adelaide is the single largest infrastructure project to be undertaken by the South Australian government. Minister, can you assure the committee that the new Royal Adelaide is on time and on budget for delivery?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I cannot add anything to what SA Health Partnership have publicly said; that is, they are working towards the April 2016 handover date. They have not said anything to me privately that they have not said publicly. I can only go on their public assurances that April 2016 will be the handover date.

Having said that, if they do approach the government at some stage saying they are not going to be able to meet that date, then that is something we will give consideration to but, to date, that has not been the case. Several weeks ago, Mr Peter Salvesson, who is overseeing the project from Hansen Yuncken, said publicly and to the TV cameras that April 2016 will be the delivery date. I can only go on what he tells me but, having said that, if they were to come to us seeking a revised delivery date, then that is something we would give consideration to.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I am referring to Part A, page 31 of the Auditor-General's Report. Dot point 3 states:

- developing a refresh business case for the NRAH (including the [Central Adelaide Local Health Network] reform program) and budget for the costs of transition planning and implementation for the NRAH

Minister, what is the budget for and time expectation to implement the transition, and are there any issues that the government has been made aware of?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We are working on the transition. Obviously, it is a significant project and there is considerable risk there to government. There is a contractual obligation from SAHP to be able to deliver the project in April 2016; likewise, there is an obligation on the state to be ready to move into the hospital in April 2016 too. The member for Morphett might be familiar with the Fiona Stanley Hospital in Western Australia where the Liberal government has had to pay out, from memory, hundreds of millions of dollars in penalties to Spotless because they were unready to move into the new Fiona Stanley Hospital when it had been completed.

We have been doing a considerable amount of work in making sure that, as a state, our health department and the Royal Adelaide Hospital are going to be ready to move in—that is what the Auditor-General is referring to. We have appointed a project director to oversee the transition from the old Royal Adelaide Hospital to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and are making sure that all those things are being appropriately resourced in order to make sure that we are ready to move in in April 2016.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I assume that is Mr Andrew Nielsen you are speaking about there, minister?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Yes.

Dr McFETRIDGE: He has taken over from Dr Panter. Is that right?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Not quite, no. Dr Panter is the chief executive of Central Adelaide Local Health Network. Andrew Nielsen has taken over with particular responsibility for project managing the transition from one to the other. Andrew Nielsen's reporting role is directly to the chief executive of the Department of Health, Mr David Swan, but in terms of the detailed planning for the transition from the old to the new Mr Nielsen has responsibility.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On that same reference, I understood that Mr Nielsen was liaising with three people—obviously, the chief executive, Mr Swan; Dr Panter; and I believe Judi Carr has come across from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure. Is that correct?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: When I came into the health portfolio, I thought we needed some particular expertise with regard to contract management and that expertise within government lies within DPTI in terms of construction projects of this sort. It is not something health does. We do not

build things. That expertise within government was in DPTI. I wanted to beef up what we had available to us, and so Judi Carr was made available for that particular purpose. In terms of managing the building contract, that is Judi Carr's particular job.

Andrew Nielsen's job is to manage the transition from the old to the new, so he is looking at things like procurement, ICT, how we manage the different clinical models; all those sorts of things come under Mr Nielsen's responsibility. Dr Panter continues to be the chief executive of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network and, of course, in that role is intimately involved in all the planning for the move to the new hospital.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On that same reference, more particularly the Auditor highlights the budget for the costs of the transition planning and implementation. Can you give the committee an idea of the costs of the transition planning stage and the costs of the implementation of that transition and also how long you expect the transition to take? I understand it is a 90-day period, but that would be pretty optimistic, I would have thought.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will get a report back to the member for Morphett on that particular point, but it is no secret that we are making sure that Mr Nielsen and his transition team are being appropriately resourced. This is the largest ever infrastructure, and the most complex ever infrastructure the state has ever undertaken, and it is certainly not something I am going to do on the cheap. It is very important we get it right because, of course, if the consortium were ready to hand over and the state was not ready to move into the hospital, there would be significant financial penalties to the state. It is a key area of risk, and it is something that merits significant investment. As to the details of the question, I will get back to the member for Morphett.

In terms of the transition period as well, I will get back to the member for Morphett. I have been updated on how long we expect it to take, but all these things we are looking at very closely at the moment. Obviously, we do not want it to take too long because there is a cost associated with having to run both hospitals at the same time and we would like to keep that to a minimum, but of course patient safety will be the absolute priority and everything else will be subject to that.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Is there a budget that has been laid out for the transition at the moment, or do you not have that with you?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I do not have it with me.

Dr McFETRIDGE: One of my favourite health subjects has come up. I think this is the fifth or sixth audit in my experience where the Auditor-General has expressed concerns over this particular issue, and it is on page 764 of Part B, Volume 2—special purpose funds. I remember asking questions about this and, referring back to 2008-09, there were non-operating funds and special purpose funds. In his audit, the Auditor points out that there is about \$240 million in the SPF projects, with about 300 projects approved and 100 projects not approved yet. As I have said before, this is a recurring issue. The Auditor points out, on the top of page 765 at the bottom of the first paragraph:

...notably the adequacy of documentation underpinning the operations of SPFs...and implications of and reasons for overdrawn SPFs.

The audit needs to know about that. It also states, 'A fully endorsed policy and procedure framework is not yet implemented.' This has been an ongoing problem with at one stage (from memory, the 2009-10 audit report) some of these non-operating funds actually being used to prop up the cash flow at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. I might be wrong there. Minister, can you assure us that the questions the Auditor is raising about these SPFs—non-operating funds, specific-purpose funds—are being addressed and that none of these funds are being used to top up cash flows in hospitals?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Just for the benefit of the committee, special-purpose funds are monies held by local hospital networks for particular purposes and money has gone in. Some of the smaller ones might have come in through charity activity of various auxiliaries, and so on, associated with the hospitals. Probably the largest and most significant are those funds held as a result of the rights of private practice by doctors working in the system, and research as well—grants, and so on, that come into the LHNs from NHMRC, and other organisations that provide research grants. They go in and are held in these SPFs.

The Auditor-General has raised concerns about this in the past. The member for Morphett looked forward to his bipartisan support when certain clinicians expressed outrage that we would be doing anything to exercise any control of the use and address any of the issues that have been raised by the Auditor-General. I am happy to say, though, that we set up a process where we had the Australian Medical Association as part of that, and I think SASMOA might have been—there was clinical representation on that—and there were officers from the department. This commenced in March 2013 and it will shortly come to a conclusion. The steering group, at its meeting held on 28 August, endorsed a plan to bring to a conclusion the SPF review process, the associated communication strategy, and the release of the revised draft SPF policy and procedure for broader consultation across SA Health. Key dates endorsed by the SPF group to conclude the SPF review include:

- SPF project managers will have until 31 October to submit any remaining outstanding SPF assessment forms together with supporting documentation for a review against the assessment criteria;
- where an SPF has not been approved, the SPF project manager has the opportunity to resubmit their application for reassessment;
- the SPF project manager has one month from 31 October (or from the date the decision is issued) to resubmit additional information; and
- once the SPF has not been approved, the local health network will be responsible for determining whether the activity undertaken by the SPF is supported ongoing, therefore transferred to operating, or the SPF or should be closed.

This process will be concluded by 19 December 2014. To ensure SPF project managers are informed of the plan to conclude the SPF review, the following communication strategies have been implemented:

- a CE check outlining the plan to conclude the SPF review together with the release of the draft SPF policy and procedure for broader consultation and feedback;
- communication from the CE to LHN CEOs to support the conclusion of the SPF review process and establish transparent governance frameworks under which SPFs will be managed in the future;
- internal communication from the CEOs within the LHNs; and
- individual communication from LHN finance and business management staff to the SPF project managers still to submit the SPFs for review.

The intention is for the SPF steering committee to reconvene in October to assess progress and consider additional feedback. New arrangements will provide a greater certainty and transparency to managers assessing SPFs and support SA Health's continued commitment to research. So, we are very close to having this matter cleared up, and I am confident that the Auditor-General will give it all a clean tick of health.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I look forward to the 2014-15 audit report to see if it is a recurring episode. I am sure the Lavender Ladies will be comforted by what the minister has just said—it is all in hand. I move on to page 765, the EPAS (Enterprise Patient Administration Systems). With the appointment of an ICT project director, what is the status of the EPAS project and, in particular, is the government still planning to use EPAS at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital? As the Auditor says at the bottom of page 765:

The new Royal Adelaide Hospital is also reliant on EPAS being implemented and embedded with reformed clinical workflows and practices.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Yes, we are. The status of the project, as I announced a couple of months ago, I think, is that EPAS has been rolled out to Noarlunga Hospital, the Repatriation General Hospital, the SA Ambulance Service and to two of the GP Plus centres, from memory. There have been problems with the PAS side of EPAS, so EPAS was replacing the legacy patient administration systems. As I have canvassed publicly before, we have had significant issues

with the PAS side of the product and, because of those issues, we have put a pause to the rollout while that PAS side of the product can be stabilised.

I have instructed the department to concentrate entirely on the delivery of EPAS to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital because, of course, it is going to be critical. One of the most important things is that we are able to roll EPAS out to the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital in plenty of time before the transition to the new hospital. We do not want to be dealing with the complexities of a new IT rollout and the complexities of moving to the new hospital all at the same time, so we will be very careful to make sure that EPAS is ready. Certainly at present, the government's intention is for EPAS to be rolled out to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Moving right along to another wonderful ITC project, Oracle, on that same page, 765, and also in Part A on page 20. Minister, is there a time limit on health's exemption from penalties for late payments pending the rollout of Oracle?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I do not think there is a time limit, but there is an expectation that health will push Oracle out as quickly as we possibly can. What we have seen is that where Oracle phase 2 has been rolled out there has been considerable improvement in account payment performance, and I am very confident. Treasurer's Instruction 11 now requires the payment of all invoices by the due date as measured by invoice volume. For the 2013-14 financial year, SA Health paid 92.82 per cent of invoices within 60 days and 76.67 per cent of invoices by the due date. Even though SA Health in partnership with Shared Services rolled out an integrated e-procurement solution, Basware—that is part of the Oracle project—to a number of health units, all other entities in SA Health still rely on manual processing to manage accounts payable processing.

The phase 3 rollout of the Oracle corporate system, Accounts Payable, is planned to include the whole of government e-procurement solution, Basware, to electronically manage the workflow of invoices throughout all entities across SA Health. This will enable SA Health entities to attain compliance with the Treasurer's Instruction 11 requirement. The programmed rollout of OCS was recently completed at the Flinders Medical Centre and the Lyell McEwin Hospital with considerable improvement in AP performance already identified; that is, processing at 80 per cent and 90 per cent respectively.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Minister, I may be in the depth of the report here, but you have one system that is working better than it ever has. Why is the Women's and Children's Hospital network the worst performer, paying 66 per cent of its bills within 30 days, yet you have the Department for Health and Ageing paying 94 per cent of its accounts within 30 days? I would have thought that you would have consistency across the system if the system is working well.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: If the member for Morphett was listening to my answer, he would have heard that we have not rolled it out everywhere yet. The Women's and Children's Hospital has not had it rolled out yet, but we have seen significant improvements in accounts payable in sites where we have had it rolled out.

Dr McFETRIDGE: It is difficult to listen to the detail sometimes when you are looking at the next question, minister; I will admit that. I thank you for your answer. In the very last minute that we have, looking at audit paper Part B, Volume 2, page 766, we are talking about documented evidence of written market quotes on the procurement and contract management. The question is: given that there was no documented evidence of written market quotes on the Procurement and Contract Management System, in relation to the four projects that were the subject of written market quotes, can the minister advise whether the issue was a lack of documentation of tasks completed or that tasks were not completed?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I think the answer is there in the A-G's Report, which states:

The Department responded positively to the audit findings and recommendations. Key initiatives advised included reviewing the procurement compliance program, ICT procurement practices and supporting policy and procedures for compliance with TIs and State Procurement Board policy guidelines. The Department also communicated it will ensure gaps in procurement documentation are identified and addressed in relation to PCMS, supplier evaluation and the selection process. Further the Department indicated improvements for probity directives and relevant procurement training and communications for responsible staff. The key initiatives are due for implementation before the end of December [this year].

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

At 17:47 the house adjourned until Wednesday 29 October 2014 at 11:00.

*Estimates Replies***O-BAHN**

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (23 July 2014).
(Estimates Committee B)

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:

At this early stage of the project there is no current proposal to acquire land.

GAWLER RAIL LINE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (23 July 2014).
(Estimates Committee B)

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:

The timing of the construction of a substation to support electric train services on the Gawler line will be determined as part of the overall scoping of the project.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (23 July 2014).
(Estimates Committee B)

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:

The State Administration Centre and the Education Building are both 'B' grade office buildings as per the Property Council of Australia's grading system for office buildings.

The National Australian Built Environment Rating System (NABERS) is a national rating system that measures building performance on a scale of zero to six stars.

The State Administration Centre has a 4.5 Star NABERS Whole Building Rating, and the Education Building has a 5.0 Star Whole Building Rating.

DARLINGTON INTERCHANGE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (23 July 2014).
(Estimates Committee B)

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:

A total of \$620 million has been allocated to the Darlington upgrade project in a partnership between the state and commonwealth governments. An allowance of \$50 million has been made for upgrade works associated with the Darlington project sections of road not at Darlington.

GAWLER RAIL LINE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (23 July 2014).
(Estimates Committee B)

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:

The forward estimates provided \$60 million in 2017-18 with a total budget of \$152.5 million for the Gawler line electrification to Salisbury.

NETLEY COMMERCIAL PARK

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (23 July 2014).
(Estimates Committee B)

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 in relation to the lease back of Netley Commercial Park:

Term of Lease:	10 years and 1 day
Commencement:	10 June 2014
Expiry:	10 June 2024
Rights of renewal:	2 terms of 7 years
Rent reviews:	fixed annual reviews 3%
Annual rent:	\$3.8 million
Premises:	whole of the land

Other tenant outgoings:

- all electricity;
- all waste removal;
- all cleaning of premises;
- all internal maintenance;
- pest control; and
- security, including perimeter.

ADELAIDE CASINO

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (23 July 2014).
(Estimates Committee B)

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:

The Skycity Adelaide lease is for a term from 30 June 1998, expiring 4 March 2025, with 3 x 20-year rights of renewal thereafter.

The forecast rental return for 2014-15 is \$2,284,995 + outgoings (electricity, land tax and insurance) \$429,448.

Forward estimates for rent, per current area leased, are subject to annual CPI increases. Outgoings expenses historically trend upward at considerably higher rates than CPI.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE HOUSING

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (23 July 2014).
(Estimates Committee B)

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:

The target was a dollar target and not a specific number of property sales as this number would vary depending on prices obtained at sale.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (23 July 2014).
(Estimates Committee B)

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):

Yes.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (23 July 2014). (Estimates Committee B)

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:

The estimated budget for 2014-15 state government funded road maintenance, rehabilitation and resurfacing is \$83.1 million. The Australian government will also provide \$27.9 million for the National Land Transport Network in South Australia and \$2.1 million from Roads to Recovery.

In comparison the 2013-14 budget was \$82.6 million from the state government and \$36.3 million from the Australian government plus \$1.9 million from Roads to Recovery.

The breakdown between urban and rural roads is as follows:

2013-14	State	Commonwealth	Road to Recovery	Total
Urban	\$24.8 m	\$13.8 m		\$38.6m
Rural	\$57.8 m	\$22.5 m	\$1.9m	\$82.2m
TOTAL	\$82.6m	\$36.3m	\$1.9m	\$120.8m
2014-15	State	Commonwealth	Road to Recovery	Total
Urban	\$24.9 m	\$17.4 m		\$42.3m
Rural	\$58.2 m	\$10.5 m	\$2.1m	\$70.8m
TOTAL	\$83.1m	\$27.9m	\$2.1m	\$113.1m

The federal Coalition government's recent budget made significant cuts to road maintenance funding for both state and local governments. Hence, the South Australian government's funding task for road maintenance has become increasingly difficult. Allocations for road maintenance from the federal government to South Australia has reduced from a total of \$189.3 million over the five year period from 2008-09 to 2013-14, to a total of \$139.6 million over the coming five years, a reduction of \$49.7 million.

This is in addition to the decision to cut the supplementary road maintenance funding for local governments.