

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 12 November 2014

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

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (11:03): On behalf of the member for Elder, I move:

That the 507th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2013-14, be noted.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Odenwalder:

That the 86th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2013-14, be noted.

(Continued from 29 October 2014.)

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:04): I rise to make a brief contribution on the Annual Report 2013-14 of the Economic and Finance Committee. I have not looked at the dates exactly, but I was a member of that committee for about a month, so I do not deserve a great deal of responsibility with regard to the formulation of this report. I look forward to serving the committee and I am sure that it will be a very productive and useful committee on behalf of the parliament.

I would like to touch briefly on section 3.5 of the annual report, entitled Eighty-Fifth Report: Emergency Services Levy 2014-2015. I will read a brief section as follows:

In accordance with its statutory function in reporting on the proposed Emergency Services Levy each financial year, the Committee noted the total expenditure on emergency services for 2014-15 is projected to be \$255.1 million, and that total expenditure for 2013-14 is expected to be broadly in line with the original budget estimate.

The Committee also noted that cash balances in the Community Emergency Services Fund were expected to reach \$0.5 million by 30 June 2014. The Committee was not provided with information on the level of remissions to be granted by the Government this year, and was therefore unable to comment on the effective levy rates for the 2014-15 period.

The reason that that is very important—particularly that last sentence, 'The Committee was not provided with information on the level of remissions to be granted by the Government this year, and was therefore unable to comment on the effective levy rates for the 2014-15 period'—is that, in removing the remissions, which the government previously provided (and historically previous governments have provided) to the people who pay the emergency services levy, the government has tried to say, and the Treasurer specifically has tried to say in this place, that everybody was fully informed, that everybody knew about it, that everybody knew it was going to happen and it should not be such a surprise. In fact, in question time, he made some very pointed and unfair comments about the member for Unley.

This report makes it clear that nobody was in a position to know what the level of remission would be, whether the remissions would be retained in full, partially retained or fully removed. It is clear that no information was provided even to the Economic and Finance Committee in advance of the government making public announcements. It might well be that the Treasurer might have known, it might well be that some members or all of cabinet might have known, it might be that the Labor caucus knew, but certainly it was not public information; there is no doubt about that.

I think that the public outrage and the opposition's outrage with regard to the removal of the remissions is justified and warranted. Mr Speaker, it would be no surprise to you or any other member of this place that the public is outraged not only—

The SPEAKER: Member for Stuart, your remarks appear to be addressed to Orders of the Day No. 3, the Economic and Finance Committee's 85th report on the emergency services levy. We are on Order of the Day No. 1, the annual report.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Mr Speaker, I know you have a lot on your mind but I did quote a section right out of this annual report and that is what I am talking about.

The SPEAKER: Do go ahead.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Section 3.5. The public understandably is outraged that not only have they had to pay the extra money but also outraged that not one dollar of the extra money that they have to pay is going to additional funding for emergency services. The emergency services sector will receive the same amount of money, regardless of the extra billing to the public, because the extra was previously topped up out of Treasury and now it is being topped up out of the public purse. Not one dollar of the additional charges the public is paying leads to any additional money for the emergency services sector.

Of course the emergency services sector itself is very angry about that because they know that. They know that people, including themselves, are being charged more, but they are not getting any more funding towards their sector. They know that not everybody in the community sector fully understands all the financial transactions in the background, so they know that the public is quite within its rights perhaps to assume that an extra emergency services levy charge must mean more money going to the emergency services sector, which of course is definitely not the case.

This is a very important section of this report. The government did not provide the information to the Economic and Finance Committee, as the Treasurer said in question time was the case. It is clearly not the case that that information was provided, and that is proven in section 3.5 of the report.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:11): I rise to contribute to the debate on noting of the annual report of the Economic and Finance Committee, and I want to canvass a similar matter to that just canvassed by the member for Stuart. I refer members to section 3.5 of the annual report, July 2013-June 2014 of the Economic and Finance Committee of this parliament. It refers to the 85th report, emergency services levy 2014-15. It goes on to say that, 'In accordance with its statutory function in reporting of the proposed emergency services levy each financial year, the committee noted the total expenditure...', etc., and reported to the parliament.

The statutory obligation of the committee, under the Emergency Services Funding Act, is to receive information from the Treasurer, and within 21 days of receipt of that information report to the house. In the meantime, the committee holds a hearing, takes evidence and reports on those matters to the house. My understanding is that the Treasurer provided the information to the committee on 6 June this year. The committee held a hearing on 12 June and reported to the house on Thursday 19 June. The report would have been tabled in the house in the morning session, I believe. The interesting other piece of information about this is that 19 June was also the day the budget was brought down, later in the day.

The committee, as the member for Stuart pointed out, has noted that the relevant information about the remissions was withheld from the committee. As the member for Stuart has pointed out, the Treasurer has been arguing that the committee could have, and should have, asked questions about that, but we all know that the response to every question asked about those sort of matters is, 'I won't be revealing what's going to be in the budget, you'll have to wait till budget day'.

The reality is that the Treasurer withheld the information that was vital for the committee to undertake its statutory work, knowing full well that the committee would again be, under its statutory obligation, forced to report on the emergency services levy 2014-15 prior to the budget being handed down. The reality is that this committee in my opinion has been prevented by the executive government from doing what is its statutory obligation in reporting to the house fully and fairly on the implications of determinations which are made by the Governor but on the advice of the Treasurer.

When the principal act, the Emergency Services Funding Act, was passed, the house determined that one of the functions of the Economic and Finance Committee would be to have a look at the determinations of the Treasurer every year and report those matters back to the house. That has happened very well in ensuing years, until this year.

There was, in my opinion, a deliberate—a deliberate—device employed by the Treasurer in withholding that information, knowing full well that the house would not be informed of the true measures that were being undertaken with regard to the emergency services levy and the public would be in the dark at least until the budget was brought down. Indeed, when the budget was brought down I suspect that the Treasurer believed that there would be so many other matters in the budget that there was a fair chance that this would be lost in the white noise surrounding other matters in the budget.

I commend the committee for bringing this particular matter to the attention of the house, because I think it is very important. I think it is very important that every member of this house, particularly those who are not part of the executive government—that is, those who are not cabinet ministers within the executive government—understands that the relevant information from the work that should be done on their behalf, so that they can keep their constituents fully informed on these relevant matters, has been withheld from the committee. As a consequence, the committee, through no fault of its own, on the one hand has statutory obligations to report to the house within 21 days and on the other hand had no ability to force this information from the Treasurer or indeed seek further explanation from the officers of the relevant agency.

Since the accounts have gone out for the emergency services, we have been told again by the government that the removal of the remissions would have an impact of some \$80 million or \$90 million a year, and we have been told that that would be something getting towards 100 per cent increase in the revenue raised. I look at examples from my own constituency—and I know the same has occurred in many of my colleagues' constituencies—and we have all read in the media about a whole host of organisations, particularly schools and non-government organisations providing important services to our communities, whose emergency services levies have gone up by much more than that advertised amount. We have seen more recently that, in the cases of some local councils, the amount of the emergency services levy they have been charged has gone up by a lot more than 100 per cent.

I think it is absolutely imperative that the house does something about this and insists that the Economic and Finance Committee is furnished with the relevant information. I think it is absolutely imperative that that committee has the opportunity to seek answers from Revenue SA about the modelling that they have done about the implications of the various rates that have been set, because I find it very hard to believe that the numbers that have been put forward in the other report (I think it is also on the *Notice Paper*) add up, particularly when I look at some of the accounts that have been sent out to my constituents.

I commend the Economic and Finance Committee for bringing this particular matter to the attention of the house in this way through its annual report, and I plead with my colleagues in this place to take this matter very seriously. They will have an opportunity, very shortly I hope, when another matter will be discussed where the house may well be able to redress the problem that has been highlighted by the committee in its annual report.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:19): I want to thank everyone for their contributions, particularly the member for MacKillop, and also the now-departed member for Davenport. These debates have been well canvassed and I will not go over them again.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.W. Key.

That the 99th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2013-14, be noted.

(Continued from 29 October 2014.)

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:20): It gives me great pleasure to rise to make a few brief comments on the Natural Resources Committee Annual Report from last year. It gave me great pleasure for the entire term of the last parliament and much of this year to serve on that committee. It is work that I thoroughly enjoyed doing on behalf of the parliament and behalf of my constituents. I think that this committee, more than any other that I have had anything to do with

directly or indirectly or heard about, is one that if people from outside the parliament actually had a look at how it works, what it achieves and what it tries to do for South Australia, they would be very proud of what this parliament does.

It operates in a very positive bipartisan fashion. That is not to say that members of the committee do not come with different views to the table, but it is a very positive committee that does excellent work, and I know that the member for Ashford deserves a great deal of credit for that good work as the chair of that committee and keeps it working in a very positive way.

As well as the work being enjoyable and productive, it is very important work that the committee does overseeing our state's natural resources. Apart from people, there is really nothing more important that we have in our state than our natural resources. The work is sometimes frustrating because, of course, there are a lot of things we cannot fix, and a lot of things we cannot actually do in the committee, but we can bring a lot of issues to light.

The two staff members, Patrick Dupont and David Trebilcock, contribute enormously to that work as well. The committee, I think, put out 14 separate reports in the previous 12 month period that is canvassed in the annual report, and I think that that probably leaves any other committee for dead with regard to the amount of work that was put in and put out by the committee.

I will just touch on a few things very briefly. One of the foundation pieces of work that this committee does is look at NRM levies, and it is a difficult issue. I have said in this place many times that the work that good people do in the regions—who work within the Department of Water and Natural Resources for the NRM boards and in that sector of the broader DEWNR work—is very good, and is actually endless. You could spend an endless amount of time and an endless amount of money trying to address the issues out there in the environment that need to be addressed. So how to set the levies is nearly an impossible task because you could find a very good justification for extra money for extra work just about everywhere that you look but, of course, it would be completely unfair to burden the taxpayer, the property owners and the water users with paying those levies with endless amounts of money.

So I took a view when I was on that committee until earlier this year that all levies should be locked in at or below CPI, because there is an important principle that the committee could, if it wanted to, endorse levy increases greater than CPI if there was appropriate justification. I think you could always come up with appropriate justification for extra money for extra good work, so I just decided in terms of the one vote that I had on the committee that I would always vote for levy increases below CPI and against levy increases above CPI because I thought that that was an appropriate way to try and find that balance.

Water, of course, is a very, very important issue. At the behest of the member for Flinders our committee put a lot of time and effort into trying to look into water supply on the Eyre Peninsula, and also did a fair bit of work, which is ongoing from pre-2010, into the Upper South-East scheme, which was very important water. We looked at a wide range of things. I will just touch on two more of them.

One was the AWNRM area, and we did manage to visit part of that area, but were not able to visit the other part. We went to the northern area but not the southern or western area. It has been very difficult, I understand, over successive parliaments for that committee to get there, for different logistical reasons. However, I know the members of the committee want to get there and they put time aside on a few different occasions to get there, and it was local, logistical issues which prevented the committee from visiting.

I do really hope that those issues are able to be overcome in the near future because that is a very important part of the world that deserves as much attention as does any other NRM region in the state. However, if the committee cannot get there to see, feel, touch and taste the issues on the ground, the Natural Resources Committee of parliament cannot support that area as well as it can the other areas that it is able to get to. I genuinely hope that these issues are overcome.

The last area that the committee put a lot of time into, which I will touch on, is with regard to bushfires. Bushfires is a very broad topic, but there was essentially consideration of bushfire preparedness and looking at the risks and the preparedness in the Adelaide Hills, but with consideration to bushfires and other natural disasters more statewide. I will say again what I have

said in this place: what I learnt about the risks that exist in the Adelaide Hills was absolutely shocking. I am not a person with great personal connection to the Adelaide Hills, so perhaps it was more eye opening for me than for others, but I am a person with great personal connection to bushfires in my own electorate, in fact in my own home town, and that sort of thing.

In combining my knowledge of bushfires and involvement with what I learnt specifically about the Adelaide Hills area, it is not alarmist to say that there is an enormous risk of a human tragedy occurring. I know that every member of this parliament would take this risk very seriously. There is combination of hilly terrain and extremely high fuel load and narrow, winding streets, which are often blocked by parked vehicles in such a way that a fire truck would really struggle to get up that street, let alone try to turn around and get out of that street if it needed to for its own safety or because it had done its job and needed to get to another section to provide support.

For me, most alarming of all is the risk of people, if they did responsibly heed the warnings and try to leave an area early, getting caught in a fire because the fire came earlier than expected, etc. I am not even talking about the people who just brushed it off and said, 'She'll be right, mate,' and did not try to make an effort. The capacity for that section of metro Adelaide to evacuate in motor vehicles over the few hours in which they would have to do it, ideally in advance of a fire coming, and to get out would, I suspect, be quite impossible, let alone overlaying this with the possibility that it could be happening when the bushfire was actually there and the tragedy that would occur.

There are a lot of issues that really concern me. Of course, most of the work we did was focused on regions, but that work, which covered more than just the last financial year, to me was the most striking and the most alarming. It is what our parliament and our government and our state and local people, who work and live in that area, should address, and it went far beyond anything else that the committee actually did, and there was lots of other important work.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:29): I rise to speak on the 99th report of the Natural Resources Committee—a committee which I joined in June this year, taking the place of the member for Stuart, who of course moved on to the Economic and Finance Committee. I am very pleased to join this committee. I have a reasonable background in natural resource management; I came up through the Landcare movement and was an inaugural member and onetime president of the Edillilie Landcare group, which began way back in the early 1990s. I progressed from that to the Lower Eyre Soil Board, as it once was, and then a Streamcare catchment group.

My interest in natural resource management has been over a long period of time, so for that reason I was very pleased to be able to take a place on this very active committee, which is very ably led by the member for Ashford, who does a wonderful job chairing it. It is a hardworking committee, and I give credit to our two supporting staff, Mr Patrick Dupont and Mr David Trebilcock. David is about to leave us after his contract expires, and he has chosen to move on to other things. Patrick, of course, will stay with us, and we will be looking very soon for a replacement for David.

Most recently, the committee ventured to Kangaroo Island on one of its field trips. It was the first field trip that has officially been undertaken by the committee since I became a member, and it was a wonderful visit. I had only been to Kangaroo Island once before in my life, in fact, and it was good to take the time over a few days to have a look around, talk to the locals, and see firsthand what is going on there. We were ably hosted by the NRM Board on Kangaroo Island. We were hosted at Flinders Chase National Park by the department. They are very proud of the work they do, and so they should be; it is a much sought-after destination, and understandably so.

On the final day, we ventured back east and spoke to a few of the farmers. Of course, my background is in primary production, and it is always at the forefront of my thinking. I can see that for the primary producers on KI a sustainable environment and sustainable landscape are paramount to their productive capacity and their long-term viability. That is self-evident in what is a really productive part of the state.

As part of this report, 14 separate reports have been tabled over the previous year—an exceedingly high work rate, I would suggest—and one site visit. In fact, even though I was not a member at the time, I was involved in that site visit to Whyalla and the Arrium site at Iron Duke. A couple of my constituents border that mine and had some concerns about the operation there. I can

safely say that those concerns were duly investigated and duly dealt with, no doubt due in no small part to the work of that committee, and it was a pleasure to be involved with that.

Another big involvement I had with the committee prior to joining was through the Eyre Peninsula water supply. When I first approached the committee with a view to convincing them—or cajoling them, really—into undertaking an inquiry, I do not think they were quite sure what they had let themselves in for, but they know now. It was a huge task, but I have to say congratulations and thank you for the work that the committee did on that.

There were 12 very good recommendations that came from that; not all were considered by the minister, but we will deal with that at another time because as the house would be aware, I have a motion to address that tabled for 4 December, so we will get to that in due course. They were very good recommendations, and the committee did their very best to accommodate everyone in that inquiry. I think that is the real value of a standing committee. A standing committee obviously has representatives from both sides of the parliament, and even the crossbenchers in the upper house, because it is a combined upper house/lower house committee. We work in a truly bipartisan way with a common goal in mind.

We have another inquiry going on at the moment. We are taking evidence with regard to fishing and aquaculture, and we have taken evidence in recent weeks. What I really like about it is that it gives everybody the opportunity to present a point of view, a perspective, an opinion, and some facts are occasionally thrown in there as well.

It is then our job as a committee to sort through that and come up with a recommendation. It is not always easy, but at least we give everybody the opportunity. If they do not take the opportunity, it is their own fault. We need to back it up with science always, of course. We try to get a balanced opinion from various departmental people and also, occasionally, from those with a scientific background, such as the CSIRO.

This is a great committee. As I said, I have only just joined, but I am really looking forward to my time on the committee. Many of the inquiries, undertakings and discussions we have will be very closely related to the electorate I represent, not just because of geography but also because my electorate of Flinders is very much based on primary production, agriculture, aquaculture, seafood and fishing. That sustainable environment is so critical to ensuring the long-term viability of those industries.

As an aside, most recently we took evidence from the Spencer Gulf prawn industry, and the minister and I attended a function with them yesterday.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Great people.

Mr TRELOAR: They are great people, and they have a vibrant fishing sector that is really well managed. It is actively managed with good baseline data, and it is an example for a whole lot of fisheries. We had an excellent presentation from Simon Clark, their chief executive.

At the same time, we also took evidence from the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery, which has been in recess for the last couple of years. I understand that they are going fishing again this month, November, for the first time in two years. They are not even doing a survey; they are just going to go out and go fishing, so it will be interesting. We are all watching with great interest to see where they go fishing, for a start, and see what they come back with.

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: It is not as simple as that, member for MacKillop. You need to know where the fish are. That is the thing.

Mr Williams: The secret!

Mr TRELOAR: That is the secret, isn't it? It is not something I have ever known really.

Mr Williams: There are a lot of fish in there, but there is a lot more water between them.

Mr TRELOAR: There it is, yes.

Members interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: There is a fair bit of interjection going on here, Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Hildyard): Order!

Mr TRELOAR: I appreciate that it is all in good jest. We are all part-time—

Mr Gardner: Kick them out!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Hildyard): Order!

Mr TRELOAR: —one-time fishermen, I am sure.

Mr Gardner: Send them all out!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Hildyard): Member for Morialta, I am in charge.

Mr TRELOAR: I will be particularly interested to see if any of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishers venture down to Backstairs Passage because my sense is that it is worth a shot, to use prawn speak. I know there have been prawns caught in the past—quite big prawns—but a good fisherman never tells where he catches his fish. If it is successful, they will tell us that it has been but not tell us any more than that.

Aquaculture, of course, is something we will be looking at in the next little while. This is another subject very close to my heart because I believe there are great opportunities for aquaculture in this state, with this fantastic and extensive coastline we have. There will be opportunities, not just with the species we are currently farming but probably with some new species as well. With that, I support the committee's report and look forward to working on that committee in the coming 12 months.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:38): I rise to support the motion to note the 99th report of the Natural Resources Committee. In doing so, I want to bring one matter to the notice of the house, a matter which has been concerning me, in the south-east of the state. I note that the committee in its annual report highlights the reports it has made during the year, and one of the series of statutory obligations the committee has is to vet or to look at the various natural resources management boards and the setting of the levies in the various areas across the state.

I want to bring a matter to the attention of the house because I think the South East Natural Resources Management Board has made a serious error, albeit at the behest, I believe, of its minister (the minister in another place). It came to my attention quite recently that, in the South-East, there has been what the government would call the establishment of a citizens' jury to look into a matter of public policy.

The matter of public policy concerns another bill that has been in the house in the last parliament. It has not been brought back to either house in this parliament. It was known as the SEDSOM Bill (the South East Drainage System Operation and Management Bill), which would repeal and replace the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act.

There are two principal differences in the new bill that was tabled in the last parliament, one being that the three currently elected members of that board would be appointed like the other members of the board. It is partly made up of elected landholder members and partly made up of ministerial appointees. The bill would change that so that all the members were appointed.

The other significant change, if that bill was adopted by the parliament, would be to give the powers to impose a new tax across the South-East to cover the cost of operation and maintenance of the drainage system. The current numbers predict that something like \$6 million a year would be raised out of the South-East.

The reason I am talking about this now is that the South East Natural Resources Management Board is funding this citizens' jury. The minister has instructed, in my opinion, the South East Natural Resources Management Board to utilise a portion of the funds that are raised through a levy on the South-East community, specifically to undertake natural resource management activities, to actually fund a political exercise to try to market and curry favour with some people to try to get some people to support the imposition of another levy on the same people in the South-East for another purpose.

I can tell the house that, in the last parliament, the other place, the upper house, refused to accept that proposition of the government. I can inform the house that, to my understanding of the make-up of the other place post the March election, I do not think the numbers have changed, and I think I can pretty well guarantee that the upper house will not accept the imposition of a new tax on the South-East. I do not think that is going to be acceptable, and I think this is an absolute waste of money.

It is costing, at the bare minimum, \$140,000. The consultancy company that has been given the task of undertaking this citizens' jury work indicates on its website that it sees the cost as being \$140,000. My understanding is that the South East Natural Resources Management Board has indeed set aside \$300,000 for this exercise.

Members of this committee will understand that, when the various natural resources management boards come before the committee, they set out their program for the forthcoming year, the costs and their budget to justify the levy rate that they want to set. I certainly have not been able to obtain information about what part of their budget and what programs have been set aside, delayed, deferred, postponed or cancelled to fund this cost of up to \$300,000.

I bring that to the attention of both the house and the committee because it is something about which I think some serious questions should be asked of the South East Natural Resources Management Board next year when they come before the committee. I would strongly urge the members of the committee to question that particular board if they are going to behave in that way, extracting money from the community ostensibly to undertake natural resource management activities.

You can go anywhere in my constituency and the members of the community will tell you that they are tearing their hair out with the spread of declared weeds and vertebrate pests, and they do not believe that the South East Natural Resources Management Board is doing a very good job in that area at least. There are plenty of other tasks for that board to undertake in the region and I think that they have seriously erred in applying these funds to what is nothing other than a political exercise. I would like the committee in its deliberations next year to take that into consideration and, indeed, suggest to the South East Natural Resources Management Board that if they can afford to carry out those sort of exercises with the money that they have available to them, they have too much money.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:45): I rise to make a contribution to the 99th report of the Natural Resources Committee, that is, the annual report July 2013 to June 2014. I note that, apart from going through the natural resources management boards' levy proposals right across the state, there were some fact-finding missions at Whyalla, issues around bushfire preparedness of properties in bushfire risk areas, discussion around prescribed burning and fire management in the Mount Lofty Ranges, Upper South-East dryland salinity and flood management, visits to the APY lands were proposed and there was debate about that, and the Eyre Peninsula water supply final report.

As I mentioned in this place before, I will declare an interest here. My wife, as an environmental scientist, was involved in the integrated natural resource management sector when it was first initiated in the state and I share some of her frustrations in the amount of reporting that has to be done by legislation. The sooner that the 2004 NRM Act can be amended to make it better for everyone, it will be better for the whole state.

NRM boards do a lot of good work, but there is frustration in the community that a lot of it is done around making sure that the reporting is up to speed with reports that have to be redone every five years or every three years or whatever the time may be. As the member for MacKillop indicated, there is a frustration across the state, and certainly throughout my electorate, with regard to vertebrate pests and weeds.

I think weed and roadside weed management is one that gets brought to my attention many times and it seems to be it is a 'take all' policy by many farmers just because of the size of their properties and the management around weeds on the roadsides. If they can get the end of a boom sprayer in there that is what they will use, so you basically take everything out. That is not good in all areas, especially if someone has some plant life or young trees that they want to establish, so then it becomes a bigger job to manage around these areas. It certainly is an issue that does get

harder as there are fewer owners of properties, as farm sizes get bigger and there is less time for people to devote to these tasks, but I certainly note with interest the issue around prescribed burning.

I have spoken in this place many times around prescribed burning and the issues that have come with that. I think prescribed burning is a great tool to keep down fuel loads if managed correctly, and this is the key point. If it is managed correctly it can be a great thing, but the problem we have seen over the years—and I raised this with minister Hunter from the other place during estimates—is that a lot of these prescribed burns, which are supposed to be controlled, get out of control.

Mr Treloar: Who is going to fight them?

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, and that is the other point. The member for Flinders raises a good point: who is going to fight them, especially on Eyre Peninsula? Because of the outrageous rises in the emergency services levy there are more and more brigades that are now saying they will not fight fire on government land, yet we had a minister in this place yesterday interject and say, 'Oh, we have got our own firefighters.' The minister needs to have a look because, last time I looked, firefighters who work for the department of environment—and I do not want to besmirch their name—knock off at 5 o'clock and the fire is still burning. That is when the volunteers really come into play, as they would have for the rest of the day anyway, if they are at the fire front.

We have certainly seen parks like Messent in the South-East or in the Gawler Ranges over on Eyre Peninsula where prescribed burns have got way out of control and overachieved. When I say 'overachieved', that is not a good thing. That means that instead of perhaps burning a third or a quarter of the area that the department wanted to burn, they have managed to burn two-thirds or three-quarters, so you would hardly call that a controlled burn.

In all seriousness, I think there is a real issue now with the emergency services levy debate around who will fight these fires. I would not blame CFS brigades for sitting on the edge of a park, whether it is on Eyre Peninsula around the Gawler Ranges or down around Messent near Keith or the Ngarkat park, or even for the few remnants that were not burnt in Billiatt in the last big fire in recent times. I would not blame both farmers and CFS for sitting in the adjoining land and fighting it as it got to them. I certainly acknowledge that breaks should be ploughed and everything should be done on the private property to prevent it from going further.

In regard to burning, it is about natural resources management but it is also heavily related to controlling park fires. There is a situation that I have mentioned in this place before. Nearly nine years ago there was a fire in the Ngarkat park and it was heading towards the grazing and farming land to the north of the park. This was going to come out at around 100 km/h, if not more, so the people of the fire front said, 'We need to back-burn because it is going to come out and hit us anyway.'

It seemed that no-one had the gumption or the courage to light the fire or they did not get the instruction from further up because, instead of doing a back-burn, which would have been highly sensible because that part of the park was going to burn anyway, the defence line was made at the Mallee Highway. If you have a high wind, a highway is not going to stop a fire, not by any means, and that is not to think about the thousands of acres of land that are going to be burnt before it gets to there and the risk to farmers' built assets—homes, sheds, etc.

Guess what happened? That afternoon, the fire came out and, thankfully, it was managed quite well before it burnt too much pasture land. There does need to be some sense around prescribed burning. It does need to be controlled and people do need to understand that they are covered by at least two acts of legislation if they do a burn-back during a fire period to save other property. I think this is a problem that has not been well orchestrated throughout the community, whether it is in volunteer ranks or elsewhere, because people are spooked by the Native Vegetation Council. I think they have a lot to answer for in this, because we need to protect people's livelihoods and their homes.

In saying that, I commend the report. I think there is endless work the Natural Resources Committee can be involved in. Certainly, in recent times, they have been involved in my electorate with issues around the River Murray and I commend the work that was done there. The Presiding Member of the committee always makes sure that local members are involved and I appreciate that every time. It is a great functioning committee and, as we see water flows slowing down into the

River Murray at the moment, we need to keep our eye on that and make sure that, into the future, all the ideals of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan are implemented not just for the sake of this generation but for future generations through this state.

So, I do commend the work of the Natural Resources Committee. I know there is some debate about levy rates, and that will always go on—especially the ones that get proposed above CPI. I note that in regard to natural resources management there is also plenty of room for improvement on the ground around the state on how we manage our resources.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:55): I would like to thank all the members for their contribution, both members on the committee and previous members of the committee. Our reports are very much part of active debate in this chamber, and I think that is really important.

I would particularly thank the staff: Patrick Dupont, our Executive Officer, and also David Trebilcock, our Research Officer. We are very sad that David Trebilcock will be finishing up at the end of the year as both of his two-year contracts are over so, sadly, he needs to depart from the committee. However, I would just like to put on record the fantastic work he has done. The produce he has come up with has been astounding, and we really appreciate the dedication and time he has put into the committee. I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2014-15

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

That the 85th report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2014-15, be noted.

which Mr Williams has moved to amend by deleting the word 'noted' and replacing with:

referred back to the Economic and Finance Committee for further consideration in light of the 2014-15 state budget.

(Continued from 16 October 2014.)

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:56): I flag that even though I have been in this place for 8½ years I am not a current member of the Economic and Finance Committee, but I was until the election—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: And he was a champion, too; one of the best ever!

Mr GRIFFITHS: Not always. But I have been there for about six years, and I have actually taken quite a sincere interest in its activities and its investigations, but a particular interest in the emergency services levy presentations that occur in Economic and Finance Committee where, without a word of a lie, there must be 25 public servants in the room and seemingly have every possible answer ready for any question that is asked because of the fact that it is a rather serious matter. Indeed, in the last few months it has become an exceptionally serious matter when it comes to concerns put by community and property owners to members of parliament about increases.

The reason I stand today is not just to reflect upon my past involvement with the Economic and Finance Committee but to discuss the amendment moved by the member for MacKillop where he seeks to change the motion to read that the report be 'referred back to the Economic and Finance Committee for further consideration in light of the 2014-15 state budget'. On that, I absolutely completely agree.

I was not a member of the committee at the time the presentation was made a few days before the state budget was delivered. I have spoken to members who were there and have had a quick look at the agenda and the report that was presented. As a person who normally, in my time, tried to be rather inquisitive and seek clarification on a lot of points, I think there is somewhat of a gap in what occurred about the rebates and remission issues that I believe is missing. That is why I stand before you supporting the recommendation to ensure that now, in the fullness of time, after issues have become known to the members from all sides, and it is very much an all-sides committee, that it has the chance to ask some rather serious questions of the levels of the emergency services team that helped form it, and the government departments that frame it to ensure that the people of South Australia get some questions answered on it.

Some might argue that this is a chance for political point scoring, but it is a true opportunity for the parliament to be involved in a very thorough review to ensure that all issues are raised. In the previous years when I was part of the committee the group assembled for probably an hour, and, yes, they answered all questions. If there were any questions they were not particularly conversant with, they ensured that an answer would come back to the committee, so I commend them on that effort. But I think this amendment from the member for MacKillop is raised purely on the virtue of the fact that they want to ensure there is a real scrutiny to occur.

I hope that there are other members prepared to stand and support this amendment, and I hope that the government is prepared to vote in support of this amendment which will bring the issue back before a rather important committee—no doubt about that—and one that does good work for the people of South Australia. To me, this is a classic example of where the good work needs to continue and the scrutiny needs to take place, and I hope that some real answers are provided to the people. When an additional \$90 million impost falls upon property owners, be it fixed or mobile property without—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Member for Goyder, would you like to seek leave to continue your remarks.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I would; I seek leave to continue my remarks, Mr Acting Speaker.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 October 2014.)

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:01): I rise to resume my remarks in relation to the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) Bill 2014. As I mentioned, things are not always what they seem. We were told that the bill was introduced to remedy minor errors, omissions and other deficiencies; however, when we delve a bit deeper into this statutes amendment bill, we see that things are not always what they seem and that there is more to it. These reforms are, in some cases, much more serious than first presented.

I would like to address each of the bill's parts in turn; some parts I will support, others I simply cannot. In relation to the signing of death certificates, I understand it was the case that when the Burial and Cremation Act 2013 was passed it was discovered that two doctors were required before a cremation permit could be issued, one being the deceased's consulting doctor immediately before death. This amendment restores the position as applied under the previous Cremation Act, in that one doctor's signature is required. I have no problem with that amendment.

In relation to the second amendment, regarding child exploitation material, when you look at the amendment bill it is obvious that it modernises the definition of that and aims not only to broaden it but also to contemporise the description of certain conduct. I think it is important that, as elected members, we update bills to reflect changes in technology, and terminology for that matter, so I have no problem in also supporting that part of the bill.

With regard to the resentencing for subsequent cooperation with law enforcement agencies, under past reforms offenders are able to receive reduced sentences if they cooperate with the police and other agencies, and it could occur after an offender is sentenced and it may be some years later that they provided assistance. It was unclear whether sentencing rules that applied at the date of the offence or at the date of resentencing should apply.

This amendment provides for resentencing according to the law and the principles applicable at the time of the offence. As the member for Bragg alluded to, however, I would also seek details of some of these cases over the past, say, two or three years where we will see the benefit of this. I look forward to receiving some of those cases in due course.

With regard to the notification of suspension of interstate legal practitioners, again it was identified as being unclear whether a court is required to notify the authorities of an individual legal practitioner's suspension, and this amendment secures the same. Again, I have no problem with that part of the amended bill.

However, then we get to a juicier part in regard to the acting chief magistrate, and we have all seen the article in relation to this in *The Advertiser* on Tuesday 11 November. With all respect, it looks like the Attorney is looking at making his own 'Cannon' law, not the kind of canon law with one 'n' some of us may have abided by in the past, but one with two n's in this instance. I certainly cannot support what the Attorney is aiming to do here.

The government has introduced an amendment to the Magistrates Act that may stop someone acting as chief magistrate. If passed, it would enable the appointment of an acting chief magistrate, if the chief magistrate is absent, or for the most senior magistrate to fill the role until the vacancy is filled.

I understand that, at present, as Deputy Chief Magistrate, Dr Cannon automatically assumes the acting chief magistrate position, and he is obviously acting in that role while the Chief Magistrate is on leave. I understand that Dr Cannon has assumed that role on numerous occasions in the past and, from talking to people in the legal fraternity, I am also informed that he has been quite competent in that role. So, 'Why change the law?' is the question I have for the Attorney. I am very much looking forward—I think that it would be the highlight of my day—to hear his explanation as to why this is taking place.

One thing for sure is that I think that it is a dangerous path for the government to go down when they start interfering with the independence of the judiciary. We should not be interfering with that process. 'Where does the interference stop?' is a valid question. If you speak to lawyers, magistrates or members of the profession, they are also scared and worried about this course of action because where does it stop?

We have an example of a law that seems to be working. The member for Bragg has asked for examples of why this is not working, but we are yet to see why this has been put in place. It also seems to be hypocritical in relation to other laws this government has passed. We have heard from the member for Heysen especially in regard to another role where this is inconsistent. I conclude by saying that we simply cannot support it.

I am not suggesting that there is a vendetta out there but, if there is, we should not be occupying this house's time debating this course of change. It is simply not a good use of the house's time and not a good precedent to set. I simply cannot support that part of the amendment.

In relation to the temporary prohibited weapons class exemptions, again I seek some clarification in regard to the mischief, I suppose, the bill is trying to rectify. I am led to believe, on our queries so far, that we are yet to receive that clarification. I will support parts of the bill, but I cannot support all parts of the bill.

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) (12:08): First of all, the good news: most of this appears to be reasonably uncontroversial, and I thank all members for their contribution. Secondly, on the matter of the weapons, just so that people understand what is going on, this is not a particular hobby of mine.

Indeed, some might regard this as slightly unusual, but it is the case that there are people who like to dress up as Confederate army officers or Union army officers; some of them even like dressing up as Sir Lancelot or doing re-creations of the Battle of Hastings and stuff like that. I personally have never been involved in this, so I am not speaking from any sort of personal anxiety about this matter, but I can tell members that there are some people for whom the annual re-enactment of the Battle of Hastings is a red-letter day. They spend a whole year preparing costumes, doing the ballot for who is going to be Harold. It is very—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Exactly. Obviously the position everyone wants to get is William, because William came out pretty well in that event. If I were ever to participate in this particular event

I would want to be William, because I would know that at the end of the day things were going to be okay. However, there are people who do this and the fact is that, by and large, they are not bad people. They are just people for whom philately is not an appealing hobby.

It has been put to me that these people, who are about to re-enact the Battle of Hastings or the Eureka Stockade or the D-Day landing or some other thing—I cannot remember exactly what it was but, if I recall it correctly, these people were going to re-enact this thing on a big oval at Reynella; the member for Reynell may be able to help me with what group I am talking about here, and she is nodding so she knows what I mean—were confronted with the possibility of, part way through the Battle of Hastings, a series of sirens and blue flashing lights turning up. That would have been completely out of keeping; it would have made it look like *Monty Python and the Holy Grail*. It would have mucked up the day, and why would that have happened? It would have happened because they had these cutlasses or whatever, which were kept under lock and key and were validly held.

The purpose of this is simply that if you have a bunch of chaps (and usually it is chaps) who want to get out there and wear this gear, and run around and suchlike with gun smoke and stuff—or even without it—and they are not hurting anyone and are actually putting on a public spectacle, while they are out there and are behaving in a decent fashion, why should it be impossible for them to apply to be given a permit for that specific event so they can indulge their dream? Why should they not be able to live their dream? The member for Hartley is living his dream; he is sitting in the parliament. What about these people?

Ms Chapman: He doesn't need a permit for that.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He does have a permit. He has—

Ms Chapman: He has 20,000 people who voted for him.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, he has got 200 people who made a mistake on their ballot paper who put him there. Anyway, I am happy to see you. The point is this: just because we, in this parliament, do not personally engage in these types of re-enactments does not mean that we—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Just because I do not engage in these particular types of re-enactments should not mean that good, law-abiding citizens, who are just putting on a bit of a spectacle (in fact, the member for Reynell may know, but I suspect families go and watch these things and have fairy floss and noodle salad and all that sort of stuff there), cannot.

That is the point, that these people can actually contact the Commissioner of Police and say, 'Look, here we are. We are the Battle of Hastings Society and we are out here doing a bit of stuff. We are only going to be on the oval up in Reynella on this particular day. We do not mind if you send the police up to have a look at this and make sure we stay nice and tidy, but do not pinch the whole lot of us just because we have a ball and chain or a mace or some other damn thing.'

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, I am told that these people are at risk of being prosecuted. That is the only reason it is here. If members of the opposition wish to be curmudgeonly and stop these people from having their little ray of sunshine, that is a matter for them.

Ms Chapman: Not one letter.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That is because these people mistakenly think that members of the opposition are supportive of them living the dream too. So, that is that one.

Now the other one, the one that has attracted all of the attention: I have mentioned this before in this place but I think I must mention it again. There are still some people who think that Elvis Presley is alive. There are some people who think the moon landing was filmed in Universal Studios. There are some people who live their lives like Fox Mulder. These people believe in conspiracies. These people are constantly looking around corners and moving away from shadows, but I want to allay their fears. What I am going to do is explain a few facts which should calm this whole thing down, I hope. The first thing is I would like to read from section 10 of the Supreme Court Act, which provides:

(1) If—

- (a) the Chief Justice is absent or, for any reason, is unable for the time being to carry out the duties of the office; or
- (b) the office of the Chief Justice becomes vacant,

the Governor may appoint a puisne judge of the court—

puisne judge, of course, not being a small judge but a judge other than the Chief Justice—

to be Acting Chief Justice until—

they return to duty or another person is appointed, as the case requires. That is section 10(1). I do not recall the *X-Files* being wheeled out when that particular provision came in. That is section 10 of the Supreme Court Act. Section 11AA, which incidentally I think was put in by the parliament not that long ago because we were confronted with a problem—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): The minister will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I won't.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): And the deputy leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That was a savage interjection to which I will not respond. The former chief judge of the District Court was either absent overseas or had retired, I cannot recall which, and there was an issue about who would be presiding over the court. It was discovered that there was a gap in the fabric of things, so 11AA was inserted. Member for Hartley, you are going to be calming right down after you have heard all of this, 11AA provides:

(1) If—

- (a) the Chief Judge is absent or, for any reason, is unable for the time being to carry out the duties of the office; or
 - (b) the office of the Chief Judge becomes vacant,
- the Governor may appoint a Judge to be Acting Chief Judge until—
- (c) the Chief Judge returns to official duties; or
 - (d) a person is appointed to the office of the Chief Judge,

as the case requires.

No equivalent provision presently resides in the Magistrates Court Act. However, the proposed insertion of section 6B provides:

(1) If—

- (a) the Chief Magistrate is absent or, for any reason, is unable for the time being to carry out the duties of the office; or
- (b) the office of the Chief Magistrate becomes vacant,—

familiar words, but what we have done is we have removed the words 'chief judge' and we have put in 'chief magistrate'—

the Governor may appoint a magistrate to be Acting Chief Magistrate until...

blah, blah, blah. What we are doing is we are creating in the Magistrates Court an identical provision to the provision that applies in the Supreme Court and the District Court. So, there is nothing novel or weird about this.

The next point is: contrary to the *X-Files* sort of stuff that has been going on around the place, I have enjoyed a good working relationship with—I cannot remember Gillian whatever her name is—

Ms Chapman: Lois Lane.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I am talking about the *X-Files*. What was her name?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Scully, Agent Scully—Agent Scully over there, yes.

Ms Chapman: Actually, you wouldn't look bad in a dress.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We might take that up afterwards, perhaps.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): I think, Deputy Speaker, you are coming perilously close to misleading the house—sorry, deputy leader, I beg your pardon. I apologise to the Deputy Speaker in advance.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As to Mr Cannon, can I say that he has now been acting in the role for a period of time due to the current illness of the Chief Magistrate. I have had several conversations with Mr Cannon. I have no complaint about the way he is discharging his duty and, on the basis that he is there for a longer period and continues to discharge his duty in the way he has to the present time, I am quite disinterested in disturbing the status quo.

Ms Chapman: I bet you are now.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Why? Why would I have changed my mind?

Ms Chapman: I think it's pretty obvious, John.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Is the member for Bragg saying that this particular issue is being agitated at the instigation of the Acting Chief Magistrate? Is that what the member for Bragg is saying?

Ms Chapman: You didn't even hear my contribution on this matter.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, let me finish. Mr Cannon is not presented with any threat by reason of this. Furthermore, and even more concerning is that, whilst the Chief Magistrate is ill and if Mr Cannon were, for example, on leave or ill, what would we then do with the Magistrates Court? The answer is that we would rush this provision into the parliament. We would have to rush this through the parliament so that the Magistrates Court had a leader, because absent this they would just be sitting there, a bunch of leaderless magistrates, wondering what to do. Now, is that good? I do not think so.

Let's say Mr Cannon had taken long service leave, or whatever the appropriate title is for that, and he was off in Europe or wherever having a well-earned rest or studying something and, whilst he is away, the Chief Magistrate becomes ill. What then? Do we wait until he gets back? Do we ring him up and say, 'Sorry, cut your holiday short, come home'? I do not think so. What if Mr Cannon becomes unwell? What then? More particularly, this is not about Mr Cannon: it is about the Magistrates Court. Who here can foresee a circumstance in the future where we may not need to have resort to this, whether there is a deputy magistrate or not? Read my lips: this is not about Mr Cannon. This is about—

Mr Gardner: Remember the last time somebody said 'read my lips'?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He was a president of the United States, I think, wasn't he? This is not about Mr Cannon: it is about the Magistrates Court. If this does not pass, at some point in the future, as sure as eggs, the situation will arise where the Deputy Chief Magistrate (if there is one at that time) is absent or sick and the Chief Magistrate is absent or sick at the same time. That will happen. It is a statistical—not probability—inevitability. I was quite good at maths, until grade 6. That is the situation. That is what this is about.

Member for Hartley, I hope those are words of comfort. I hope you can now feel happy that you are discharging a worthy function here in supporting the bill unamended.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6.

Ms CHAPMAN: Congratulations, Madam Chair. I think this is the first bill we have done with your chairmanship and you are doing a great job so far.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Hildyard): Thank you very much.

Ms CHAPMAN: Clause 6 relates to the deletion of reference to 'pornography' in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and proposes 'exploitation material' be its replacement. I have indicated in our contribution that this side of the house supports that. Our concern, Attorney, is the delay in the implementation of this (years) and that has been raised in our second reading contribution. Can you explain to the house why we are so far behind in relation to this legislation? We did review this matter in 2011, which was also Attorney-General's portfolio legislation, which was then dealt with in 2012. I am still puzzled as to why this matter has not been picked up and dealt with, as other jurisdictions have modernised some years before.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I take that as meaning sort of cryptically that you are actually supporting what we are doing here.

Ms Chapman: I just said that.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay, so it was just an opportunity to ask that question? Fair enough. It is a bit of a cheap shot, but fair enough.

Ms Chapman: I raised it in second reading.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Sure—doesn't make it any better. The point is there are a number of things going on in the Attorney-General's Department. There is a large amount of legislation which needs to be dealt with. We have a process whereby we have these bills which are an amalgam of a number of tweekings in a whole bunch of other bills which, unless there is some overwhelming urgency for them, are allowed to accumulate as a package, if you like—a completely miscellaneous package—until there is enough in the package to warrant introduction as a bill. That is basically what has happened here.

There has been no mischief created in the world by this not having been done six months or 12 months ago. This is an appropriate place, time and way to do it. It would not realistically have been appropriate to be a stand-alone proposition, in my view, because it was not something that was causing any particular harm. It is simply changing the naming of something into a contemporary phraseology, which I am quite frankly reasonably agnostic about. I am not sure it takes it anywhere other than to be more hip from a legislative point of view and, if that is the case, that is good, but the world has not been suffering terribly by reason of this not having been done last year or the year before. It is in here as part of what you would have to concede is a mixed bag of measures. This has got all sorts of things—burials and cremations, magistrates, all sorts of things—so that is why it is here.

Ms CHAPMAN: I do understand that, Attorney, and, in fact, as I previously pointed out, the last Attorney-General's portfolio bill to pick up miscellaneous matters, and sometimes not as pressing or not deserving of independent legislation, was the 2011 bill, dealt with in 2012. This academic debate, that you have referred to in your own second reading, was actually back in the 2008 era. In fact, some of the academic contributions made in this regard, some of which you have referred to in your second reading, also were provided through briefings from your office, and I thank them for providing that.

But this has been going on for years. New South Wales, as you acknowledged in your own contribution, dealt with this issue back in 2010. So I am just asking why this was not picked up in the last mop-up of the usual Attorney-General portfolio matters. It is significant, according to these academics, and you acknowledge it is significant. It is still an offence, but it is an issue in relation to contemporary language, in which we are a long way behind. I just want to know whether there was some reason. Had it been forgotten, or slipped off the bench? I do not understand why we are here in 2014 dealing with this when the last portfolio bill we had was two years ago.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think I have said all I can say about this. The member for Bragg is probably more with it—is that what they say these days, with it: or hip, cool—than me.

Mr Treloar: Groovy.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Groovy. Anyway, the member for Bragg is more groovy than me because the member for Bragg is more in with contemporary hip, cool daddy, sort of wag—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: She's got more swag.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Swag. The member for Bragg has got a bit more swag than me. I am a bit behind the times. My children say that frequently. They say, 'That's not right. You don't use that.'

Ms Chapman: Don't say 'groovy'. They will think you are in the dark ages.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: They have actually said that to me on occasions, yes. Anyway, if I stand accused of using slightly antiquated, quaint language, I possibly have to plead guilty. If I stand accused of being more preoccupied with minor things such as introducing an ICAC, changing WorkCover and various other things, then changing a semantic proposition in order to be more of a swag—is that what it's called—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: You have swag.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes—I have to say, 'You got me, guvnor.' But nobody has suffered, other than those who are in with the hip language, by reason—

Ms Chapman: The domestic violence groups are not going to be happy with this language.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: This language does not change who is captured by the offence, so it is purely and simply a question of nomenclature. That is it. It is a completely vacuous argument in terms of the impact it has on the people who are behaving in this way, which we all agree is unacceptable. They are still being prosecuted now. There is no change in the scope or the reach of the offence. None at all. This is about whether or not there is some contemporary language to describe something which is not changing. That is it. That is all it is about.

It is in this bill. If New South Wales managed to get it in one of their portfolio bills in 2010, good for them. It is in here and it should pass, I hope. I am, frankly, puzzled as to why we are spending any time at all having a conversation about why a piece of semantics was not massaged a couple of years ago, or now, in circumstances where there is no substantial change whatsoever to the reach or scope of the offence. I am acknowledging that the change is appropriate. I am simply saying that, in the queue of things that we are working our way through, this was not a standalone proposition. Something which should be in a portfolio bill—it is in a portfolio bill—we are trying to deal with it, but it does not make any practical difference in terms of whether particular behaviour is captured by the offence or not.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am disappointed we do not have an answer, Attorney, as to why. It may be that it was just overlooked, and that may be a perfectly legitimate reason, but to have given no answer and just to diminish the importance of this reform in that spray I think is undignified and unacceptable for those who have been passionately advocating for this for at least, to my knowledge, the last six years on which we are at the tail end charlie of. Nevertheless, we will be supporting the amendment. I am happy, Madam Acting Chair, to move to clause 13.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 12 passed.

Clause 13.

Ms CHAPMAN: Could the Attorney identify whether he had any conversation with the current Chief Magistrate before implementing this proposed amendment and, if so, when?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I honestly do not recall. I may have, I may not have, I do not know. I just don't know, but I will make this clear: this is tidying up and I certainly am not in a position where I can recall any particular discussion with the current Chief Magistrate about this matter. It may or may not have been canvassed at some time; I honestly do not recall.

Ms CHAPMAN: Did you have any discussion with the Chief Magistrate at the time that we dealt with the amendments to the District Court Act and Supreme Court Act in the last couple of years as to any reason why a similar provision would or would not be introduced in the Magistrates Court Act?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Again, I have no recollection one way or the other, but my assumption is probably not, because—and I stand to be corrected by my advisers—my recollection of the matter is this: the Supreme Court Act provision had been there for some time. It was only circumstances which presented themselves in the District Court which turned my attention to the absence of such a provision in the District Court and that, I believe, raised in my mind the question as to whether there was such a thing in the Magistrates Court which is why it is in here. Because it only concerned the District Court I think it is highly unlikely I had any conversation with the Chief Magistrate about that matter, but I have no particular recollection of it.

Ms CHAPMAN: I know you had discussions with the then Chief Judge of the District Court when the amendments were introduced to that act, because obviously Chief Judge Worthington's retirement at that time was imminent. However, when you changed the Supreme Court Act, did you have any discussion with the Chief Justice about the amendment to his act and, if so, was it prior to moving that amendment?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I cannot recall any particular conversation about that either. I am not even sure off the top of my head what year the Supreme Court one was done, but if it was done in my time I can say with some confidence that I would have discussed it with the then chief justice, but I have no recollection of that. I know that my practice would not have been to fiddle with the Supreme Court Act without having talked to the Chief Justice. I specifically do recall having talked to Chief Judge Worthington, although I do not remember word for word what the conversation was.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, having discussed the reforms in relation to the Supreme Court and District Court with their chief judicial officer, why would it be any different to you proposing to amend the Magistrates Court without a discussion with the chief magistrate, or indeed with any other representatives in the magistracy whom this may affect?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: First and foremost, at the moment the Chief Magistrate is, temporarily I hope, absent from duties. Secondly, I formed the view that, having had this matter confront me as a problem in a very specific sense in the District Court (and I do not now have a recollection of exactly what was the story in the Supreme Court), but certainly having a real problem in the District Court it was prudent housekeeping to do this.

Ms CHAPMAN: You had a discussion about it with the people affected by that, and obviously you are the party under the Magistrate's Court Act, as the Attorney, who is in a position to be able to grant extended leave, for example, or to not act in a circumstance where a magistrate takes leave (or could otherwise be adjudged as being not able to undertake their duties under the Magistrate's Court Act), and in the circumstances—and I indicated in the second reading and I will not go into the detail of that in this parliament—as to the need for extended leave (and that is acknowledged), and having identified that there was likely to be a request and the fulfilment of it for an extend had period of leave, that this matter was drawn to your attention.

It just seems incomprehensible that you would not have had any discussion with the Chief Magistrate that, during her absence or even before she left, you would be introducing a bill that would affect the appointment of her position as a replacement as an acting chief judge, and, indeed, whether in the normal practice of meeting regularly with the heads of the court, what the replacement arrangements ought to be in place during her absence. It is incomprehensible to me that there would not have been some discussion and some alert to her of your view, as you have expressed, of the need to fix up this matter as you deem to be necessary.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I do not know how many ways I can say this. The Chief Magistrate has been absent, for reasons that are not relevant, for a period of time. This bill was being assembled post election, and this in my view was a necessary and appropriate housekeeping matter which did not, much like the one you referred to earlier about the definition of child pornography, warrant a stand-alone proposition, was not of that nature of urgency, but was an appropriate thing to include in one of these.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: With the benefit of hindsight a great many things might have been done by a great many people. Perhaps even the member for Bragg at some point might have done something different—I do not know. All I am saying is that there is nothing sinister about this, this is

just something that seems to me to be self-evidently sensible housekeeping. It is appropriate to be in a portfolio bill, it does not warrant a stand-alone proposition, and the Chief Magistrate has not been around the place for a while.

I have no recall of any particular conversation with the Chief Magistrate about this matter. I have formed the view that it is here as a matter of housekeeping because, having been presented with the issue in the District Court a while ago, when we were putting this thing together it occurred to me that we could be presented with an equally unsatisfactory position in the Magistrates Court, given certain circumstances.

At the present time—and I say this again—Dr Cannon is performing the role. I have not been in receipt of complaints about Dr Cannon, and my meetings with him in his capacity as Acting Chief Magistrate have been cordial; he has been helpful and constructive.

Ms CHAPMAN: Did you have any conversation with the Deputy Chief Magistrate either before or after the introduction of this bill about the need for this amendment?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I do not believe so. This has, quite frankly, in my mind, nothing much to do with Dr Cannon. It depends how you look at it. If you come at this and see this as a conspiracy, well, of course it looks very sinister, but if you look at it from my point of view, I am doing bit of housekeeping.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Hildyard): This is the final question on this clause. This will be the seventh question.

Ms CHAPMAN: Just for future chairmanships, Madam Acting Chair, I am happy in bills to ask my three questions on every clause on the bill, or I am happy to confine it to the clauses that are pertinent and in dispute.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Hildyard): Sure.

Ms CHAPMAN: As long as we understand that.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Hildyard): I thought seven was a reasonable number.

Ms CHAPMAN: In the next bill, we have 58 clauses, so it can take a long time. Let's just go back to the position of what I think you and I are describing as a 'tidy up' of the situation to be consistent with the other two acts. You have not consulted with the Chief Magistrate; you did not see that as necessary. You have no recollection of having discussed it with the Deputy Chief Magistrate.

When the circumstances prevailed in this instance, where a deputy was going to be called upon under the act to undertake the Chief Magistrate's role, did you at that stage engage in any discussion with the Deputy Chief Magistrate about his willingness to undertake the role as acting, given that it was likely to be over an extended period of time, and was there any indication by him other than that he was happy to undertake that duty as part of his current statutory role as deputy?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, I did not. This underscores the point, I guess, because as things presently stand neither the deputy nor I have any choice. Had a provision such as this been there, I could have had a conversation with the deputy and said, 'Look, are you okay with this? You don't want to go on leave for the next year? Are you happy to be sitting there for an indeterminate period of time?' The deputy might have said, 'Yes, I'm fine with that,' or the deputy might have said, 'Well, actually that's damn inconvenient. Can't you pick somebody else?' As things presently stand, that conversation is not open to me because there is nothing to talk about.

Ms CHAPMAN: Have you had any conversation with the Deputy Chief Magistrate, since this bill has been introduced, about proceeding with it? That is, since he's been the Acting Chief Magistrate, do you have regular meetings with the Chief Magistrate?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, I think I have said that. I meet with the Acting Chief Magistrate. I cannot remember how often—every six weeks, five weeks, four weeks, something like that, I do not know. We sit down and we have a chat. I do not recall having spoken to him about this. The difference between the member for Bragg and me is that as far as I am concerned this is not about the Deputy Chief Magistrate: this is about tidying up the legislation, that is all.

Ms CHAPMAN: Attorney, this is where the difference is. Even if you think it is a tidy-up, if you think it is an amendment that is necessary to follow on as a precedent that has been set in other levels of the judiciary, it is still a change to a piece of legislation which is there designed for the establishment and operation of the magistracy in South Australia.

Given that you are, as Attorney, regularly meeting with the Chief Magistrate, as you would expect, this would be a logical thing to discuss with him or her—however minor you think it may be and however independent it may be of the current circumstances—but at no time it appears that you have had any discussion with anyone. When I have had advisers from your office consult with me on this matter, there does not appear to have been consultation with anyone, not the Law Society, nobody.

So, I ask: given that you say this is to be consistent with other jurisdictions, is it not the situation, though, that in the Supreme Court and the District Court there was no provision in those acts for what was to happen for an acting chief judge or chief justice in those legislations so you had to do something? You came to me, you came to the opposition, and we had to deal with the situation and the circumstances because you had not nominated your successor.

Therefore, to ensure that there was no vacancy in this head position and that the potential may be that any delay in that, because you had not yet made the appointment as to who you wanted to have as your chief judge in the District Court, we came into this house to remedy that situation because the District Court Act at that stage, and separately on the Supreme Court Act, was silent on that issue.

This was a not a situation of bringing in the Magistrates Court amendment to in some way deal with this in the same way as the Supreme Court and the District Court because they had no provision. We have provision already in this legislation. We have it there, and there is a circumstance prescribed in this legislation which is to deal with the absence of a chief magistrate for any reason that they are unwilling or unable to undertake that duty.

I do not see it all as consistent with bringing it into line with that legislation and, if you say you are doing it to now make it the same, are you going to do the same in respect of the dismissal of judges, bringing it into line with magistrates or magistrates in line with judges? The answer to that logically is no. This parliament makes decisions under the Supreme Court and District Court as to dealing with the capacity to dismiss judges for obvious reason—the separation of powers. The Magistrates Court has a different procedure: the termination of Magistrates Court magistrates can be dealt with by you.

We have a different regime because to date we have not treated the magistracy in the same manner as we have the Supreme Court, and then in the 1970s the addition of the District Court. We treated them as in different roles, and of the appointment and dismissal included in that—indeed, even their salary entitlements—as different from judges. My question is: if you say that this is to be in line and consistent with the Supreme Court and District Court acts, which were indeed silent on this issue, are you intending to move to make amendments in respect of the termination arrangements for magistrates?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think this is relevant to what has just been said. This is a quote that I think is most apposite. These are not my words, this is a quote:

...this is Chewbacca. Chewbacca is a Wookiee from the planet Kashyyyk. But Chewbacca lives on the planet Endor. Now think about that. That does not make sense...Why would a Wookiee, an 8-foot-tall Wookiee, want to live on Endor with a bunch of 2-foot-tall Ewoks? That does not make sense!...'What does that have to do with this case?' Nothing. Ladies and gentlemen, it has nothing to do with this case! It does not make sense!...None of this makes sense.

It is a complete red herring about dismissal introduced completely at random—nothing to do with this, absolutely nothing to do with this—as proof that, because I am not doing something about something that has nothing to do with this, that means there is something wrong with this. This is *South Park*; it is crazy. The reality is this is nothing more than it purports to be. I am not intending to do anything about dismissal. If I was it would be in here. This proposition is really, really simple. The chief magistrate may be unable to serve for a range of reasons for an indefinite period of time or a short period of time in circumstances where (a) the deputy chief magistrate is absent, (b) the deputy

chief magistrate is unwell or on leave for some other reason, and (c), and perhaps even more complicated, the deputy chief magistrate does not for whatever reason want to serve—

Ms Chapman: You didn't ask him; you didn't even ask him.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I didn't have to because the law says he is serving. Hello!

Ms Chapman: And if he wasn't available then you would have come in here.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: For goodness sake! If we had not done something about this, if Mr Cannon—and I do not wish this on him—became unwell, he would say, "Why didn't you foresee this and have something fixed? Now you're forcing us to come into this parliament in a rush, just like you did with the District Court. You should have foreseen this, you silly man, you didn't see this coming." Well, hello! We have seen it coming; it is possible, and we are trying to fix it.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, I take it that is a no.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: You can take it however you like but that's the answer.

Ms CHAPMAN: Your position is that you have come in here to deal with this to make it consistent. We say that it is not consistent; it was not before, and the District Court and the Supreme Court acts were silent on these issues, Attorney, and now you are trying to say that you are just fixing up this little tidying up arrangement to make it consistent. I am just asking: are there any other planned amendments to the Magistrates Court Act or, indeed, the others that you say that you are going to move to somehow or another make them consistent? They are an entirely different structure. The terms of appointment, the salaries, the entitlements, the retirement arrangements, the dismissal arrangements are all different. Is it the intention of the government that, apart from this one issue that you say you are going to make consistent with the other legislation, it is going to be amended, that is proposed?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is the intention of the government that at no point in time in the future should the Magistrates Court be in a position where it is leaderless.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it the intention of government that, if it is going to make any amendments to the magistrates' structure (if I put that generally), you will consult with the chief magistrate in respect of his or her court?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That would be my normal practice. If it was something that was actually an issue, like, I was going to say, that their termination arrangements would be different, or something of that nature, I expect I would. We get to the fundamental point here: the member for Bragg sees this as something sinister; I see this as a bit of prudent housekeeping. That is the difference.

Ms CHAPMAN: To use the current legislation, which provides in the Magistrates Court Act that you, Attorney, have the capacity to deal with a situation in the event that the chief magistrate is not able to undertake his or her duties. The terms of the provision in this act make provision for the deputy to do that, and in the event that the deputy is unable or unwilling to undertake that role as part of their duties as the deputy then, of course, you have the power to appoint a new deputy. Why would you not elect that option rather than coming in here and presenting this as some kind of tidying up provision?

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

The SPEAKER: I call the members for Newland, Elder, and the Treasurer to order for interjecting 'Shame!' after the reading of a notice of motion, but, I—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: It is a pleasure to give you that warning—but, I warn the opposition that it is routine for the opposition to yell 'Shame!' after second reading divisions, and I will be warning them also.

Honourable members: Shame!

Dr McFetridge: Kavel made us do it; we didn't want to do it.

The SPEAKER: One man must suffer for the people.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today the Port Elliot and Middleton Probus Club, who are guests of the member for Finniss, and also people from Operation Flinders, who are guests of the member for Adelaide.

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Ministerial Statement

RENEWABLE ENERGY

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Last year, the government sought to suspend standing orders to debate two matters of grave importance to the South Australian economy: Holden and wind farms. Since becoming Prime Minister, we have seen what Tony Abbott has done to Holden, and now he is coming for our renewable energy sector. His proposed cuts to the renewable energy target will hurt existing projects, undermine new investment, and will force up household power prices.

The federal Labor Party has been in discussions with the federal government to try to find a workable solution, but it has become clear that they have no interest in clean energy jobs and investment. They may talk about a 'real 20 per cent' but what they really mean is a 40 per cent cut to the target. For too long, federal policy uncertainty has stalled new investment in the renewable energy sector. Now, that uncertainty is being replaced by the worst-case scenario from the ideologically driven Warburton report, further damaging an exciting industry.

The state government supports a strong and expanding renewable sector because it lowers power prices, creates new manufacturing and clean energy jobs, and reduces Australia's carbon pollution. This is why the state government has made renewable energy investment a priority. Today, South Australia leads the nation when it comes to clean energy. If South Australia was a nation, we would be second only to Denmark when it comes to clean energy generation.

We have a strong competitive advantage in renewable energy generation, with outstanding resources close to existing infrastructure. The decisions this government has made have supported industry to harness these natural advantages and build a nation-leading industry essentially from scratch. If you compare our actions with those of the federal government, the contrast could not be more stark.

That is why today I can announce that I will convene a clean energy summit. The summit will bring together clean energy companies, investors and interest groups to respond to the crisis facing the renewable energy sector, and be held before Christmas. South Australia's manufacturing industry is facing severe pressures. The federal government has driven our automotive industry offshore and has our shipbuilding industry hanging on by a thread. The last thing South Australia needs—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Mazda over there.

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The last thing South Australia needs is another industry packing up because of the sovereign risk created by a federal government breaking another election commitment by proposing to water down the RET. This government will continue to stand up for South Australia's jobs and investment and calls on all members of this place—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Here is your opportunity—to support our clean energy summit.

Mr Williams: Just another whinge!

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is called to order. That's my whinge!

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Dairy Authority of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14

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

Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy, Department for—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for the Public Sector (Hon. S.E. Close)—

State of the Public Sector—Annual Report 2013-14

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:07): I bring up the 13th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

Mr ODENWALDER: I bring up the 14th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

HOSPITAL WAITING TIMES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the health minister. Does the minister stand by his statement made yesterday that our hospital waiting times are among the best performance numbers in the nation, when the National Health Performance Authority report, released in May of this year, showed that our major metropolitan hospitals—the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Flinders hospital—have slipped to the bottom 10 per cent of the emergency department clearance rankings?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:09): What—

Mr Marshall: I mean, if you turn it up the other way, it's pretty good.

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: What I stand by is what I said yesterday, and that was, in terms of people being seen promptly when they present at emergency departments, yes, we are among the leaders in the nation in terms of waiting times.

HOSPITAL WAITING TIMES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): Sorry, can the minister perhaps explain to the house what our clearance rate last year was for the Flinders hospital and for the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:10): The emergency rate is not what I was talking about yesterday. I was talking about how promptly people are seen in emergency departments: when they present to an emergency department, how quickly they are seen by a doctor. According to that data—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

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

HOSPITAL WAITING TIMES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): Nevertheless, sir, can I ask the minister what the clearance rates at those two hospitals are?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:10): I can't add to what I have said, and that simply is what I said yesterday. Yes, I stand by those remarks.

HOSPITAL WAITING TIMES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): A supplementary, sir: how can the minister possibly claim that our hospital emergency departments are improving when all six of the South Australian metropolitan hospitals in the National Health Performance Authority slipped in the national rankings this year—slipped?

The SPEAKER: I suggest that that really isn't a question: it's debate, but the minister may wish to respond to it.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:11): I can't really add much more to what I said yesterday. I have always acknowledged that we do have issues. When a person needs to be admitted into an acute bed, yes, they often can be left waiting for unacceptably long periods in an emergency department, and that is particularly the case in mental health.

That's why I am determined to see changes to the way mental health patients are treated, to make sure that they are not left waiting for sometimes days at a time to be admitted into an acute mental health bed. It is something I am determined to fix. I have always been up-front about that fact. I have also been up-front that we do need to improve our ability to have people quickly admitted, when the decision is made, into a hospital bed rather than being left waiting in the emergency departments. The issue we have is not in fact with our emergency departments. Our emergency departments in fact work extremely well. The issues that we have—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Leader of the Opposition just does not understand nor does he have any interest in our health system and in our hospital system. He is nothing but a political ambulance chaser and—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir: the minister is not responsible for the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Sir, you did indicate that, given the argumentative nature of the question, I would be given some latitude. I have been responding to the inane interjections of the opposition.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir: it is also disorderly to respond to interjections.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the member for Unley's point of order. Minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I have always acknowledged that we do need our system working better, and that's why I've engaged the clinicians. That's why I've gone out to talk to the doctors, the nurses, the allied health professionals, who are actually at the coalface, who understand how our hospitals need to improve, who understand what we need to do to have a better running health system so that we don't have people waiting unacceptably long periods in emergency departments to be admitted.

There is a whole range of things which they are suggesting we need to look at. One is we need to look at how we make our hospitals work on a seven-day basis. People present to our hospitals seven days a week, 24 hours a day but, in many respects, our hospitals are geared towards business hours Monday to Friday. We need to look at how we can make our hospitals more—

Mr Marshall: Are you kidding?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Don't pretend you know a thing about hospitals, you idiot. You do not know a single thing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health is called to order. The Minister for Health will now withdraw and apologise to the person he referred to as 'you idiot' which, on the face of it, was me, not that I take offence.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I do withdraw and apologise to the Leader of the Opposition for my remarks. However, I do maintain that we are looking at how we can improve our hospital system. The best people who are going to be able to provide advice to the government and advice to me as Minister for Health on how we can make our hospitals work better are not those who sit opposite and certainly not the Leader of the Opposition. They are our doctors, they are our nurses, they are our allied health professionals who day by day deal with these sorts of issues and who I am confident can help us transform the South Australian health system to deal with these sorts of issues.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Before we get to the supplementary, it may seem long ago and far away, but I call to order the members for Chaffey, Unley, Hartley, Heysen and the deputy leader. Supplementary, leader.

HOSPITAL WAITING TIMES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): Could the minister perhaps explain to the house why Noarlunga Hospital slipped 46 positions in the national rankings last year, Modbury Hospital slipped 86 positions in the rankings last year, Flinders Medical Centre came 123rd out of 124 hospitals in the rankings, and the Royal Adelaide Hospital came last?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:15): There is little I can add to what I have already said. I have acknowledged the fact—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the second and final time and he will not shout all through my attempt to warn him.

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: There is little I can add to what I have said and that is we have acknowledged we do need to improve our hospital system; in particular, we need to improve how quickly we admit patients once the decision is taken to admit. I had an opportunity to travel to the Alfred Hospital a few weeks ago in Melbourne and I must say there are a lot of lessons which we can learn from the Alfred Hospital. It is a standout.

One of the things which they have pioneered is having direct admission rights so that senior emergency doctors take the decision to admit a patient and their patient is admitted into the ward, whereas, of course, what we have in most of our hospitals in South Australia is that often senior consultants have to go to a registrar, who is a more junior doctor to a consultant, to get permission from the registrar to admit a patient into a ward. There are all sorts of things. We need to look at our diagnostics and we need to look at medical imaging. Every aspect of the hospital we need to examine to work out how we can make it more efficient and, as I said earlier, how we make it work better, particularly after hours when we have some of the biggest delays.

We saw data last week which looked at the frequency of discharges from hospitals on Sunday compared to during the week. There are roughly half the number of discharges on a Sunday compared to a Friday, so it is no wonder that on Monday mornings when people present to our emergency departments, our emergency departments are overflowing with patients needing an acute bed because very few people have been discharged over the Sunday. These are all the sorts of things which we need to address, and we will address these issues. I would call upon the opposition, rather than just behaving like ambulance chasers, to join with the government in a bipartisan way—not to behave like ambulance chasers but to engage with the system and to join the government in a bipartisan way—to look at how we can make our hospitals work better.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the first time. The member for Hammond is called to order, and I remind the leader that if his lips move out of order for the remaining 51 minutes of question time, I will have no choice but to suspend him from the service of the house under the sessional order. Leader, next question.

Mr GARDNER: We give you a list, sir, so that you can have these all ordered. Can I have the call, sir?

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is correct, he is next on the list.

POLICE CELLS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Now that the minister has had 24 hours to read the comments of the police commissioner and given the comments this morning by Corrections CEO, David Brown, that the use of surge beds have an impact on police operations, does the minister stand by his statement in question time yesterday and I quote, '...our current use of surge beds is not having a negative impact on their operations'?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:19): I would like to thank the honourable member for his question. My answer would be the same: nothing was said by the CEO of Corrections this morning on radio which would indicate that is incorrect, as he indicated that we have a number of surge beds allocated to us in a number of cells and, certainly, we use them and we use them on a regular basis. At this point in time—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That's correct—we will do our best to make sure that we keep within that. Having said that, I am confident that both SAPOL and Corrections will meet the orders of any court should they insist that we house somebody.

POLICE CELLS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:20): Supplementary, sir: are any special arrangements being considered in order to deal with the anticipated further spike in prisoner numbers over the Christmas period when the courts are closed for nine days in a row?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:20): All I can say is that I am advised and assured by the department that they have plans in place and, as I said, I can just reaffirm that people who are not given bail by police and need to be housed by Corrections will be housed. If the member would like details on the matters, which I prefer not to go into, I am happy to brief him.

JUSTICE REFORM

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:21): My supplementary—

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: —is to the Minister for Justice Reform. Given that yesterday, when answering a similar question, he identified that the government's approach was going to be based on changes to bail laws and other things in his justice reform package, which is due out, I think, at the end of this year or early next year, and given that the courts are closing for nine days, will the minister now release his bail reform proposals so that they can be considered immediately?

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) (14:21): I thank the honourable member for his question. I am working on a number of proposals, some of them very actively, in conjunction with the Minister for Police and Corrections. As a matter of fact, the Minister for Police and Corrections and I have been very busy in looking at this particular problem, and we feel that we are reasonably close to being in a position where we have something we can say publicly about some of these matters.

I need to emphasise again what I was trying to explain yesterday: none of this is a simple, silver bullet solution to the problem. That is just not the case. It is no more realistic to say, 'Tweak the courts,' or tweak something, 'and you'll solve this problem,' than it is to say, 'Have lessons in being a nice person at school and you won't have criminals committing crime.' It is not that simple.

What has to happen is a series of interconnected changes. My hope is that I will be able to put a paper out in the public domain—which I would be very happy to share and discuss, and I have said this to the member for Morialta before. I am very keen to engage, but it is difficult to engage on a paper that is not yet complete.

When it is complete, I am very happy to engage with the member for Morialta—and, indeed, everybody—about it, but I can say that, in the meantime, there are elements we will be dealing with in that paper that the Minister for Police and Corrections and I have been working on, and I am reasonably confident (and I think the minister would share this view) that we should be in a position to say something about some of these things before the release of that document. But what we will be saying will be something which fits into the high level—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: You can put it that way, but this parliament, in the last parliament, dealt with discounts for early guilty pleas, for instance. That is a part of justice reform. That is one of the pillars of justice reform which we have already put in place. The mere fact that it is already there doesn't mean it is not part of the whole structure. When you are building a house, you put the foundations down before you start putting the roof on, so what—

Ms Chapman: What if the house was already full, overloaded?

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: So that's the situation. Can I say to the member for Morialta, because I know he is genuinely interested in this and he and I have spoken about this, I am happy to engage with the member for Morialta about these matters—I know he does have a genuine interest in it—and as soon as it is possible for me to talk to him about particular matters, I am very happy to do that.

It is not much good me talking to him about things which have not yet been formulated or which I have not yet had the opportunity to discuss with my cabinet colleagues, but as soon as we are in that position, I am very happy to brief the member for Morialta and anyone else who is interested in these matters. As I said before, the Minister for Correctional Services and Police and I have been talking about a number of these matters, and we are hopeful to be able to put something before the parliament and certainly before the public very soon.

JUSTICE REFORM

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:25): A final supplementary on this line, sir: given that the CEO of Corrections in evidence to the Public Works Committee on 9 October identified that the spike in prisoner numbers is partly due to a 30 per cent increase in assault, 50 per cent of which are domestic violence related and also Parole Board warrants and bail breaches, can the minister reassure the house that his proposals to relax bail conditions will not make it easier for these categories of remand prisoners to walk free?

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) (14:26): Again, I thank the honourable member for his question; it is a very good question. I make it clear that in respect of bail he has used the word 'relax'. I do not want to let that word be passed by into *Hansard* and not be commented upon. I am not talking about relaxing bail conditions if what you mean to imply by that is say that a lot of people who should not be getting bail are getting bail; that is not what we mean. We are talking about refining the tests that are used to ascertain whether bail is appropriate in particular cases; that is a different proposition.

The second point is that the primary concern this government has—and we have demonstrated this time and time again in terms of legislative change—is with public safety and an analysis of the risk presented to the public by particular accused people. The member for Morialta in saying that in cases of domestic violence we do have particularly difficult circumstances where there may be a significant risk to particular individuals, although not necessarily to the whole community, is absolutely correct. Of course, we are not taking those matters lightly; they are very serious matters.

The point I was trying to make the other day is that there might be a person who is perhaps facing a custodial sentence because of repeated abuses of the Road Traffic Act—driving without a licence or unregistered and uninsured or whatever the case might be. I am not condoning that behaviour for a moment; I don't wish to say that. But I do raise the question—and it is one of the questions that we will be asking in the context of this overall review of the justice system—is custodial sentence in a prison institution the appropriate way to deal with that person having regard to the risk that that person presents to other members of the community if they were to be punished in a different way? That is the question. I do not purport to have the answer here for you at the moment, but that is the sort of question we are asking because we need to be a bit honest with ourselves here.

The prison system is a very intensive system from the point of view of the people who are in it. It is a resource intensive system, it occupies significant government resources, and it means that the people who are in prison for the time that they are in prison are denied whatever benefits—and I realise sometimes these are not great—they might have of living with friends and family and whatever benefits they might have of potentially being employed. Anybody will tell you that a person in employment who has decent connections with family and other people who will keep them on the right track is less likely to become a reoffender than somebody who does not have that position.

If, for example, we have people who are not dangerous and the alternative is there that that person might be able to be dealt with in a circumstance where they continue to go to work, albeit with a curfew or something, and they continue to live with their family and have some contact and responsibility, it is my view—and I think the data bears this out—that it is more likely than not that that person will produce a better outcome at the end than if you took that person and stuck them in Yatala for two years. That's what I am saying.

JUSTICE REFORM

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:29): A final supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta, you said the last one was a final one.

Mr GARDNER: Well, I am saying it again now, sir. The minister introduced a lot of new information in that answer. The minister is now saying that there are these vast categories of prisoners in our prison system who don't deserve to be there. Where has the minister been for the last three elections?

The SPEAKER: I am very inclined to suspend the member for Morialta from the service of the house for using a supplementary question to make a speech and not even cast it in an interrogatory form.

An honourable member: 'Where has he been'?

The SPEAKER: 'Where has the minister been for the last however many years?' That's a question, is it?

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Morialta to order, and I warn him for the first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Point of order: I appreciate—

The SPEAKER: The minister wants to tell us where he's been!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I have been right here; well, not specifically right here, but—

The SPEAKER: I want the answer to be strictly to the terms of the question: where has the minister been?

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) (14:30): I'm objecting to the use of the word 'vast'. In the question was 'vast numbers of prisoners'. I object; I am being verbally there. Otherwise, the answer is, I have been in this building.

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell.

SCHOOL FUNDING

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How will public schools in southern Adelaide benefit under the Gonski agreement?

The SPEAKER: Minister, you are here; excellent.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:31): Yes, sir; thank you, sir. I want to thank the member for Reynell for her question. Across the state, our public schools are going to benefit to the tune of around \$20.4 million in additional funding next year under our Gonski agreement. This is additional funding which will mean more support for local schools to deliver targeted support and programs for their students.

I have seen how these additional funds are being used directly with students—high achieving students participating in advanced science classes, for example, their interest and engagement such that they do additional work in their lunch breaks, and small groups of young ones receiving specialised assistance in their numeracy and literacy to the point where one young student doing some maths learning said he was now finding maths fun to do.

I saw this during my visit out to Roma Mitchell College, which will be, by the way, receiving \$218,241 to build on these programs next year. This school has grown its SACE completion rate in just three years. Roma Mitchell is one of our super schools—and it is super. It is super in relation to its teachers, super in relation to the students who are going there, and super in relation to the academic achievements they are receiving. They have gone from a 57 per cent completion rate three years ago for SACE to nearly 92 per cent last year.

I also visited last week schools in the member for Reynell's electorate and the member for Kaurna's electorate. Public schools across southern Adelaide will receive an additional \$3 million. Christies Beach High will receive just over \$400,000 in additional funding in 2015. Aldinga Beach Primary School, where they have one of our great new children's centres, yet to be officially opened, will receive more than \$111,600.

There is a big hit coming their way, however. Schools across southern Adelaide will lose more than \$45 million in federal funding, resources and support—the equivalent of more than 400 teachers—because South Australia's Christopher Pyne, the federal Minister for Education, steadfastly refuses to honour the full six years of the Gonski agreement. That means Christies Beach

High losing \$1.4 million in just two years, Aldinga Beach Primary School losing \$875,000, Brighton High losing \$1.8 million—

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The question was specifically about public schools in the southern suburbs that are receiving Gonski money, so I think that the minister's answer under standing order 98—

The SPEAKER: Is the point of order that no school is receiving Gonski funding?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No, sir.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The minister is no longer addressing the substance of the question, because the question was about schools that are receiving Gonski money in the southern suburbs.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I'll read the question again for your benefit, if you like.

The SPEAKER: The minister is clearly a shorthand practitioner.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am, sir, I am.

The SPEAKER: I don't see any merit in the point of order at all. I do not uphold the point of order. Minister.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir. The question I was asked was about the benefit of Gonski, so I've outlined what they will be receiving this year, but in years 2018 and 2019 Christies Beach High School will be losing \$1.4 million in federal funding—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Shame!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —Aldinga Beach Primary School, \$875,000—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Shame!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —in two years of federal funding.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Shame!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Brighton High School, \$1.8 million in two years.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Shame!

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will no longer use 'shame'; he is warned.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Reynella East will be losing \$2.1 million, and Aberfoyle Park High School will be losing \$1.2 million.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Shame!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: This is a scandal, sir. On top of this, indexation applying from 2018 entrenches ongoing disadvantage for all South Australian schools—public, Catholic and independent.

The SPEAKER: Alas! The minister's time has expired. And I warn the member for Newland also for shouting 'Shame!'

Mr Pederick: Chuck him out, sir.

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Hammond really think I should chuck the member out after only one warning?

Mr Pederick: Why not? Set a precedent, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am reluctant to call the member for Morialta because of the way he abused his right to ask a question on the last occasion, but if he is genuinely contrite—

Mr GARDNER: Sir, I am contrite.

The SPEAKER: —I will allow him another question.

Mr GARDNER: I apologise to you. I seek no longer to undermine your authority.

PRISON CAPACITY

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Have there been any days during the current financial year when the number of prisoners in our corrections system has not exceeded the approved capacity within the system?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:37): Thank you for the question. If the question is including the surge capacity—it's not excluding—

Mr Gardner: Approved capacity.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I will have to get that information for you.

PRISON CAPACITY

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:37): Supplementary, sir: has the minister requested or received any advice from the department as to the expected cost of the use of police cells and other surge capacity beds this year, given that the use of surge capacity beds is not included in the annual budget?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:38): Yes, I have received some advice on that to date, but I have also received further advice that all the cost will be absorbed by the department by savings in other areas; so there will be no additional cost to the taxpayer.

PRISON CAPACITY

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:38): Supplementary, sir: given the minister's response just then, that the cost of surge capacity, which last year was \$3 million and this year may or may not be more, and that, further, the government has \$5 million worth of savings as part of the efficiency dividend and that the minister has ruled out any staff cuts, does the minister believe there is any chance he is going to meet his budget targets for the corrections department?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:38): I thank the honourable member for the question, but I think it's unfair to ask me that question in front of the Treasurer. What I can say is that the department and I are working hard to make sure we get as close to that figure as possible.

PRISON CAPACITY

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:39): Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary; third and final supplementary.

Mr GARDNER: I bow to your wisdom, sir. Understanding that there has been a \$2 million increase to the Corrections budget, approved by cabinet, to enable further capital works, as identified in the Public Works Committee in October, are there any other improvements that have been approved by cabinet since 1 July?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:39): What I can say is that all those matters which have been approved by cabinet and have gone to Public Works have been made public. You will be advised of any subsequent application made to cabinet in due course.

WATER PRICING

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:39): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer inform the house of efforts being made to ensure equity in water pricing across the state?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:40): The National Competition Policy requires government to run its businesses the same way as the private sector, earning a real rate of return. However, unlike the private sector, this government reapplies the returns on its investment for the public good. We ensure that the money goes back into our communities, not interstate or abroad.

Over the financial year period 2014-15, the government is forecast to receive \$196 million in contributions from SA Water. The government will return this money to the community in two very significant forms of return on this income—first, our community service obligation payments back to SA Water in the amount of \$126 million, which lower water and sewerage prices and provide for community services, community service obligations that we ensure regular customers do not pay more for than metropolitan customers. For example, without these subsidies, customers in Eyre Peninsula could pay at least 200 per cent more for their water.

The second major return made to SA Water customers during this period is water and sewerage concession payments of \$43 million that benefit low income water and sewerage service customers. Payments are made to ensure that the most vulnerable in our community are supported.

Last year the government took a major step in economic reform of water and sewerage services, handing over licensing and revenue-setting powers to ESCOSA. With the pricing orders in place, the ESCOSA determination resulted in a 6.4 per cent reduction in water prices and a commitment that prices would rise by no more than CPI for the next two years.

On Monday the opposition questioned why we are subsidising so heavily—why are we subsidising so heavily? Why are we ensuring that our rural and remote citizens do not pay punishing amounts for their water supplies? That was actually a question posed by the Leader of the Opposition to the Premier on radio. Because we believe, unlike members opposite, living in the driest state in the driest continent, our community deserves water security into the future. We do not believe in selling off our assets and seeing those returns go overseas. This government will ensure that SA Water continues to provide benefits for all South Australians on a level playing field, even if members opposite think that rural people should be paying more for their water.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is to the Premier. Now that the Premier has had four weeks to consider the comments made by Mr Bruce Lander in his annual report regarding ministerial staff inappropriately using personal email accounts to conduct government business, will the Premier confirm whether or not he has instructed his staff to surrender any relevant emails and directed them to cease this practice, if they are currently doing so?

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) (14:43): The situation in respect of Commissioner Lander's report is that the government is progressively working its way through all of the recommendations in that report. Most of them have already been attended to. The two that the honourable member refers to are ones that I am presently working on in conjunction with officers of my department and in consultation with Commissioner Lander, and I intend providing the Premier with advice about those matters so that he might issue appropriate directions. That, I expect, will be done soon, but it is something we are just working on now. But I want to say this and make it very clear—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I want to make this very clear: the government—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned for the second time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The government does not endorse the use of private emails by staff members—and I include in this, incidentally, opposition staff members—to make sure that material is not appearing in the public domain or on an official record, if that it is indeed the purpose of some of these things. Secondly, we certainly do not endorse, and have never endorsed, the idea of people masquerading in a way which is not transparently absurd on Twitter, particularly if those individuals are making derogatory, defamatory or hurtful comments about other people. That is not acceptable, and even though the Premier has not yet seen my advice, I say: Premier, I will be advising you along those lines. I hope you don't mind me telling you this in front of them—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will be saying too, Mr Premier, that I think we should make a very clear statement to everybody concerned that these things are just not acceptable, and that it is not condoned, and we will not support, encourage or condone people who do these things. We are very clear on where we are going. If—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We agree on that, don't we?

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: Yes.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We agreed on it! We have agreed on it. Nobody here disagrees with any of this; we are all of the same mind. The matter is really resolved, but the actual implementation of that by way of an official edict or some form of instrument, or whatever it might be, is the matter about which we are presently seeking advice.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, deputy leader, who is on two warnings.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): This is to the Attorney: why does it take the Attorney four weeks, since the issue of the potential of this practice being exposed and the potential destruction of documents, including the emails in breach of the State Records Act, which has been identified in the ICAC report—

The SPEAKER: Can we come to the question, please.

Ms CHAPMAN: Why does it take four weeks for you to write an email to send out to the staff in the government that they are not allowed to destroy any emails if they have used this practice, and they are to cease this practice, which has clearly been indicated by the commissioner?

The SPEAKER: I think we have got the question. Deputy Premier.

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) (14:47): Mr Speaker, the member for Bragg, once more, in an attempt to make a point, slightly overshoots it. She is evoking the final scenes from *Downfall* where, in late April-early May of 1945, a large number documents are being loaded into incinerators.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: I think the Deputy Premier is not only being germane, he is being witty.

Ms CHAPMAN: No, not this time, sir. I think it is a bit like the Chewbacca defence: it has fallen flat; it has been used so many times. It is a question of relevance: 1945 is quite a distance away and has nothing to do with his—

The SPEAKER: But it is about hiding documents; they have that in common.

Ms CHAPMAN: If there has been an admission that these documents exist, it is even more concerning as to why it has taken four weeks to draft an edict to the staff in government that they are not to do this.

The SPEAKER: I am intrigued; continue.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: To do this properly, Mr Speaker, I have to have my glasses on originally—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Don't let your hand shake!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and my hand needs to shake. Look, the situation is essentially this: I know, and all of us know, that it is not appropriate for these behaviours to go on. I am confident that all ministers and members of parliament have read the commissioner's report and have taken appropriate action. I can assure the member for Bragg that there have not been bonfires burning in the courtyards of various ministries, and I know of no attempt at all—no attempt at all—to go around searching for or destroying any documents.

As I have said, there are questions about exactly how one can best, by way of an instrument, if that is what is required, enable the Premier to promulgate this in some official fashion. There is no question about what the position is.

The SPEAKER: Further supplementary.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): Has the Attorney-General or the Premier ever used a private email account for the purpose of conducting government business?

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) (14:50): I cannot really comment on what the Premier has done, but I am generally regarded by my staff as having several shortcomings, and one of them is a very poor grasp of technology. In fact, some time ago I discovered that there was a thing called 'email' and it was on the 'interweb', and I had steps taken to remove it. I thought, if people were bona fide in attempting to contact me, they would be disappointed that several years later they had not received a reply because I did not know how to do it, so I had myself taken off it on the basis that people would try another method to contact me.

I am not a user of that particular medium and, as I said, I am pretty sure the Premier does not go around sending lots of emails either. The situation is pretty clear. I think I have made it clear what our view about all this stuff is and we intend to—when I have given the Premier some advice—deal with it accordingly.

The SPEAKER: Third supplementary, deputy leader.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): Further supplementary to the Premier: has the Premier?

The SPEAKER: Has the Premier what?

Ms CHAPMAN: Used a private email for the purposes of conducting government business?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:51): Sadly, I am not very further advanced from the deputy leader on matters of technology.

Ms Chapman: Is that a no?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I rarely use my email and I certainly don't use it for transacting government business.

Dr McFetridge: You sent 90,000 public servants an email, mate!

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett is called to order. The member for Kaurna.

FARE EVASION

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. How has the government continued to address the issue of fare evasion throughout our public transport network?

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) (14:52): I thank the member for Kaurna for his question. I know he has a keen interest in this topic. As some members would be aware, particularly from feedback from their constituents—I know I have had a lot of correspondence from a few members in the house, the member for Mitchell included, about fare evasion—those who do not pay their way on public transport erode confidence in the network for all commuters. That is why the government has continued to place a high priority on reducing the instances of fare evasion through increased compliance activities and better education of people using our public transport system.

In the last two financial years, our compliance enforcement activities have increased, with 10,691 incidents of fare evasion being detected and forwarded for prosecution between July 2012 and June 2014. This compares to 5,384 incidents forwarded for prosecution in the two prior financial years between July 2010 and June 2012. This is nearly a 100 per cent increase between these two periods. These results are a direct impact of more transit police being recruited, effective policing strategies, and increased joint operations between the transit police and the transport department's passenger service assistants (PSA).

As I have already reported to the house, a series of major targeted operations were undertaken in July this year, with 24 operations conducted by transit police and PSAs across the network. I am pleased to report to the house that these targeted strategies, informed by intelligence from transit police, resulted in 767 expiations for evading fares. This has resulted in over \$168,000 in fines to these fare evaders alone; revenue which can contribute to our public transport system for the benefit of all commuters.

In the months following July, department officials and transit police have continued to target key areas of concern and increase their visibility on the network; in particular, an increasing effort on establishing a visible police presence on bus services to complement activities on the rail network.

In August and September this year, another 746 incidents were detected and, again, forwarded for prosecution after over 29,000 bus tickets and over 76,000 train and tram tickets were checked in a sweep of operations. The government makes no apologies for increasing our efforts so that commuters who do the right thing and pay their way on our network are not disadvantaged by those who aren't doing the right thing.

This year, I have had the opportunity to travel on the rail network with our transit police during a regular Saturday night shift and speak directly to the officers who deal with these issues each and every day. They have highlighted their concerns to me, not only regarding fare evasion but also around graffiti prevention, substance abuse and antisocial behaviour both on and around our public transport infrastructure.

Together with a new chief inspector who took charge of the transit services branch earlier this year, transit police have placed a focus on highly visible, uniformed officers travelling with commuters to prevent and deter, let alone enforce, fare evasion as or even before it occurs. Crime prevention initiatives such as these reduce the cost and burden to the community in the areas of compliance, enforcement and prosecution and ensure that the support and confidence of the general public are maintained across our public transport network. As the government continues our record investment in public transport, we will continue to invest in initiatives to reduce fare evasion.

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton.

AUSTRALIAN INTERNATIONAL 3 DAY EVENT

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:55): Goodness me, sir, what a surprise! Thank you. My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister advise the house what attendees can expect to experience at this year's Australian International 3 Day Event?

An honourable member: There will be horses!

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) (14:56): They might expect a little bit of horse activity, a bit of equine involvement. It is a fantastic event. It's the biggest of its kind in the Southern Hemisphere—the only four-star three-day event in the Southern Hemisphere—and one that we are all very proud of.

Tomorrow sees the first of two days of dressage, then on Saturday we will have the cross-country through the Parklands, and on Sunday we will wrap up with the showjumping. We will have some of the world's best riders in action. It's the only place in the world where an event of this nature and this size is held in the heart of a major city.

We have Dirk Schrade—the German Olympic gold medallist and World Equestrian Games winner—and crowd favourite Chris Burton, who is an Olympian and a World Equestrian Games team member. He was a very popular winner of the event last year. We will also have Wendy Schaeffer, who of course won gold in Atlanta in 1996 on Sunburst. She is a terrific South Australian. Unfortunately, Wendy was there last year, but she was on crutches as she had an injury. Megan Jones, who won silver at the Beijing Olympics in 2008, was also on crutches last year, so it's going to be great to have a couple of local heroes back competing this year.

There is also Polo in the Park on Friday night, with plenty of representation from New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. It is a bit of a social scene and a big night out in the beautiful Parklands. The government, through Events SA, is the major sponsor of the three-day event, and we are very proud of the way we put on events of this type; 23,000 people came to last year's event, and we are looking for numbers even better than that this year.

I would like to also place on the record my thanks to Gill Rolton, who of course, on Peppermint Grove, won Olympic gold in Barcelona in 1992 and backed that up in 1996 in Atlanta. Gill has done an amazing job since she has taken over the running of the Australian International 3 Day Event.

I want to thank her for the tireless work that she has done in advocating for her sport and also for organising everything that happens. It's very difficult to put on an event of this magnitude and she does it brilliantly. She has also been promoted to the highest level by the FEI (the International Federation for Equestrian Sports). So congratulations to Gill, and on behalf of all South Australians, I would like to thank her for the tremendous contribution that she has made to South Australia both on the horse and in administration as well.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN REGIONAL ORGANISATION OF COUNCILS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Minister, in noting that the South Australian Regional Organisation of Councils (known as SAROC) has met three times since you as the member for Frome became a minister, can you confirm if you have attended any of their meetings?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:59): I have not had the opportunity because my diary does not coincide with SAROC's. However, I have visited other central local government and SELGA, and it is just a matter of coordinating the diaries; some of those times just do not mix.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN REGIONAL ORGANISATION OF COUNCILS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:59): Supplementary, sir, if I may: will the minister be attending the meeting on 19 November at Clare?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:59): I presume the member means the central local government meeting?

Mr GRIFFITHS: No, sir, I am talking about SAROC, which is meeting next week.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I think I am, but I would have to check. My diary, as you can understand, gets very full and every day there are meetings but certainly, if you want, I can go into

my diary now and have a look. Certainly, if I have a vacant space in there, I will be attending it, but I have to check.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN REGIONAL ORGANISATION OF COUNCILS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:00): Supplementary, sir: as a matter of process, the parliament is aware that the Minister for Road Safety has sought leave to attend the meeting next week, but we are not aware that the Minister for Local Government is attending the meeting, and I don't think it is actually on the agenda. Are you able to confirm what your diary does say, minister?

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for the Public Sector. Can the minister advise the house about recent developments—

Mr GRIFFITHS: Point of order, sir. I believe I asked a legitimate question to the minister, and there was no recognition or response from him at all.

The SPEAKER: Was there a question?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Could the member for Goyder restate the question?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: I don't need to be careful.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN REGIONAL ORGANISATION OF COUNCILS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:01): The house is aware as part of its business practices that the Minister for Road Safety is attending the meeting in Clare of SAROC next week because the minister has sought leave of parliament for that afternoon.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr GRIFFITHS: The question was: why is it that the Minister for Local Government and Regional Development has not undertaken the same process or is attending the meeting?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:01): I was checking my diary to ensure if it was in my diary. It is not in my diary at this particular point; however, if that is the case, I will apply for leave from this house if it is granted, if I am given a pair, to attend that meeting.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for the Public Sector. Can the minister advise the house about recent developments in support of the growth of the information and communication technology industry in the state?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:02): It is hard to believe that it has been 27 years since the first handheld analog mobile phone came into commercial use—I believe that the Attorney-General may still be using one—and it has been just 25 years since the first permanent internet access became available to universities through Australia's academic and research network, known as AARNet. Again, I am not sure if the Attorney-General is quite up to date with that. These two events mark the beginning of what is now the modern ICT industry in this country.

Most of us now take for granted web-enabled smartphones that link to our mobile devices over the internet. These innovations have changed the way we do business, the way we interact socially and also the way we interact with government, and this government recognises that digital technology is critical to the way we modernise and transform our public services.

It is no longer sufficient simply to provide access to information through government websites. Websites now need to provide access to services and also the opportunity to provide feedback to the government through its various agencies. The government needs to be clear about its priorities with ICT for both service delivery and also to guide the ICT industry in this state.

Last night, I was pleased to attend the Australian Information Industry Association dinner, where the Premier announced the Digital By Default Declaration for South Australia. The event was full of positive energy and enthusiasm. The declaration commits the government to proactively transforming its services, including using digital technology. Government services will be designed to be more easily accessible for people and businesses in the community.

South Australians should be able to have access to government services when and where they want through the internet and on their smartphones, laptops, tablets and whatever is the next innovation in this rapidly shifting industry of technology. By March next year, the government plans to finalise a digital landscape report which will identify our capacity to transform government services. A digital report card will also be created so that the community and the industry can judge our progress. Public sector agencies will be expected to transition existing services and paper-based processes to digital platforms. Agencies will develop, in partnership with those affected, new services from a digital-by-default perspective.

They also need to ensure that those who do not use digital media, or only in a limited way, are not disadvantaged. This is very important to me and we must keep in mind that a government must be accessible to all. I am particularly interested in the segment of the population that uses technology but is not comfortable or confident, and I will be looking for ways to simplify our processes and communication methods for that segment.

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Goyder have another question?

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:05): I do, sir, if I may. Again, to the Minister for Local Government. Can the minister confirm if the increase in the emergency services levy costs on local government was discussed with the minister as part of the bilateral discussions prior to the budget with 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) (15:05): All cabinet decisions are taken collectively. The budget was announced and the opposition was informed that remissions would be done differently, through the Economic and Finance Committee. It is not my fault they do not read their papers.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Before the budget. Any questions on the emergency services levy should be directed to me, Mr Speaker, and the government has made its position clear that we are more than happy to return the remissions once the commonwealth reverse their decisions. Interestingly, I noted on the radio the Treasurer, Joe Hockey, talking about—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: I am waiting to see how the Treasurer is going to join up these remarks to the question.

Ms CHAPMAN: Except that the Treasurer has already indicated that not only he should be the sole repository for answering questions on this but he preceded that by saying all of those discussions were cabinet discussions and wouldn't be discussed, so he has answered the question. So, I ask that reference to other discussions are completely irrelevant.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is not upheld. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In the context of the ESL remission changes, the Treasurer was on radio talking about how there had been no cut to funding and that our budget papers were not accurate. I have here a list of cuts. The health special purpose payments, National Health Reform Agreement, provides \$1 billion per year in general funding support to public hospitals. Those cuts—

Ms CHAPMAN: Further point of order. The question was: what discussions were held between the Minister for Local Government and the Treasurer? Unless Mr Hockey was present in those discussions and somehow or other exempt from cabinet solidarity, I suggest it is completely irrelevant to this question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, the government is being asked questions about the removal of remissions to the emergency services levy and I am providing a context for that.

The SPEAKER: They were other questions. This was about the Minister for Local Government's involvement in budget bilaterals.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand, sir, but I am giving a context to those budget bilaterals.

The SPEAKER: I would like you, in the next 30 seconds, to join this up with the question, if you would.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Let me be very clear about this. The long list of cuts made by the commonwealth total \$898.4 million and the state government had five weeks to address this unprecedented cut to our hospitals, our schools and our pensioners. The emergency services levy, in that context, remissions were removed.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, I am trying to put this in context and I do not wish to offend you or the house, but it seems to me there is an inconvenient truth that members opposite do not want to accept when it comes to the emergency services levy, that it is their political party that is responsible for it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, I do not think the Treasurer quite ever joined it up. The member for Chaffey.

PORT PIRIE SPORTS FACILITY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Can the minister confirm how much the state government has committed to build the Memorial Oval sports facility in Port Pirie?

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) (15:09): We have been having discussions with the former mayor of Port Pirie and the council. They came to us about a month ago, about five weeks ago. It was first brought up at an LGA meeting that I was at at the Crowne Plaza hotel, I think earlier this year or the end of last year, and the mayor asked me a question about it at the time.

I said, 'The first thing you need to do is go and talk to the Office for Recreation & Sport about what it is you want to do.' He came and saw me a few weeks ago here at Parliament House with the CE and they said, 'Here is our big plan.' It was like \$15 million. I said, 'Have you been to see the Office for Recreation & Sport?' He said, 'That's right. You told me to do that, didn't you?' He is not the mayor anymore. I will be happy to have discussions with the new mayor. We want to support sport and recreation in all our regions. There is a great development at Port Augusta in the member for Stuart's electorate with \$5 million from the state government, \$5 million from the federal government and the balance which is I think a lot more than \$5 million now from the—

An honourable member: Seven or eight.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Seven or eight—from the local council in Port Augusta, so we want to work with councils and organisations right throughout the state to make sure that people in our regions get access to top quality sporting infrastructure.

*Ministerial Statement***GOSS, HON. W.K.**

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:10): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Hon. W.K. Goss made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills.

*Grievance Debate***SOUTH AUSTRALIAN REGIONAL AWARDS**

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:10): Today I rise to congratulate the individuals, community groups and businesses in the electorate of Chaffey who were worthy winners of the South Australian Regional Awards held in Waikerie recently. I note that the member for Hammond was there. With 383 nominations in the Murraylands and Riverland, it certainly added another level of interest to the Regional Awards this year. In fact, there was an impressive 2,346 nominations across the state, up on last year's figure of 1,949.

It was an honour to present an award on the night, to see proud winners receive their accolades and acknowledge the outstanding efforts of finalists. I would like to briefly speak about some of the award winners in my electorate. The Riverland Youth Theatre was given the Dr+Group Arts Award. The Riverland Youth Theatre offers 3,000 young people annually, aged between five and 26, across the Riverland, opportunities to develop their creative expression, performance and technical skills in the context of their own community and culture since it was created in 1985. Well done to Michael Pater and his team.

The Glenview Poultry Farm won the Telstra Small Business Award. The Glenview Poultry Farm is the Riverland's only commercial egg farm supplying fresh free-range and cage eggs to the Riverland, Sunraysia and Mallee area. Darren, his staff, and particularly his family who are very active in the community, are passionate about the egg industry. You could say that they are quite 'egg-centric' about their business.

Almondco Australia won the Food South Australia Regional Food Award. They also won the Telstra Large Business Award. Almondco, Australian based in the Riverland, was constructed by almond growers under the cooperative approach. Recently I attended the 70-year celebrations for the world leaders in the nut industry, with 85 per cent of Australian growers involved with the state-of-the-art business. Export sales represent 45 per cent of Almondco's sales, and Brenton Woolston, his team and the board of directors are reaping the rewards of their hard work.

Friends of the Pinnaroo Wetlands won the Adelaide Showground Community Group Award, which was a great reward for a lot of hard work by that community. It was a pleasure to attend the official launch of the fantastic wetland project, which is a great example of what can be achieved by a passionate group of volunteers in a small community. The wetland is a strong asset to the town and has been used and contributed to by people across Australia. Jill Nickolls and her group of volunteers deserve that recognition.

The lovely Gwen Webber OAM won the Seniors Card Community Individual Award. Gwen is a popular character in the Waikerie community, having lived there all her life. As a passionate volunteer for a local senior citizens home, schools, church groups and sporting groups, to name a few, she writes a regular column in *The River News*—and when I say 'regular', it has been published for 15 years consecutively. Gwen was a deserving winner.

The Murray Mallee Aged Care Group won the WorkCover SA Health Award. The Murray Mallee Aged Care Group is a local not-for-profit aged care service provider, offering home care to ageing rural people across a 3,500 square kilometre region. The group is very important to my electorate, serving more than 100 clients. Well done to the board and everyone involved.

A favourite of mine, 919 Wines, received the Primary Industries and Regions South Australia Regional Wine Award. Eric and Jenny Semmler at 919 Wines are changing the face of the Riverland wine industry. Eric was recently named the Winestate Australian Winemaker of the Year, and the

winery has won flow-on accolades in recent times. This award recognises the efforts that Eric and Jenny contribute not only to the wine industry but to the Riverland overall.

The Discover Murray River won the Statewide Super Tourism Award. Discover Murray River is Australia's only tourism and travel promoter on the Murray, from source to sea, through South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, established in 1988. Shane Strudwick has done a fantastic job in promoting the Riverland and the Mallee.

I now turn to Meg Gillespie. I have watched Meg over the last five years really blossom. She received the Leukaemia Foundation Youth Award. Meg is a bright and talented young girl who has volunteered much of her time to many organisations. Congratulations. I would also like to acknowledge the finalists: Clint and Liz Frankel, Karyn Skewes, 919 Wines again, Arissto Coffee, Berri District Youth Club, Nancy Murdock, Pinnaroo Golf Club, Arissto Coffee once again and Banrock Station. They have all done a great job, including Caudo Vineyards with its True Grit event. It was extremely encouraging to see so many individuals, community groups and businesses from the Riverland and Mallee acknowledged at these regional awards. Just to see their passion and innovation is an inspiration to all.

REMEMBRANCE DAY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:16): Many commemorations have been taking place this year, and I recently attended one on behalf of the Minister for Veterans Affairs, organised by Legacy on Friday 31 October, to remember horses in war. It was fittingly held at the War Horse Memorial, that familiar landmark that we all know on the corner of North and East terraces. Many dignitaries from many other service organisations assembled with a large contingent of the public with an interest in the ceremony to welcome His Excellency the Governor Hieu Van Le in very hot and windy conditions.

Legacy is a uniquely Australian voluntary organisation established in 1923 and dedicated to supporting the families of incapacitated and deceased vets. Legacy's caring and compassionate service assists over 90,000 widows and 1,900 children and dependants with a disability nationally. In South Australia and Broken Hill over 8,000 widows and 120 children and dependants with a disability are assisted.

Support provided by Legacy now extends to include dependants of members of today's Australian defence forces who have lost their lives or health as a result of their military service. As a charitable not-for-profit organisation, Legacy works to raise most of its own funds. The service was enhanced by the attendance of men and horses from the Barossa Light Horse and a contingent of police greys. Thanks go to them and the catafalque party from the 1st Armoured Regiment, chaplain Matthew Stuart from the 16th Air Land Regiment, bugler Corporal Bowden from the Australian Army Band, and a member of Equestrian SA. The Pulteney Grammar School band provided the wonderful music for the service.

Legatee Reg Williams RFD provided the welcome and intros. Legacy President, Legatee Keith Bleechmore gave the address of remembrance. Gareth Heron, who was the Equestrian SA rep, gave a wonderful tribute to the horses and mentioned that this weekend, as the minister said earlier, the Parklands will host that wonderful world-class four-star three-day event. Major Roger Burzacott RFD (Retd) recited the ode to the fallen horses. The numbers of mounts lost during all conflicts was staggering, and after building close relationships and relying on the courage of their mounts, many soldiers were forced to put them down rather than have them have an uncertain future. I believe only one horse returned to Australia. We definitely will remember them.

Again, yesterday on Remembrance Day, I attended the ceremony at Modbury High School. Principal Martin Rumsby and deputy principal John Wood welcomed guests and students to what has become a wonderful local tradition. A catafalque party of RAAF cadets distinguished themselves with a very polished display. The school concert band, led by Ms Baker, gave its usual masterly performance, and Olivia Mitchard led vocals for the national anthem. School vice captains read the poem *Why wear a poppy?*—something we are all no doubt familiar with—and school captains assisted me with the wreath laying ceremony.

One of our highly decorated local vets, Rocky Anock, recited the ode. A really stirring moment was when piper Matthew Burford's rendition of *Highland Cathedral* rang through the gym,

accompanied by the band. It was even more commendable when we realised that Matthew had only been playing the bagpipes for 12 months.

The highlight this year was the address by Flight Lieutenant Andrew Spear, who is a credit to his uniform, his family and all who have shaped him. Himself an Afghanistan veteran, he spoke of a posthumous VC winner, and used that fine example of service to country to inspire all who had gathered—the entire school student body, all staff and many associated with the school community. I have rarely heard a more inspiring or better crafted speech, which was truly from his heart. He will be a hard act to follow. Perhaps Brendan Nelson, himself a former student of Modbury High School and now director of the Australian War Memorial, can be coaxed into attending one of our events. I know that the actual Remembrance Day would be a very hard day to secure him, but we hope one day he will return to Modbury High and witness what has, as I said, become a fine local tradition.

I put on the record my admiration and thanks for all who are involved in this event to recall the valour of all who have served and especially those who made the ultimate sacrifice in war. Lest we forget.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert.

STATE BUDGET

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:20): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and you honour us with your presence, not that I am reflecting on such. I rise today to try to bring some different information into a debate that has been running since the federal and state budgets and the recent debate about the need to scrap the emergency service levy remissions, which would bring about \$90 million to the government. I wanted to put that \$90 million per annum tax increase into perspective. What I want to put aside first off is the fact that in 2014 the state government blew out its own budget by \$311 million, or the fact that the Treasurer's own budget was blown by \$15 million or, indeed, that the emergency services minister's own budget was \$26 million over, not underlying the fact that maybe there are more prudent ways for this government to manage its own budget.

I wanted to talk about a number of items that the public and I would consider as waste. I am somebody who regularly goes to my local pub and enacts the pub test, and there are some things that have not passed muster. First off with those is the revolving door and separation package payouts this government has had to pay out because of its own ineptitude. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet has, after the election, cleaned out 15 ministerial advisers at a total cost of \$714,000 (there is an item where we could save a bit of money). The fact is that Rod Hook's separation package was over half a million dollars, Fred Hansen's was almost \$400,000 and Lino Di Lerna's was about \$450,000.

If we leave those aside, this government's idea that government advertising is a fantastic spend of money really needs to be put into perspective when we look at the harsh household budgets that are being affected by these emergency services levy increases. The government's big build advertising campaign, at a cost of \$180,000 to the taxpayer, or the government's politically motivated campaign against the federal budget cuts of \$1.1 million—\$1.1 million—prove that there is plenty of money that we can save, not underlying the fact that the government has spent \$267.9 million giving TVSPs to 2,325 people, but at the same time total general government sector employment has increased by 1,898 FTEs. I do not understand how you can voluntarily separate 2,000 people but still increase by 2,000 people. I think the maths there is a little bit skewed.

I think that is \$267.9 million that this government could have saved by being a little bit smarter about the way they have gone about it. The fact is that almost every single IT project that this government has undertaken has blown out. EPAS has blown out by \$54 million, with a potential for \$100 million worth of blowout. The fact is that RISTEC was originally billed for \$22.6 million and is now at \$54.1 million, but at the same time it will not be able to administer the taxes that it originally said it would; in fact, its scope has reduced even though its cost has doubled.

I will talk about the ongoing saga that is CASIS. I know that the member for Morphet dreads estimates every year when he has to come in here and get another blowout figure from the minister in relation to this. It started off as a \$600,000 project and has turned into a \$5.8 million behemoth, and the stupid thing is that it has not even been implemented properly. It has blown out almost 10

times its original cost, yet it still has not actually delivered what it said it would deliver. You really do question whether or not this government can deliver.

I would also like to point out some of the very political decisions of this government. If the member for Waite wants to talk about his independence, about him being part of a prudent, financial government that manages its budget well and is delivering to the people of South Australia, I think he should look no further than the \$8.4 million that this government is spending by increasing its frontbench and giving him an office—\$8.4 million. I find that spending an absolute disgrace.

There have been plenty of opportunities for this government to save money. We have talked about the More Than Cars advertising campaign worth \$450,000, and I understand there are plenty of spare T-shirts to go around. We have talked about the Adelaide Oval acceleration, which cost the state government \$600,000, which in the end was a complete waste of money, on top of the money that was spent on bringing the Rolling Stones here in the first place. But the kicker, Deputy Speaker, is the \$130,000 that we spent advertising Adelaide to Adelaideans.

HORTICULTURE ROUND TABLE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:25): I would like to speak about something that happened in one of the rooms in Old Parliament House today. I had the opportunity to bring together people from horticulture, the chicken industry and pork producers with government departments, ministers and horticultural representatives at a horticulture round table aimed at cutting industry red tape.

The horticulture round table aims to cut red tape that we estimate is holding back about \$50 million worth of potential investments in the Northern Adelaide Plains and the greater South Australia area. I was pleased to hold this round table in collaboration with the Hortex Alliance, a horticultural industry group based in Virginia within my electorate of Taylor.

I am very grateful to the chair of that alliance, Dino Musolino, and their executive officer, Bryan Robertson, who were both at the table today speaking with minister Bignell, who attended, as well as representatives from minister Rau's office and minister Piccolo's office and representatives from the CFS, the MFS, DSD and PIRSA. It was wonderful to have all these people in the same room so that we could work closely together with the South Australian government to further economic development throughout the state, particularly considering that the horticultural industry of South Australia contributes more than \$1 billion to the state's economy.

The industry was very interested to talk about issues such as fire regulation and modernising our building code. We are looking to build new glasshouses, grow new jobs and increase our export capacities to South-East Asia. As I said, I was greatly appreciative of minister Bignell's attendance at the round table today for more than an hour, and minister Piccolo, and their support over the previous weeks in trying to resolve some of the emergency services perspectives about building regulations.

The chairman of Primary Producers South Australia and member of the Economic Development Board, Mr Rob Kerin, was also there and he was very optimistic about the outcomes from the meeting. Rob has gone on the record as saying, 'Primary industries are major contributors to our local economy, this round table was about helping primary producers avoid these extra business costs caused by red and green tape. It is great to see industry and government working together to further a key state economic priority.'

Mr Musolino, a lettuce grower and salad mix grower in my electorate, believes that the round table helped resolve some long-standing issues. He said it was very important to see people actively listening at the meeting and making useful contributions and that they will work together on these solutions going forward.

Some of the key outcomes of today's round table included minister Piccolo allowing the establishment of a peer review panel to assist primary producers to navigate the process of obtaining fire regulation approval and DPTI forming a reference group that will talk to industry, planning experts and emergency services to modernise planning laws, particularly around glasshouse codes 8 and 10a.

I cannot say how highly I appreciate the efforts of everyone who helped us convene this round table, which we have been working on since early March this year. I would particularly like to acknowledge the contribution of Julie Woodman from my electorate office and Juan Legaspi, my parliamentary adviser. Their work has been invaluable, as has the work of all the other ministerial officers. This is just the beginning of the work we are going to do together with the Hortex Alliance, and I look forward to updating the house on it further at a future date.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:29): I rise today to speak about the renewed local governments which will soon be sworn in to the communities within my electorate following the conclusion of the three-week postal voting period on Friday and the counting of ballots over the weekend. As I have mentioned before in this place, I have a great interest in local government, having been a member of the City of Marion council prior to my election to state parliament. I learned a huge amount when I was on Marion council and it served as a great apprenticeship for my eventual election to this place.

I believe that local government is a tier of government that has a significant and immediate impact on the lives of its constituents, and a well-functioning, responsive council should be able to deliver good things for its communities and citizens. What makes a well-functioning council is open to conjecture, but I would suggest it includes effective working relationships between councillors and the mayor, between councillors and the chief executive officer, and between the mayor and councillors. Councillors with strong existing links into communities and a good knowledge and understanding of what makes their communities tick are also important traits. The best councillors on the councils I have dealt with were those who had strong, legitimate connections to their communities prior to their elections.

I have mentioned in a previous speech here that I believe local governments have a substantial role to play in developing their local economies, and I believe this is a function that is too often overlooked by elected members and their administrations. Some councils do this well, but others do it poorly or not at all. I would urge incoming councillors to keep economic development at the forefront of their minds and reflect on how every decision they make enhances or hinders their local business environment.

Councils should be looking to create an environment which helps business flourish, minimising bureaucracy and sweeping away unnecessary barriers to progress, change and innovation. Overzealous by-laws, planning regulations, approaches to rezoning, consistency of applying planning laws, rating policies and economic development strategies are all things that councils should have in their minds when they are working to achieve this.

The electorate of Bright is divided fairly evenly between two local government areas: the City of Marion, which includes Hallett Cove, Marino and part of Seacliff Park, and the City of Holdfast Bay, which includes the other part of Seacliff Park, Seacliff, Kingston Park, South Brighton, Brighton, Hove, North Brighton and Somerton Park. Both councils have achieved substantial change in their most recent round of elections.

In the City of Marion, long-serving mayor and influential local government figure, Felicity-ann Lewis, chose not to recontest her position and was replaced by Kris Hanna, who was elected unopposed. In Coastal Ward, we have two new councillors, with councillor Cheryl Connor retiring and the vacancy I created when I left needing to be filled. Ian Crossland, an active community member, police officer, key member of the Blue Light Disco movement, founding member of the Friends of the Lower Field River, and the man responsible for turning the Hallett Cove Surf Club into a must-visit local eatery, was elected with a result surpassing the required quota. He will be joined by longtime Marino resident, author, thoroughbred racing expert and active community member, Tim Gard.

In the other Marion ward which touches Bright, Southern Hills Ward, councillor Kathleen Allen returned, and councillor Frank Verrall was not re-elected, replaced by local Rotarian, small businesswoman and disability advocate Janet Byram, and stalwart of the Trott Park Community Centre, Nick Westwood.

In the City of Holdfast Bay, there have been some very significant changes to the council. Long-serving mayor, Dr Ken Rolland, was not re-elected after 12 years serving as mayor.

Dr Rolland's public service should not be underestimated. He and his wife, Anne, have selflessly dedicated many years to serving the Holdfast Bay community and were regulars at almost every community event I attended within their jurisdiction during my time as a candidate and as an MP.

Dr Rolland has been replaced by former deputy mayor, Stephen Patterson. Mr Patterson is a 43-year-old father of four. He is a former Collingwood footballer, has a successful IT business and is an active surf lifesaver at Glenelg. I look forward to working with Mr Patterson as he provides a new focus for the City of Holdfast Bay and takes it forward for the next four years.

I also want to mention the new councillors in Seacliff Ward—an all-women team: well-known real estate agent Annette Bradshaw joins existing councillors Lynda Yates and Susan Lonie. In Brighton Ward, long-serving councillor Rosemary Clancy is joined by re-elected community member, Karen Donaldson, and by Bob Snewin, CEO of Craniofacial Australia and treasurer of the Royal Adelaide Show. I look forward to working very closely with the City of Holdfast Bay and the City of Marion as we work together to make our local communities the best that they can be.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are talking about this surf club that has great food: do they do good schnitzels?

Mr SPEIRS: Absolutely; in fact, Somerton Lifesaving Club has its \$10 schnitzel night on Wednesday evenings, so if you would like to come dine as my guest—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You tempt us. Member for Kaurna.

Mr PICTON: We will have to have you down to Kaurna as well, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I need to eat down south, yes.

WHITLAM, HON. E.G.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:34): On 21 October, Australia sadly lost former prime minister Edward Gough Whitlam, a man who helped transform our country from a closed, conservative nation to a progressive, fair nation, ushering in more reforms in the first few weeks than most governments could achieve in the first few years. Our house obviously has had a condolence motion already, which was time limited, so I was keen to make some remarks about Gough during this grievance debate.

Following the passing of Gough, I was brought to some bedtime reading of some of his important speeches. Given the great orator he was, there are many, but I came across the following passage in his 1972 'It's Time' speech that still rings true today, as it did then. No, I will not be attempting the voice, but I would like to quote the following passage:

If Australia is ever to have decent schools and equal opportunities, if we are ever to have decent hospitals where they are needed, if we are ever to have decent cities and public transport, the national government must be directly involved. For too long the federal system has been used as an alibi. Our national government is less involved in the great national matters than the national government of any other federal system, and yet our national government has a greater share of national finances and resources than that of any other federal government. In Australia the federal government raises 77% of public revenues, in the United States 64% and in Canada and West Germany 50%. My basic proposition is this: that any basic service or function of our community which can be hitched to the star of the Commonwealth grows in quality and affluence. Any function or activity which is financially limited to the States will grow slowly or even decline. Further, a function will be fairly financed to the extent that the Commonwealth finds the money for it. A function will be unfairly and inadequately financed if the whole burden falls upon the States.

I think that passage has the same currency today as it did 42 years ago. Take the figure Mr Whitlam used, that in 1972 77 per cent of public revenue went to the federal government. If you compare that figure to now, some 84 per cent of revenue goes to the federal government. If you take out the federal tax of GST from their ledger and put it onto the states' ledger, the federal government percentage still stands at 72 per cent.

That is a huge percentage for one level of government, when a much larger percentage of the services are actually provided through states and territories than that figure would suggest. This puts a huge reliance on both the GST, which is obviously a tax that relies heavily on consumer sentiment and so can go up and down unpredictably, and on grants from the federal government through special purpose payments and national partnership agreements.

In the past year, we have seen some dramatic threats to this already precarious federal-state funding balance. Firstly, the federal government has ripped up the federal health reform agreement, cutting \$50 billion over 10 years from state finances and from our public hospitals. This agreement sought to address the imbalance between funding sources, as Whitlam referred to, and to help public hospitals meet the growing demand for services due to the ageing of the population. Under this agreement, the commonwealth would have funded 50 per cent of the growth funding. Hospitals, of course, are the largest growing area of expenditure across all levels of government.

Therefore, it was incredible to hear the federal Treasurer on ABC radio this week saying that the federal Liberal Party had only committed to increasing funding for four years, not for the whole agreement, when in fact the policy they released, as I have previously said to the house, said that they committed to reaching that 50 per cent goal of their share of increased funding, which they are absolutely not going to do; in fact, their share is going to continue to fall as a proportion of hospital funding over time.

The second issue that has happened recently is that the Prime Minister has also started, as he says, a conversation about the federation and the GST, both increasing the GST and separating areas of responsibility of federal and state governments. In fact, he even insultingly said that he is 'inviting the Labor Party, the state governments to join Team Australia and think of our country and not just the next election'.

Firstly, it is completely derogatory to the states to suggest that, if they do not want to increase the GST, then somehow they are un-Australian. It also does not address the fact that the states face an issue of a heavy reliance upon one particular tax, not a broad range of taxes such as the commonwealth has at its disposal. Of course, the Prime Minister does not seem to care that an increase in GST would hit low-income earners the hardest since they spend the largest percentage of their income and have little ability to evade tax, unlike higher-income earners.

As the Premier has said, it is not as easy as the commonwealth getting out of each other's way. All of our public services are linked. Taking health, for instance, GPs, hospitals and aged care are all connected; and with schools, universities, TAFE and jobs are all connected. I think it is as true now as it was in Whitlam's time that to properly improve services the commonwealth needs to play a role.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 13.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have asked a question, and I am waiting for the answer.

The CHAIR: Sorry, he is answering what?

Ms CHAPMAN: The question I asked before lunch.

The CHAIR: A question from beforehand, right. Are you right, Attorney?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am up to a point, Madam Chair. The member for Bragg asked me a number of questions before the luncheon adjournment, and they have sort of just merged into a single basic question in my mind. I am wondering if she could just refresh my memory about the last in that series of questions.

Ms CHAPMAN: In respect of the Magistrates Court Act provisions, the terms of that act make provision for the deputy to undertake the duty that we are referring to in this legislation. In the event that the deputy is unable or unwilling to undertake that role as part of their duties as the deputy,

then of course you have the power to appoint a new deputy. The question was: why would you not elect that option rather than coming in here and presenting this as some kind of tidying up provision?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Let us follow that little hypothetical through. The hypothetical is I have a deputy chief magistrate and a chief magistrate. The chief magistrate, either by reason of being on leave or being unwell, is not available. The deputy chief magistrate is either not around the place or is on leave or says, 'I do not want to do the job.' Incidentally, not everybody wants to do this job, but that is sort of by the way.

The question is: why do I not make somebody else deputy? The answer could be put another way. The punishment for the deputy chief magistrate for not agreeing to take a job they do not want to do is that I sack them as deputy chief magistrate so I can appoint 'my friend'—because that is the way this thing has been sort of tricked up by everybody—to be deputy chief magistrate so they can go in the job. I think that is horrible—absolutely horrible.

Ms Chapman: You can do it anyway.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Here is the point, isn't it? If I can do it anyway and this thing was this great big conspiracy—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order, member for Bragg!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If this was something that had been cooked up by the illuminati and I am part of this thing then, of course, I would have done that already, wouldn't I?

Ms CHAPMAN: The only thing missing in that little scenario and performance, Attorney, is that you already have a current law which says the deputy does it. You did not inquire on this occasion whether there was any difficulty with that, as had been exposed in relation to the position of a vacancy coming up in the District Court. You did not make any inquiries if there was any problem with that. You are suggesting to us in this committee that this is just a little tidy up to make it all the same as the District and the Supreme courts to avoid a future problem.

That is what you are trying to convince us of, and yet you have a Magistrates Court Act which makes certain provision and does allow for the extraordinary circumstances where, for whatever reason, there is no-one to fill the job when the chief magistrate is unwilling or unable to do the job and there is no deputy in a position to do that. In those extraordinary circumstances you have power to act under this legislation.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Point number one is that I completely disagree with that last statement. Point number two is—and I am going to say this really slowly again—this has nothing to do with the person who currently occupies the role of deputy chief magistrate.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIR: The deputy leader is reminded she is on two warnings from question time and I will not hesitate, considering there have been a number of questions already on this clause, as I have just been reminded by the table, so we need to move things along in an orderly fashion.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will take it into a different context so it is perhaps easier to comprehend. You are in your backyard one day minding your own business—a nice place to be—and your neighbour's house burns down. The house just burns down right next to you and you speak to your neighbour who luckily is not in the house. They come home and the house is burned down and you say, 'Terrible thing,' and they say, 'Yes, and you know what? Thank God we had insurance because if we did not have insurance we would be in a terrible mess.' And you think, 'Hey, that is an idea. What if my house burns down?'

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Or a forest.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Or a forest.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: 'Wouldn't it be nice if I had insurance?' So being a prudent householder who has seen the District Court nearly burn down in my metaphorical analogy-type scenario—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! The deputy leader is reminded.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and having suffered the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune by being tortured verbally by the member for Bragg for having rushed this thing in here at the last minute to cover up my failings, having been so chastened and absolutely scarred by that, I have decided never again will I be in the position where the member for Bragg can tear me to shreds for having to rush something into this parliament at the last minute. I have peered into the crystal ball. I have seen the unlikely but possible and I have decided to put my insurance here in the legislation.

Clause passed.

Clause 14.

Ms CHAPMAN: This also deals with the question of reform under the Magistrates Court Act. My question now is: having decided that you wanted to make provision for this contingency, why was it necessary to remove provision for the first stage being that the deputy do the job and then, in the event that they are not available, that there be appointment by someone else?

Given that that is one of the circumstances in which it is appropriate to have a deputy, and as much as we have deputies, whether in government departments, magistrates courts or anywhere else, so that they can take the leadership in circumstances like this, especially as it is specified in the act, why do you not add a clause to provide that in the event that he or she was unable or unwilling to do the job, you pick an arrangement with your captain's pick?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I have got the question. The answer I have given umpteen times already. Quite frankly, the situation in the superior courts has always been that, even though there was no formality about who should be the stand-in person in the event of the senior judge being unavailable, the convention had more or less been that it would be the senior puisne judge and if, for some reason, they were not interested or suitable, it might be somebody else.

I do not know that I can expand on this anymore. I do not see why the Magistrates Court should be any different to the other two courts, full stop. The problem is this is all about the conspiracy theory. I do not know how many times I have to say it. I have had a number of meetings with Dr Cannon. I do not have any particular issue with Dr Cannon. He has been, actually, quite helpful in the role.

This is not about Dr Cannon but it might be that we are in the circumstance because of bad luck or coincidence or serendipity where the fact that we have not passed this thing is an embarrassment, and the opposition, if they succeed in blocking this, will be totally to blame for that and the theatre of having to rush something into this place to deal with a problem we should never have had will be their responsibility.

Ms CHAPMAN: I can take that threat, Attorney, and I welcome it, in a way. What I will say is this. You keep saying you want to have consistency with the other courts and their legislation but let us remember the retirement age issue and, again, you keep saying, 'I have no issue with Dr Cannon having this position, this is not about him,' etc., but two years ago we were standing here in this parliament having to deal with the government's attempt to reduce the retirement age—not to be consistent with other superior courts but because you wanted to decide to move it from 70 to 65 years of age. Let us not be cute about this.

The Hon. J.R. Rau: Hang on, you've got it completely back to front.

Ms CHAPMAN: You may say that, but you backed off at the time, so let's be realistic about this.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Number one, we have moved from the peripheral to the utterly irrelevant. We are now talking about something completely different. We are back into the Chewbacca defence again. The thing is I made no secret of the fact that we were in favour of moving

it from 65 to 70. I made it clear at the time that we intended to do that as part of a portfolio bill, and I cannot exactly remember which portfolio bill it was.

For reasons that evade my comprehension, the member for Adelaide, in one of her few interventions into the Attorney-General's Department, found it necessary to move an amendment when another bill was in the place to increase the retirement age of magistrates from 65 to 70. It was an unusual intervention by the member for Adelaide. At the time I said, 'I am not going to oppose this amendment because I fully intend to do this myself.' It is just that—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Slow down. Read the *Hansard*, member for Bragg.

The CHAIR: Order! Sit down. Deputy leader, I have to ask you to observe the rules of the house. Do not interject. Attorney.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Anyway, I was just setting the record straight. I have never had an argument about retirement ages being moved to 70. This has nothing to do with Dr Cannon. It has got nothing to do with retirement ages. It has got nothing to do with pensions. It has got nothing to do with salaries. It has got nothing to do with termination of employment. What it has got to do with is, in the event of the court being leaderless, what is good enough for the Supreme Court and good enough for the District Court should be good enough for the Magistrates Court. Full stop.

The committee divided on the clause:

Ayes 21
 Noes 18
 Majority 3

AYES

Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.	Brock, G.G.
Caica, P.	Close, S.E.	Digance, A.F.C.
Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.	Hughes, E.J.
Kenyon, T.R.	Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Rau, J.R. (teller)	Snelling, J.J.
Vlahos, L.A.	Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.

NOES

Bell, T.S.	Chapman, V.A. (teller)	Gardner, J.A.W.
Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P.	Knoll, S.K.
Marshall, S.S.	McFetridge, D.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Redmond, I.M.	Sanderson, R.
Speirs, D.	Tarzia, V.A.	Treloar, P.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Williams, M.R.

PAIRS

Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Pengilly, M.R.
------------------------	----------------

Clause thus passed.

Clause 15.

The CHAIR: Do we have any questions on clause 15?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, I do. I think we have to move that—

The CHAIR: What's wrong, member for Stuart?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The Auditor-General's Report?

The CHAIR: Order, everybody! Please take your seats or leave the chamber.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Mr GARDNER: Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

(Continued from 11 November 2014.)

The CHAIR: We have the Treasurer's reporting section, and we ask him to commence.

Mr MARSHALL: My question relates to the Auditor-General's Report, Part B, Volume 6, page 2080, regarding the RISTEC system. In particular, that page references note 8 in the financial statements, which I find on page 2103. On that, note No. 8 has a heading 'Derecognition of assets', which I presume is \$4½ million. Can the Treasurer advise the house what this refers to, the derecognition of assets of \$4½ million in 2014?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the financial statements of DTF in the Auditor-General's Report to parliament show a write-off of \$4.515 million in relation to the RISTEC project. The write-off relates to funds expended in previous accounting periods but capitalised as part of the RISTEC system asset. This money has been included in the cost of the project as previously reported and is not a new cost.

The decision to discontinue release 3 (R3) in its current form means that, under accounting standards expenditure, I am advised that expenditure related to release 3 can only be treated as an asset to be amortised over future accounting periods but, rather, must be treated as an expense. I am also further advised that, if a future decision is made to proceed with an SAP-based solution or an alternative solution for R3, the department can still use and take advantage of the design and specific R3 work undertaken to date.

I am further advised that specifications, functional and technical and operation works can still be applied to SAP solution, or elements of this work can be applied and used in the development of an alternative solution. Basically, the advice I have received is that it is an accounting standard and that we have allocated it in the appropriate way.

Mr MARSHALL: Yes, but just on that are you suggesting that this is \$4½ million which has previously been expensed, then capitalised and now written off, relating to work done on stage 3, which is now not going to continue?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is the advice I have, but I have also just received advice, which you probably heard, that it is not lost; we could still probably use it.

Mr MARSHALL: You are writing off an asset; why would you write off an asset if it is something that you are using? Can you also explain whether there are any other expenses here related to phase 3 of the RISTEC implementation which have been expensed in the past?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not understand the last part. Do you want a list of any other expenses on top of the \$4.5 million that have been written off as part of the R3 RISTEC program, or do you want a breakdown of the \$4.5 million?

Mr MARSHALL: Treasurer, you explained that in expensing the work done on RISTEC phase 3 you would capitalise that onto the balance sheet, and you have then written it off the balance sheet. So, you have taken it from an expense to a capital item, and now you have written it off. What I would like to know is whether any other expenses have been incurred for RISTEC phase 3 which, as I understand from your responses to estimates, will not be going ahead.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The advice I have is that there are no other works that have been written off as a result of not proceeding with the expense. Again, Treasury and Finance want to reinforce to the committee that it does not mean that if we decide to proceed with R3 this work is lost.

Mr MARSHALL: It is my understanding that phase 3 will not be proceeded with; in other words, it has been lost. Does the RISTEC system deal with the ESL payments?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that, no, it is not and that it is still legacy programs running the ESL billing system for this period.

Mr MARSHALL: Which system is that, sorry?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the system is called Climber and it is part of a legacy system the department has in place.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the Treasurer advise the house if any cost was incurred and what that cost may be to update the system with regard to the changes to the remission announced in the budget?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that there was a cost. We do not have that here now, but I can get that for the committee.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the Treasurer advise whether that work was done internally or externally? If it was done externally, who did that work?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that it was done externally by an IT company called Prophecy.

Mr MARSHALL: And you will come back to the house with the cost of that. I am still on this ESL line but I am happy to change the reference, so that it is a bit more relevant, to Part C, page 8, which deals with this matter. My question is really to do with the aged care sector and the implementation of the removal of the remission policy of the government and the impacts upon the aged care sector. The Treasurer has spoken on this in the past, but we still do not have perfect clarity regarding either the retirement sector or the aged care sector. Can the Treasurer give us an update on that and when the industry is likely to be informed of the outcome?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As I advised the FIVEaa Leon Byner program and the 891 program, and I think the parliament but I will have to check, it is not the government's intention to have people who are living in supported accommodation or retirement villages impacted by the removal of the ESL remissions. I understand that to the best of the department's knowledge there has been a stop put on all accounts for people in that type of accommodation. We are in discussions with the industry about how best to manage it.

As the Leader of the Opposition and the house may be aware, it is very difficult. There are quite a number of mixed people in retirement villages and nursing homes. We have not come to a final landing yet, but it is certainly the government's intention that we maintain the remissions for people who receive the appropriate concession cards, regardless of the supported accommodation, be it a retirement village or likewise. We will have an answer for the house very soon, but we are in constant contact. The commissioner is in contact, I am advised, with the industry to make sure that we are working through a solution.

Mr MARSHALL: On that same reference, what budget did Treasury advise the Treasurer would be a suitable budget for the retirement village sector and the aged care sector for the removal of the remissions of the total amount of \$355.8 million?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Do you want the total?

Mr MARSHALL: The total amount in your budget was \$355.8 million. What percentage or what dollar amount of that was envisaged would come from the retirement village sector and what was envisaged would come from the aged care sector? And if they are both removed, what will be the hit to the budget?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are talking mainly about retirement villages here, but I will have to get that back to you. I am not sure that nursing homes were ever envisaged as part of the exemption. But in terms of the breakdown of the—is it \$327 million or \$355 million? I will have to check because I do not have those numbers in front of me. I can get you a percentage cost, remembering that it is not our intention to collect that money from the retirement village sector because we are trying to work out a way of making sure that people who are in retirement villages who have the appropriate concession cards still maintain their remissions.

Given that they do not own property, they still have a right to occupy. It is something that the commissioner is working through, and we are working through that with the industry. There are a number of issues that have come up with this industry—not only that, but in terms of stimulus packages that the government has announced as well through conveyance duty and stamp duty exemptions that the industry has brought up. I am certainly looking at that to make sure that they are not disadvantaged when the government makes its policy decisions. I can get you those details but I just do not have them here with me now.

Mr MARSHALL: On that same level, are you suggesting that aged-care facilities will not be part of this envisaged exemption?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The people we are trying to exempt are people who are analogous to owning their own property but have the appropriate concession cards. Again, that is not necessarily a nursing home, but it is a retirement village. They are the people we are attempting to exempt. That is what we are working through. Anyone who is in an analogous position to that (that is, accommodation that is like ownership of property but they are in a communal setting such as a retirement village) their concessions must be honoured because the government made that commitment, and we are trying to work through with the industry how best to apply that.

It may be that the easiest approach is just to exempt all retirement villages. It may be the simplest and most efficient way to do that, but at the same time, we do not want to see all of a sudden a whole group of people who do not attract the concession to eventually start—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, that could be very good for the retirement village industry; it could be a great stimulus package.

Mr MARSHALL: Can you explain to the committee, then, why the aged-care facilities in South Australia have not received their emergency services levy rates notices for this year?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Because we have put an account stop on them to try to understand exactly what the nature of the people who are residing in these properties are, and how they reside in them; for example, if it is analogous to being in your own home, then we want you to have the remission. If it is some other form of care, the government is working through that to make sure we do not disadvantage people.

Mr MARSHALL: Just for clarity, Treasurer, you are saying that all of these things that you are considering relate to the retirement village sector, but the aged-care sector (nursing homes) have not received their levy notices either. Are you considering exempting them also or not? If not, why have they not received their rates notices? Surely you are wanting to get that cash in?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The principle the government has is this: is it analogous to ownership of property? People in retirement villages technically do not own the house they are in, but they have the right to occupy it for a period of time, which is not quite legal ownership. Nursing home admittance is not analogous to homeownership, and that is the difference.

Mr MARSHALL: So why have they not received their rates notices?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will check, but it depends on the nature of the nursing home. Some of them could have a mixture between retirement village and nursing home, but I will check that for you and find out and get back to you.

Mr MARSHALL: Are there any other sectors that have not received their rates notices in South Australia at the moment, other than the aged-care sector and the retirement village sector?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that we are at the point of the cycle where most accounts have been issued, unless there is some ongoing dispute in terms of land use or any ongoing dispute that might have been historical in nature. So, we are at the same point where we are, where the majority of the bills—and when I say 'majority', I mean almost all the bills—have been sent out, other than those that have had a deliberate stop put on them or where there is some sort of dispute. I would envisage that almost all of them have been sent out.

Mr MARSHALL: Are there currently any other sectors for which the government is contemplating a restoration of the remission?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If we are, we would announce anything like that in the budget.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Treasurer, I refer to page 2121 of the same book. How many reminder notices were sent out for ESL bills to businesses and households in 2012-13 and 2013-14?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that we do not have that number because it is not finalised yet but, at the same stage as we were last year, it is about 2 per cent more.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Can you come back with the answer once it is finalised?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: In the same table on the same page, looking at the contribution from the Lotteries Commission of South Australia, what has created that significant reduction in income?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think Treasury and I are on the same page on this: taking a wild stab in the dark, we probably think it is because we have sold the TAB and the Lotteries Commission, and now the Lotteries Commission's profits are being taken by the private consortium that bought them. That is what I think the reduction is, but we will go back and check for you.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: So not all the profits, but a significant share of the profits?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Next is minerals, please.

The CHAIR: Can we have a page, member for Stuart?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, Part B, Volume 3, page 1128. It says on that page:

Apart from this annual review, DMITRE does not have a process which will identify any subsequent, and potentially invalid, changes made to the fees during the year.

Are you aware of any instances where the fees and the TMS were invalid or incorrect for an extended period of time?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Like with any system, I am advised that we probably did make some minor errors, but we have gone through and reconciled those. As of 24 October, they have been reconciled, but I do not have a list here handy with me, so I am happy to provide those to you.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: How long has the annual review been in place? Is that something that has always been there or was it more frequent and it became annual?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is a long-established practice, I am advised. I think it is so long established that we do not actually have at hand information about when we started it.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: It has traditionally been annual?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It has traditionally been annual, and it is a good process. We do not want people having tenements we do not know about.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I refer to page 1127, just the page before. It says:

As DMITRE does not raise invoices for the application fee and first year annual licence fee relating to petroleum licences, there are no records of these transactions in the Petroleum Processing system.

How long have invoices not been raised for the application fee in the first year?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the receipting of non-invoice transactions was completed by 30 June 2014, and they are reflected in the statements. I do not have an explanation as to why it was not done initially, but I will inquire of the department and get back to the committee.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Could you, when you do that, come back with the number of invoices and the value?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: In the same book, page 1131 talks about the method of calculation of royalties payable. It says in the third dot point in the middle of the page that 'a change in the method of calculation of the royalty payable for a...mineral producer' is one of the reasons for the increase in royalties collected. Can you just explain how that change in the method of calculation has contributed directly to the change in royalties collected?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I cannot, but I am assured by Treasury and Finance that shifting to a monthly process ensured a short-term benefit to the finances, but I can get you a detailed answer. I am convinced there is a reason:

- the once-off revenue benefit of \$31 million from implementing monthly royalty payments rather than six-monthly and, in one case, quarterly for larger mineral producers;
- the effect of the finalisation of the amendment of the OneSteel indenture resulting in a higher rate of royalties being applied for the mining activities of Arrium in the Middleback Ranges; and
- the changes that were announced in the 2010-11 budget.

It is simply the implementation of a previous budget decision that has seen a benefit of \$31 million, I am advised, to the finances, which is a good thing.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: On the same page, Treasurer, the dot point says that 'a change in the Mining Act 1971 which now requires major mineral producers to pay mining royalties monthly rather than every six months' has resulted in the extra royalty payment. How much additional royalty did the government receive as a result of this change? Is that the \$31 million?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Is that the same as you budgeted for?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You will see that in the Mid-Year Budget Review, no doubt.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Referring to page 1150, can you advise if it is was the government's policy to purchase half of its electricity supplies from green power in 2013-14? Was that a position? I think it was but I just need confirmation.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand there was a policy position taken. I think that is correct, but I do not have that level of detail here in front of me. I only have the audited reports. I do not have policy position papers with me, so I will have to check my records and get back to the house.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I think it was also, so I was just looking for that confirmation. I would be grateful if you could come back. When you come back with your answer, can you tell me whether you will be continuing that policy? Is it a savings measure or is there a cost attached to it? If there is a savings or a cost, how much is it either way?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As Treasurer, I hope the government is buying the most efficient and cheapest type of power we possibly can to try to give maximum savings to the taxpayer. I will get a detailed answer for you and get back to the committee.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Page 1139 states:

- supporting the mineral and energy resources sectors to deliver outcomes that continue to build South Australia's international profile and strengthen the State's economic prosperity through sustainable development and best practice regulation.

Can you explain what due diligence was done by the government prior to issuing Ambassador their exploration licence in the Cooper Basin, given the company had no operating history in the oil and gas industry?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is an offensive question. If the member has an accusation to make, he should make it and then he should walk outside and make it again.

Ms Chapman: C'mon, Tom.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, you can just hush and be quiet for a moment. First and foremost, I play absolutely no role in the allocation of these PRLs. They are done independent of me. I delegate my authority to the department and they do it. I have absolutely no say in it at all and the accusation that Ambassador Oil has no capability is inaccurate and offensive to the people who work tirelessly in that industry.

Quite frankly, when it gets out to the industry that you have repeated an accusation made in *The Australian* in the parliament about a long-term industry worker who works for Ambassador and who was involved in that process and you make those type of comments, this type of question shows an ignorance of the industry and probably why at the last election the Liberal Party released no resources policy and probably why right now every major resources company and resources industry group is condemning the Liberal Party today because of their actions. Tom Playford looks down at all of you disapprovingly at the way you are conducting yourselves in this industry and I think the shadow spokesperson should know better. His job is to stand up for the industry.

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! Next question, member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thank you very much, Chair. There is no accusation there whatsoever.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, there was.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No, the question was about what due diligence has been done—

The CHAIR: Yes, we have had that question.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —and I actually said nothing about their capacity either, so that was completely fallacious. I asked about—

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —their operating history, Treasurer. Check the *Hansard*. If an exploration licence is put to tender, are there any prerequisites for the winning bidder with regard to their prior operating history?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This process is independent of me. *The Australian* made inquiries into this and I know that members opposite are the first to jump at conspiracy. I will say that Barry Goldstein is an industry advocate and regulator of the highest possible standing and they are the people—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Nobody doubts that. Nobody questions it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Obviously other than your loaded questions.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Rubbish.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sure, no worries, you have the highest standing in the industry. The Liberal Party right now is top of the pops when it comes to the resources sector. They all think you are fantastic.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Just answer the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Look, I am answering the question and you will sit there and listen to it.

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Chair: it is disorderly to respond to objections.

The CHAIR: You are all being disorderly, so sit down and let's finish—

Mr PISONI: I beg your pardon, I haven't said a word.

The CHAIR: You are on your feet.

Mr PISONI: It is a point of order. My point of order is in order.

Mr Gardner: The Treasurer is acting like a thug.

The CHAIR: You are interjecting and you have run out of time. The amount of time having expired, I thank the Treasurer and his advisers for their attendance and call on the next section which is the Minister for Education and Children's Services.

Mr PISONI: The first question, minister, refers to page 494 in Volume 2—Consultancy fees. Can you explain the significant increase in consultancy fees listed between 2013 and 2014?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Yes, I can. The department engaged the services of five consultants during 2013-2014. If you want a sum of the information around them, the Australian and New Zealand School of Government was engaged. That expenditure was around \$51,000. GK Corporation was engaged and was helping with the redesign and restructure of Families SA. That was \$73,000. ARTD Consultants, their expenditure was a little over \$97,000, and that was looking at the Innovative Community Action Networks and doing an evaluation of that. They were also engaged to evaluate mentoring programs, and it was a \$52,000 consultancy. Community Matters and Mayhem Two services were engaged for evaluation of the youth development program, and that was a \$42,000 consultancy.

Mr PISONI: I did not quite get the name of the consultancy that did the redesign work but, nevertheless, I will pick it up in *Hansard*. Are you able to detail to the house the experience that organisation has in managing the design of child protection systems?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I do not have with me the detail around them, but we do have a consultant who came over from the US working with Families SA, working on solution-based case work. I am not sure whether GK was that particular organisation but I am happy to take that work on notice.

The redesign program is really about Families SA working in a different way, and that is working on the strengths of families, working with families, hopefully in maintaining the family and strengthening that family rather than taking a child away. Members would know that when there is a real concern about the safety of a child we will go to—

The CHAIR: Do you have a point of order, member for Unley?

Mr PISONI: The minister is drifting away from the substance of the question. The question was whether that company had any experience in redesigning.

The CHAIR: I am listening very carefully.

Mr PISONI: That has been answered and an answer will be brought back to the house, the minister said.

The CHAIR: So you have another question, do you?

Mr PISONI: Thank you very much. This refers to page 506 of the same volume. Provision of current workers compensation, legal claims and fire claims all appear to be significantly up. We have gone from \$18.4 million to \$24 million in one year. Are you able to advise the house, minister, as to the reasons why we have seen that increase?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Do you want both legal and WorkCover?

Mr PISONI: Yes, thank you.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The provision for legal claims increased by \$228,000. The provision for legal claims fluctuates. It depends on the number of unsettled claims against the department and the estimated value of each claim as at 30 June each year. The number of outstanding legal claims against the department increased by 21 claims from 30 June 2013 to 30 June 2014. That would depend not only on the number of claims lodged during that year, as I understand it, but the number of claims that may have been settled. So each year they will fluctuate.

The provision for workers compensation increased by \$7.3 million, and that is calculated by the independent actuary Taylor Fry, consulting actuaries who are engaged by DPC to value the whole-of-government workers compensation liability. There is a range of factors that have impacted on that.

There has been a decrease in the income maintenance payment trends for long-term claims, higher than expected section 42 payments, an increase in the medical payments accounting, an increase in the S43 payment trends, a decrease in the rehabilitation payment trends, an increase in physiotherapy payment trends, an increase in other payment trends, an increase in the recovery payment trends, a decrease in the discount rate combined with a decrease in the AWE inflation rates has accounted for the increase in the liability, and the projected increase in claims liability as a result of the additional year of exposure and unwinding of one year's investment earnings.

Mr PISONI: Can the minister advise the house how many legal claims against the department were settled in 2013 and 2014?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I do not have that number with me, but I am happy to take that question on notice.

Mr PISONI: Are you also able to provide the nature of the claims, obviously respecting the privacy of the families? When you bring that information back, minister, could you advise what the nature of those claims were?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am happy to provide as much information as I can. There may be some issues that we cannot, but I am happy to provide the member with as much information as I can.

Mr PISONI: In reference to the workers compensation claims, the increase in the budget from the actual from last year to the previous year, are you able to anticipate what effect the workers compensation changes that have gone through the parliament will have for future workers compensation claims based on historical records that you have had previously?

I know that in the Department for Education about 52 per cent of workers compensation claims are stress related and I think there were changes to the Workers Compensation Act to minimise stress-related claims. Has your department done any work on what the expected savings will be, particularly through stress related claims, with the new Workers Compensation Act?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The department has started some preliminary work in relation to trying to assess the impact. I would expect that, as we move forward with that, we will need to engage with the actuary again to make those professional assessments.

Mr PISONI: As to those currently on workers compensation or who have a claim, if they return to work but then the claim is re-engaged or they go into a relapse, will they be treated under the terms of the Workers Compensation Act before the changes or will they be then treated under the new act?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The workers compensation legislation, as the member for Unley would know, is within the purview of the Deputy Premier, so he is the expert in how all of that occurs. My understanding of it is that all people with a compensation claim now start with the two-year process and new claims start with the two-year process as well. I am happy to seek the advice of the Deputy Premier in relation to that.

Mr PISONI: I refer now to page 462 regarding purchase cards. I appreciate you might not have this figure with you now and will be happy for you to bring it back. How many DECD staff have purchase cards and what is the nature of the cards? In other words, what are the limitations or what are they allowed to purchase/not allowed to purchase on those cards? Is there a set of guidelines or rules that they sign off on when they receive those cards?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: There are guidelines and limitations placed on cards. I am happy to get that detail and bring it back.

Mr PISONI: The audit has raised a number of serious issues associated with the management of the cards in your department—for example, interstate travel arranged and paid for before being approved, entertainment costs that are not approved, and the Auditor-General had identified an employee who had a limit of \$10,000 instead of \$1,000. Are you able to advise why it is that travel has been paid for before it has been approved?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: There are clear guidelines about how people are to use these travel cards. The department is, as a result of this finding, undertaking a training program for all cardholders and supervisors to further alert them to their requirements.

Mr PISONI: This is not the first year that the Auditor-General has raised that concern, so you are saying you have only just started now training staff in how to use their credit cards?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am advised that this is the first time the Auditor has raised this particular issue and so we are drilling down to further check what he is referring to, but in the meantime we are reasserting, to make sure people understand that when they purchase items they have to provide the proper taxation receipt for that, that when they travel—this is interstate travel, by the way, not overseas travel—they have to get proper authorisation. We will be doing monthly sample checks of transactions to make sure that the requirements are being complied with.

Mr PISONI: Entertainment costs that are not approved: are you able to advise the house as to how much is spent on entertainment by cardholders annually, certainly what was spent in 2013-14 and 2012-13?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am advised that we can get that information for you.

Mr PISONI: Are you able to advise what the credit limit is for cards and how many cards are issued with credit limits above \$1,000?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Obviously, depending on the person's position in the department and the work they undertake, the upper limit on those cards differs. For those cardholders, it is quite different across the department. I can see whether that information can be easily accessed.

Mr PISONI: Could I also have, while you are accessing that, the highest limit available on a DECD credit card?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: We are happy to provide the credit limits for you.

Mr PISONI: The Auditor-General also found that terminated employees had been detected with cards that have not been deactivated. Are you able to advise how many terminated employees still held cards that were not deactivated?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am advised that there were three instances of terminated employees whose purchase cards had not been cancelled. They have since had that happen.

Mr PISONI: Were those cards used after the termination of employment, and what was the value of the purchases?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, I am advised there was no activity noted from the termination date.

Ms SANDERSON: This relates to pages 464 and 465 in the Auditor-General's Report and concerns the annual carer reviews. In 2011, the carers were continually exceeding the 12-monthly review. In 2012, the Auditor-General noted they were still behind in reviewing 239; in 2013, still behind in reviewing 207; and in 2014, the annual review showed 98 had passed their one year. Given an annual review is required in accordance with the standards of alternative care in South Australia,

what is the minister doing to ensure this happens, and what are the safeguards or penalties that apply?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I thank the member for Adelaide for her question. I am pleased that she has been able to acknowledge that there have been significant improvements in addressing the number of outstanding reviews over the last couple of years. The issue is, of course, that we need to get that information from non-government organisations, so we have been actively pursuing those non-government organisations in relation to those reviews. As you would realise, I think we have in excess of, or around, 1,000 foster carers and slightly more kinship carers, so it is a big job. Obviously we want non-government organisations to complete that work. As far as I am aware, we do not place any penalty on our non-government organisations for not providing that information.

Ms SANDERSON: Does this also cover Families SA workers who work in residential facilities with children? Are they also subject to an annual review?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: It is a completely different process, yes.

Mr PISONI: I refer to page 460. Can the minister confirm that the department still has salary overpayments of \$2 million as of June 2014, as detailed in the Auditor-General's papers? Can she advise how old those overpayments are?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am advised that unrecovered salary overpayments was \$2 million as at June 2014, and that has decreased since June 2013. The value of the debts has been managed by Shared Services. DECD reduced it by a further \$129,000 over the period 30 June 2014 to 23 October 2014, so we have had a \$776,000 reduction and a further \$129,433 between June and October this year.

Mr PISONI: Minister, it is down from last year, when it was 2.695, but in 2012 it was less than \$1.3 million, in 2011 it was just over \$1 million, and in 2010 it was \$847,000. We have seen a continuous increase. Obviously, we are starting from a very high base, or the highest level of overpayments for 2013, more than double the figure of two years earlier. Can you advise why these overpayments are occurring?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I will restate that we are on the decline, that we are seeing improvements in this, and I have outlined those amounts for the committee. I am advised that the majority of overpayments are in relation to leave applications that are lodged late, as I understand it. We are working with Shared Services to make sure that we rectify those problems.

Mr PISONI: Are you saying, then, minister, that it is only leave that is causing—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: I didn't say that.

Mr PISONI: Well, that's all you mentioned, so I have asked for the reasons for the overpayments. Why are the overpayments happening? Are they happening because of staff errors, such as teachers and SSOs? My understanding is that these overpayments are heavily weighted towards support staff rather than teachers. Are you able to confirm whether or not that is correct? Can you confirm, perhaps, the percentage of our teachers, the percentage who are support staff, and whether it is mistakes being made by the staff in claiming the payments or whether it is the processing of the payments by the department that is causing the overpayments?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: As I said, the majority are, as I understand it, the submission of leave requests and the management of leave entitlements. I am happy to get more detail for the member for Unley, but the department is working with Shared Services to streamline this process so that we can reduce the debts even further in these events occurring.

Mr PISONI: I did ask you earlier just how old the \$2 million worth of debts are. Do they relate to that year only or is there a higher accumulated amount in the figure?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I will take that on notice and see what detail we can get for the member.

Mr PISONI: The other question I have has to do with the FBT liability. This is the same page, where it states:

Audit understands that where the overpayment recipient is still a departmental employee the ATO treats the salary overpayment as an interest free loan, and where repayment does not occur prior to the end of the financial year there is an additional cost of FBT to the Department.

Are you able to advise the total cost of fringe benefits tax payments to the ATO from the department due to overpayment of salaries since 2010?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I can certainly get 2013-14 for the member.

Mr PISONI: With due respect, the Auditor-General goes back to 2010 in his report, and I believe that we are examining the Auditor-General's Report today.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I will ask my department to get as much information as it can for the member for Unley.

Ms SANDERSON: I refer to page 465, regarding the carer approval and registration manual. In 2012 the Auditor-General's Report stated that the manual was still in draft. It was still in draft in 2013 and is still in draft in 2014. Given that the manual has been in draft for three years, why is this taking so long? And is the minister 100 per cent certain of the new 1 January 2015 completion date that was given in response?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The manual has been delayed because we are going into the new redesign. So the practices that Families SA will be undertaking will be different to what the current manual is. The rollout of the redesign and the solution-based casework has delayed that. I hope very much that we have the manual ready to go for next year. I know that people are working on that as quickly as they possibly can, but there has been a lot of work in relation to the redesign and the solution-based casework, turning the focus of the department around so that we are working with families to help them improve while the children remain in their care, rather than getting a court order, taking them away and causing that trauma.

It is very difficult, and I know the member for Adelaide understands the trauma that both families and children suffer. We want to work with them so that they see Families SA is there to help them, rather than policemen taking the children away and then telling the families what they need to do to get their children back.

Ms SANDERSON: That was also the same response that was given in 2013 to the Auditor-General, that the solution-based casework had delayed it. This is a year later and the response is now that it will be ready on 1 January. Is that still the date you are giving?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: That is what the department has told me. This has been a monumental shift across the department. It is not something that can be done quickly. People need to be trained and retrained in the new process. We have had to redesign the teams, the way people work, relocate them, so it has taken time, but hopefully it will be worth it. The outcomes will be more families staying together and more children staying safely with their families.

Mr PISONI: Just back on the overpayments, minister—I understand that you will not be able to do this immediately—are you able to advise how many overpayment plans there are that will take more than 12 months to pay? Can I also have the average size of overpayment debts and the highest and lowest amount that the department is chasing?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Whatever information we can provide, we will. Obviously, there are a range, from relatively small amounts to larger amounts of overpayments, so we are happy to do that.

Mr PISONI: I just want to take you to page 456, the proposal to modify non-government school funding arrangements. The Auditor-General has noted that the minister has sought to waive the requirement for non-government schools to participate in the enrolment census. Can you advise on what advice that decision was made?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I can. Essentially, what we wanted to do was reduce the admin burden on non-government schools. We decided that we would take the commonwealth government's census on students as the funding base for schools so that they do not have to report a census amount to the commonwealth and do another census amount for the state government. I have been advised:

- the commonwealth has in place controls that include different levels of access to online census;
- the requirement for the approved authority signatory to certify that the numbers are accurate with warnings of the penalties for making false statements;
- up to 200 business rules built into the system that provide multiple layers of validation;
- all submitted census returns being validated by a commonwealth officer; and
- a sample of non-government schools participating in a census post-remuneration process where the commonwealth officers validate census data against schools.

Given this, I have approved for the August 2014 enrolment census data collected by the commonwealth to be used to determine state government funding entitlements for the 2014 year and waived the requirement of non-government schools to complete a separate state census for August 2014. This change in process, as I said, is to minimise the duplication. I think the Auditor was in fact approving of those particular control mechanisms.

Ms SANDERSON: I refer to pages 465 and 466: how many care and protection service agreements with NGOs expired on 30 June 2014, and how many have still not been executed?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am advised there were 48 individual care and protection service agreements with non-government organisations that expired on 30 June 2013.

Ms SANDERSON: 2014?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Yes. What I did was approve emergency payments totalling \$12.1 million so that those NGOs could continue—

Ms SANDERSON: Sorry, that is the wrong year; that was 2013. I am asking for this—

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I understand. The majority of the 2013-14 agreements were executed in October 2013. In relation to any contracts that have not been executed for 2014-15, if that is what you are asking about—

Ms SANDERSON: 2013-14; they have finished, so they should have now been executed.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The contracts for 2013-14 would have been done in 2013.

Ms SANDERSON: So for 2014-15 then—the ones that should be signed up now.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Are you asking me: are there any contracts this financial year which have not yet been executed?

Ms SANDERSON: Yes.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Okay; well, we will find that out for you.

Ms SANDERSON: Thank you.

The CHAIR: The time allotted having expired, we thank the minister and her advisers and call on the Minister for Disabilities, Police, Correctional Services, Emergency Services and Road Safety.

Mr GARDNER: I indicate to the house that I will ask a couple of questions about police, then corrections, and then the member for Morphett can do the rest.

The CHAIR: Can you give us a page number and we will get ourselves ready?

Mr GARDNER: We will start with Part B, Volume 4, page 1550. Page 1550 identifies \$60 million worth of land and \$212 million worth of buildings. I am very happy for it to be taken on notice if you would like, but I would be very interested in a broken down list of individual sites and site values of those sites.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That will have to be on notice.

The CHAIR: Is it dot point 16 or 17 that you are looking at?

Mr GARDNER: It is under point 17, and I appreciate the minister taking that on notice. We will now move to our next book, which is Part C, page 21. I quote:

South Australia Police reported actual FTEs of 129 FTEs below its cap mainly due to delays in recruitment of sworn officers and the timing of recruitment of sworn officers and cadets.

I understand that the timing of recruitment of sworn officers and cadets can largely be relevant to the change from the six month to the 12 month cadet program, so that makes sense. I wonder if the minister can identify what the nature of the delay to recruitment of sworn officers is, apart from that relating to cadets?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The difference of the 129 FTEs mainly reflects the timing of unsworn vacancies, which are 92 FTEs, and takes into account the cadet intake plan being reduced, as police FTEs were 30 above establishment at 30 June 2013.

Mr GARDNER: On what date does the government project that they will now reach the recruit 300 target?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That was previously advised in the chamber and I have been asked on previous occasions. I am advised by the commissioner that that advice still stands.

Mr GARDNER: The previous advice has been the 2017-18 year, from memory. Can the minister confirm that?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That is correct.

Mr GARDNER: The minister has advised, I understand, that cadets will be included in that count. Can the minister advise when they will reach the target of 300, above and beyond the net figure of 300, if cadets were not to be included in that calculation?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: We will need to take that specific question on notice. However, having said that, cadets are people we recruit and they are subject to training. Once their training is completed, they will be fully sworn officers, so I assume we will meet that requirement still in 2017-18.

Mr GARDNER: In relation to that argument, the cadets obviously will be sworn officers. If you take it that, 'We would like to have this many cadets and sworn officers and we haven't yet recruited them, but you can count that number, too'—it is all very much 'will be'. Can I confirm that the minister is taking on notice and will provide an answer as to when they will reach the figure of 300 sworn officers higher than it was, and he will provide us with a date? Is that what he has taken on notice?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes.

Mr GARDNER: We can move on to corrections, so we are looking now at Volume 1, page 368. Under point 6, travel expenses, there is a listing of \$1.035 million. My question is simply: what was that spent on?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Did you want the breakdown of the figures?

Mr GARDNER: Yes, please.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am advised that the \$1.035 million in expenditure in that year consists of \$314,000 for accommodation, \$285,000 for travel expenses in intra and interstate airfares and other travel fares, \$271,000 for meal allowances, \$78,000 for private motor vehicles, \$75,000 for taxi hire, and \$12,000 for overseas travel.

Mr GARDNER: Is that \$12,000 for overseas travel in relation to airfares?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: It is airfares and accommodation.

Mr GARDNER: If that is the breakdown in terms of the nature of the costs, is it possible to break down the figure of \$1.035 million in relation to the trips in particular: how much was spent on trip A, trip B and where those trips were to?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Can I clarify whether that question was for the whole lot or does it relate to the actual overseas travel only?

Mr GARDNER: I would suggest the whole figure.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: A lot of that travel actually involves staff in the city going intrastate and is broken up, so it might involve hundreds and hundreds of different transactions.

Mr GARDNER: Perhaps I could re-ask the question, rather than taking up public servants' time on a bit that is probably less useful. Can the minister provide details of interstate and international trips?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes, we can.

Mr GARDNER: I will ask two more questions before letting the member for Morphett have a go. On page 368 still, remuneration of employees, the 2013 number lists 24 people at executive-level salaries, and for 2014 there are 19. There appears to be a cut of five executive-level positions. I am wondering what areas those positions were in.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am advised that that figure includes not just executives but also all employees who earn over \$138,000, which includes a whole range of allowances which people may be eligible for.

Mr GARDNER: Can the minister perhaps clarify that there has not actually been a reduction in executives; it is more that there are perhaps fewer people who, as a result of overtime and extra allowances, are putting themselves over that threshold that would mix them in with the executives in the payment list?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I can advise that there actually was a reduction of one executive, and the rest of the people have moved, because of allowances, into that income category.

Mr GARDNER: In what area was that executive?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I can advise that as a result of an internal review, to obviously find a whole range of savings in the organisation, the number of executive positions went down from seven to six and that one of the executive positions of strategy was abolished.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Auditor-General's Report, Part B, Volume 5, page 1611, SAFECOM.

The CHAIR: What page are we on?

Dr McFETRIDGE: Page 1611, Part B, Volume 5.

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for Morphett. What is your question?

Dr McFETRIDGE: Under Administered Statement of Financial Position, the Auditor makes the comment that in 2013-14 the government paid \$108 million in levy remissions to the fund (I assume that he is referring to the emergency services levy), which reduced the net levies paid by fixed and mobile property owners to \$134 million.

The Auditor goes on to say, 'The 2014-15 Budget removed government general remissions for all property owners, except eligible concession recipients.' The comment the Auditor makes which causes concern, and I would like the minister to clarify for the committee, is that, while in 2013-14 sufficient cash was held back to ensure that cash flows could continue, there is a concern that, because property owners are paying via instalments and mobile levies are dependent on the timing of motor registration, there is an issue. He states, 'Cash inflows into the Fund are dependent on when owners remit payment.'

Can the minister assure the committee that the emergency service organisations will not be in any way inconvenienced or their cash flows embarrassed by the current arrangements?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am advised that both Treasury and SAFECOM are aware of it and that they are working on contingencies should that problem actually arise. I know that the issue of payment of the ESL has had a lot of media attention, but every year there are a number of people who do not pay their ESL on time or do not pay their ESL at all, so these sorts of things we have to deal with every year.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On the same reference, will the government be topping up the ESL if there is an embarrassment of paucity of funds?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I can advise that on a number of occasions—for example, we had major incidents, such as Bangor, Wangary and Kangaroo Island—it has been the policy of the government to top up to ensure that the agency has sufficient funding, and it has occurred on those occasions.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Just moving across to page 1619, under Taxation, in paragraph (g) the Auditor states that SAFECOM is not subject to income tax and that SAFECOM is liable to pay payroll tax, FBT and GST. Does the CFS, MFS and SES (through SAFECOM I assume) pay the ESL?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am advised that under section 127 of the relevant act, the Fire and Emergency Services Act, the agencies are exempt from the ESL, which is not unusual given that the money is actually used for them—you would only be paying yourself. There are some small amounts we do pay, and they are very small amounts. I do not have the exact figure, which I can get for you, but there are some private properties which we have some involvement in which may be liable for ESL, but the last figure I saw it was less than \$2,000 but I will confirm that. It was some small amount.

Dr McFETRIDGE: That is reassuring, because it would be a nonsense to do that, which is why you do not do it. I am puzzled, minister, and the audit refers to it on page 1611, why the South Australia Police budget is topped up to the tune of \$20.3 million out of the ESL. In fact, I think it was actually held back this year, according to page 1612. The payments to the police were not paid until October, last month. I assume it is the Star Force. Why do they take that money out of the ESL? Why is it not out of the police budget?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am sure you will like this answer. It is actually a policy decision made by the government which actually created the ESL, and you will know the government I am talking about. Secondly, it is provided for in the act. It is not just Star Force but a whole range of police activities which are directly related to emergency services, like attendance at a motor vehicle accident, water rescue, etc., and all those things that police are involved in that are emergency services related.

Mr Gardner: Like bushfire management?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Anything which is involved in emergency activity. They get charged to that levy, which is provided for by the act which I understand was brought in by a previous government.

Dr McFETRIDGE: We will go back to page 1603 and, for those in the know, we will talk about FMCPs which, for those who are not (including me, until I read it), means financial management compliance problems. I am just a humble veterinarian not an accountant so I look at these documents and do what I can to interpret them. The question, though, is: under the financial management compliance problems, the Auditor comments:

Past audits have reported that FMCPs prepared for the sector had a number of significant compliance areas for which controls were assessed as either 'neither effective nor ineffective' or 'ineffective'.

The Auditor goes on to say:

In response, the Chief Executive of SAFECOM advises that an action plan has been developed for 2014-15 with due dates.

Can the minister give the committee details of the action plans, and will this be reported again in the audit next year?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I can advise the honourable member that SAFECOM agrees with this audit recommendation and that we have developed through the Audit and Risk Working Group an action plan for 2014-15 which prioritises all items assessed as level 3 in terms of noncompliance. Previously, we had a lot of areas which were below the level 3. We have raised those to level 3, which means there is a greater level of compliance and, therefore, rather than being ineffective, they are now classed as either 'effective or not' or 'neither effective nor ineffective', or less, for action in the 2014-15 financial year. Due dates have been assigned for each item. An action plan is monitored by both the Audit and Risk Working Group and Audit and Risk Management Committee. If the member would like some more detail, I will have to take the rest on notice.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Moving to page 1604, regarding purchasing policy and recordkeeping. This one has been repeated in the audits over the years; in fact, I remember asking this in 2010-11. It was about the Port Lincoln fire station at that stage. I am concerned that the Auditor has made comments here that purchasing policy is yet to be approved and used by staff, resulting in management controls and recordkeeping practices being similar to previous years. Is purchasing policy and recordkeeping still to the extent when the Port Lincoln complex was built when subcontractors were not being paid or some were paid and did not do the work? Can the minister tell the committee whether that has been improved and audit will not be complaining each year?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I can advise that the matter the honourable member has raised is one of the action items mentioned in the previous question which is earmarked for attention this year. The action has been included in the Audit and Risk Working Group action plan for 2014-15, a responsible officer has been assigned and a due date of 30 June 2015 has been set to achieve that work.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Moving to page 1605, regarding banking arrangements and reporting, the Auditor talks about the fact that SA CFS brigades and SA SES units have balances of \$4.7 million and I assume that is all from their own fundraising such as sausage sizzles and election day collection activities. The audit acknowledges then the important role of volunteers and the time they already invest in collecting revenue, supporting operations and administering numerous brigade and group accounts. I can speak personally on this having been a captain of a very busy brigade. I spent nearly two days a week doing this and it is quite onerous.

However, it is important for SAFECOM, SA CFS and SA SES to work with and assist the brigade and units to approve the overall control environment including for bank and deposit accounts. Minister, what assistance is the government, your department—SAFECOM—giving the poor admin officers and treasurers of these brigades and units?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I can advise there are over 811 accounts which are open for various brigades, units, etc., and, as the member has quite correctly pointed out, this is a lot of the money they raise at sausage sizzles and when you go to vote they grab your money as you are going to the booth and at a whole range of events. We are looking at e-banking as a way of trying to monitor it so that the brigades have independence on how they spend their money but also to make sure it is spent for the purpose intended. What I can say is it is going to be quite a big job given the number of different brigades and units involved. We are consulting with volunteers in accordance with the volunteer charter signed by the Premier and we hope to have a better understanding of how we should be able to provide the support they need.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On that same topic, minister, can you assure the committee as to the \$4.7 million as at 30 June and any other additional funds that none of that will be siphoned off as administration fees or anything by SAFECOM?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Could you repeat that?

Dr McFETRIDGE: Does SAFECOM charge an administration fee or Shared Services so that the brigades are not suffering through somebody else managing their accounts?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: No, in fact, we have a person who works full time assisting the various units and brigades. I can also add that we do sample auditing just to reassure ourselves as much as we can with the limited resources we have that those accounts are properly accounted for.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On that same reference, minister, is interest paid on those accounts and at what rate?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: It varies because they have their own banking arrangements and it varies according to which bank they have their account with, what sort of account they have. The interest would accrue to them but it would vary from account to account.

Dr McFETRIDGE: So, minister, on that same reference, there is no requirement of brigades or units to lodge their funds with a central account. I think there was a move to do that a number of years ago.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Not at this stage, no.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I hope it does not happen at any stage. Moving on—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: There might be a change in government, which might have a different policy.

Dr McFETRIDGE: It will not be happening under us, mate; it will not be happening under us. They work too hard for it. Other audit findings on that same reference include dot point 2, which states that 'an approved version of the SAFECOM charter should be made publicly available as required by the Act'. Has that charter been made publicly available, and if not, when will it be made publicly available?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am advised that that charter is somewhat dated and does require review, and is one of the things that we will look at undertaking.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I am so tempted, but I won't. Page 1607, under Statement of Comprehensive Income, states:

Expenses are dominated by employee benefits expenses of \$138 million...which represent 58% of total expenses.

In the same section the Auditor comments:

- workers compensation costs increasing by \$2.9 million, due mainly to recent presumptive legislative changes that increase firefighters' compensation for certain cancers associated with their employment.

On page 1612 there is another comment by the Auditor, where he says:

Consequently, there may be a significant increase in the workers compensation provision in future years as further claims are received and assessed.

As the presumptive legislation has been passed—we are very pleased about that and so are the volunteers—can you give us an update on what that presumptive cover will do to the costs associated with workers compensation?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I can advise the member that we had no claims in the previous financial year, apart from some small medical expenses, but no claim as such which has been resolved under the presumptive legislation. Obviously, with the passing of the additional legislation, what will be shown in the books are the provisions we will make from year to year to deal with any claims that do come in.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On that same reference, can you provide me as the shadow minister with a copy of the actuary report on the new estimates of costs?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That was a cabinet document, so I need to get advice on that. I also need to clarify, there were no settled claims in the financial year. That is why there are no amounts in the financial year. On the other matter, I will need to get some advice and get back to you with what advice I receive.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you, minister. Just in the last few minutes, we will move on to Disability SA if we can. I refer to Part B, Volume 1, page 282: Disability SA—Receipt of services, where the Auditor notes:

Previous audits have recommended that the Department consider improving controls to ensure that services provided are adequately received before making payment.

Can the minister assure the committee that services are being provided before payment is being made and what protocols are in place to ensure that this is happening?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Can you just restate what item that is?

Dr McFETRIDGE: Page 282, Disability SA—Receipt of services. The first paragraph states:

Previous audits have recommended that the Department consider improving controls to ensure that services provided are adequately received before making payment.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: In 2013-14, as you mentioned, the department provided \$134 million of brokerage services, and that is the amount you are referring to. Disability SA represents the majority of brokerage expenditure, with \$120 million spent in 2013-14 for

approximately 3,200 clients. Generally, these services are provided to clients in their homes. The department is not able to directly confirm that all services have been provided at times; however, overall, the department relies on a range of indicators, communications and workflows to ensure that the agreed services are provided to clients. Although client feedback and verification of feature services provided would be valuable, a balance needs to be struck between gaining the best assurance that the service is delivered and troubling potentially vulnerable clients. I can add that just recently I had a third-party complaint; and we do investigate anything that is raised.

The CHAIR: I can report the committee has further examined ministers on matters contained in the Auditor-General's Report and has completed its examination.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 15.

The CHAIR: Do you have a question, deputy leader?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, a number. This clause proposes to allow for a class of persons to be exempt by the minister on the basis that there is a publication in the *Gazette* of this exemption. It follows on, Attorney, from the understanding I think you have, from what is identified in your second reading and from what was provided at the briefing, that the current provisions under the Summary Offences Act do not facilitate a class of persons, as distinct from an individual, from being able to display what is currently a prohibited weapon at a certain event or festival.

During the course of the briefing, I asked for some further information about the basis upon which this is sought. I have considered the provisions of part 3A relating to weapons under the Summary Offences Act and the list of exemptions in part 2 of the Summary Offences Act. In essence, what is clear is two things: one is that we have very strict rules in respect of prohibited weapons—who can have them, who can make them, in what circumstances they can be carried and who can sell them. The second one deals with a whole procedure which, if someone has demonstrated certain conduct, could be the subject of a weapons prohibition order and there is another threshold of obligations that they need to surmount to be able to use, have in their possession or deal with a weapon.

The schedule provides for a number of exemptions: obviously police, emergency services and persons using them in the course of their business or other reasons—religion, sports, ceremonies, museums. There is certain provision already under entertainment, in particular:

A person is an exempt person for the purposes of an offence of use or possession of a prohibited weapon under section 21F(1)(b) of this Act if the person uses or has possession of a prohibited weapon in the course of providing a lawful and recognised form of entertainment of other persons that reasonably requires the use or possession of the weapon.

One obviously can think of a play in a public place, etc. The Summary Offences Act carries really a whole regime of rules in respect of weapons, and some of them have been expanded upon, particularly in respect of knives in recent years, given some of the actions that have occurred and have had to be dealt with.

From the second reading, there may be a particular event or festival that could take place that would not cover a class of persons. I should also say that, in applying for an exemption, which is provided in the section 21F process, a person needs to obviously satisfy you, minister, that there is a necessity for them to have in their possession or use a weapon, and you have the power to set conditions. Notice has to be filed with you, with the appropriate fee, etc., to grant it. You effectively cannot progress that until you have consulted with the Commissioner of Police for the purposes of this act and this process. All of this, to be frank, is there for good reason.

When I asked for some further information about what events are currently being, I suppose, inconvenienced or excluded from being able to have the opportunity to display weapons, I was

provided with correspondence signed by you which again just repeated that this temporary exemption was targeted towards the possession and use of prohibited weapons rather than the manufacture, sale, distribution or supply of prohibited weapons. However, that is not to say that an issue might not arise in the future when it may become necessary.

You repeated again the issue of the relation to a legitimate festival or event. Of course, my immediate response was: like what? Today I think you have given us the Battle of Hastings and the Eureka Stockade ideas that perhaps would be prejudiced in some way by not being able to do this. You also reported, and I quote—

The Hon. J.R. Rau: I have had concerned people come to me—

Ms CHAPMAN: I will ask you that in a minute. You also say that in the case of a one-off event, a temporary class exemption can be granted rather than having to issue exemptions to all individuals involved and that, where it appears as though there will be an ongoing event, a temporary exemption could be granted for the initial period of that event while an amendment to schedule 2 of the act is considered to provide a permanent class exemption. I can say to you that that gives me no extra information, to be honest, as to what on earth would justify this.

At present, if someone wants to display a gun in some Shakespearean play, they can have the exemptions that are already here. There are certain identified bodies who, during the course of the operation of their business, whether they are in a museum, an art gallery or whether they are collectors of heirlooms—I think the Freemasons get special provision, etc.; there are a whole lot of usual suspects, I suppose—that one can say have a legitimate reason to have an exemption.

Let us just start with this, because quite frankly, Attorney, telling us that somebody might miss out on having some parade for the celebration of the 1066 success is not really convincing to me, and neither is a display of some celebratory time of the Eureka Stockade. In fact, if it was going to be some parade or celebration of a war event, I would have to say that I would be even more concerned that some class of exemption would be provided to a class of persons rather than an individual.

Let's just start with this: who has applied to you since you have been Attorney, and have any of them been rejected? What inconvenience has been caused to any one of them that has in some way or another interrupted their parade or festival as a result of not having the amendments you are now asking for?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: To give you a very precise answer to that question I would need to take it away, and I am happy to do that and get back to you between the houses. The circumstances which initiated this were that a group of chaps came to see me, and they were very—

Ms Chapman: Not Morris dancers?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: They were not Morris dancers, no. They were not outrageous, apparently irresponsible people; they seemed to be people whose hobby was different from mine and obviously the member for Bragg's. Their hobby was dressing up in certain gear and parading about, and—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No. I am just telling the member for Bragg what they told me. They want to have an annual meet, as I was saying before, somewhere out Reynella way, where they have a fair day or something. They turn up with all this paraphernalia and go through whatever mock activities they go through, or they just march up and down looking like Colonel Klink or something. I do not know exactly, but—

Ms Chapman: Is this a dress-up party?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No. They were genuinely concerned that because some of the items they were using as props were, if you were carrying them around in public, a prohibited thing—

Ms Chapman: Like what?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, the one that springs to mind is bayonets.

Ms Chapman: Bathers?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Bayonets.

Ms Chapman: Real ones or just alfoil ones?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, these were real ones. Actually, come to think of it, it might even have application to something like Fort Largs, for instance, where—

Ms Chapman: I bet they are already covered.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, they might be specifically covered, but that type of thing. I am sure the member for Bragg has been down there at some stage, where the chaps—

Ms Chapman: No, I can't say I have.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The member for Bragg is missing out. I will get the itinerary. It is absolutely terrific; in fact, I might even come down there with the member for Bragg, if that would help encourage her—or perhaps it would not. There are a number of chaps who dress up in the attire of the South Australian Marine Corps or Army circa 1868 or something, with these lovely red jacket-type things, with belts and big boots and a pith helmet-type arrangement.

They march around inside Fort Largs and shout, 'Attention!' and all that sort of stuff, and they do the standing to salute, and they have these rifles. The rifles are Martini-Henry, or whatever was the fashionable thing in the 1860s, with a bayonet, and these chaps go through this rigmarole, and kids love it. You go there—

Ms Chapman: Are children there as well?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, they have children there; they do not actually injure the children. What they do partway through is select children to be part of the platoon—they do not use weapons or anything in that aspect of it—and the children get up and stand with them, and their parents take photos. They have a big cannon which blows out a noise and a puff of smoke, and it is all great. Kids love it—except for my son, who did not like it too much; he got a bit scared. In fact, come to think of it, the member for Bragg was actually there the last time I was there. There was an event, and I think the member for Bragg was there, if I remember correctly.

Ms Chapman: Isn't that under 'Ceremonies'?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It might be. Even if that event is covered, there are other people who have these things as their hobby. These people are not dangerous, they are not criminals, they are not—

Ms Chapman: How do you know?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, because if they were dangerous I am sure the police would have weapons prohibition notices and various other things in respect of these people. I did ask the question. I think the answer is basically this: under the present legislation something needs to be required. If you went to the Great Moscow Circus and Marvello the Magnificent, who throws knives around the place, has—

Ms Chapman: He is covered under entertainment.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, he is covered, but it would be necessary for him because his whole entertainment is throwing knives.

The CHAIR: Marvelovic!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Marvelovic, correct. If the member for Bragg ever does go to one of those shows, the thing you have to watch out for is if they blindfold you and stick you up there with the balloons around you. The good news is that, because you are blindfolded, you do not realise they are not actually throwing them at you. It looks like they are going to throw them at you, but the clown who is standing behind the thing you are strapped to actually just comes up and goes 'pop'. It is nowhere near as scary as it seems.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No. All I can say is that this is something that has been brought to me by these people. You could call it red tape. Between the houses, if it would be helpful, if I can track down who this group was, I would be happy to try to put them in touch with the member for Bragg so that they can explain from their own perspective what the problems are.

They were saying, 'We are fearful that we will be pinched for wandering around with these things,' which they acknowledge are not things that people should have in public in the normal course of events, but they are doing it in the context of a particular fair, event or whatever the case might be. I emphasise that I am not interested in having dangerous weapons out on the street any more than the member for Bragg is.

Ms CHAPMAN: So we have the historical re-enactors, as the member for Morialta has described them. Let's call them that. Apart from that, has any other group come to you to say, 'We can't get through the system at the moment and we can't get an exemption'?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I cannot say off the top of my head that I can think of any other definite application for this. It might be that circumstances throw up another occasion when this sort of thing might be appropriate. As I have said before to the house, this is a portfolio bill and it is intended to contain things which are not of themselves of such great urgency or moment that they warrant a standalone proposition; they are just miscellaneous things that come across the desk. I am sure I have records in the office of who these fellows were. It did seem to me that they were harmless enough and that they were providing some sort of fair-type atmosphere.

The CHAIR: A Viking re-enactment.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: A Viking re-enactment or whatever they were doing. It was in the nature of people who have these things turn up dressed in costumes and people come and look at them. That was the nature of the thing.

The CHAIR: A Harry Potter thing could end up with something offensive.

Ms CHAPMAN: I hear what the Attorney is saying and I welcome that. I am a little curious also to have some answers on this: when you say that it may be necessary to actually have an exemption for the manufacture, sale or distribution, not just possession or use, I have no idea what that could possibly relate to. Is that in the same category? Can you get some information as to what on earth that would be needed for?

If it is just an amateur group (and I say this respectfully) which has this desire to dress up then, given all the rules we have in respect of prohibited weapons, if these people are going to be in a public place, which is what we are talking about here—some sort of procession, Halloween-type activity or whatever, I do not know what time of the night they come out, whether they have alcohol present or what the deal is—let's assume they are an innocent group that likes to dress up in this re-enactment sort of concept.

Why would they not, unless they have all the strict rules that apply to general entertainment, just use fake pieces of equipment—swords or plastic guns with no bayonets on them or bayonets that are made of foil or whatever? I just make the point that it does not seem to me, on the face of it, an acceptable situation for any group, however innocent this particular group may have been in coming to you with their plight or potential problem, to have a relaxation which is so general as to go to a class of persons—that is, everyone who has paid their \$2 to be a member of this group—

The Hon. J.R. Rau: On that day.

Ms CHAPMAN: —on that day or for that month, which is what we are talking up to here, to be able to carry out this activity. What happens when a group of undesirables work out that this is a way in which they can come along, or join the group that you have already identified as being a decent group of blokes who then are infiltrated by this other group?

It just seems to me that it is, on the face of it, too lax for no identified significant reason. I am not saying that this particular group are not genuine or decent people. I just make the point that you are not filling me with confidence as to why this is necessary when, really, we have a process which says, 'If you want to do something, you can come along to me, and I can check with the police commissioner and he or she can give me advice as to whether proper security is there or whether

you are going to have a parade which does not involve alcohol, or you are going to have some other security there or nobody can flog the weapons.' These are all areas in which the police commissioner, who is particularly in charge of firearms but we are talking prohibited weapons here, has a job to do.

On our side of the house, we do not like red tape, we do not like difficulty, but we understand why we have a very strict regime in relation to weapons. We are just not satisfied at this point that the relaxation in this very general way should be allowed. Certainly, if it is allowed, it seems to me that it should be for one-off events—for a 24-hour period, for example—and for possession and display only, if we are talking about the type of thing you mentioned as an example, and certainly not for manufacture or sale, etc.

A number of the other exemptions in the schedule, if they become part of the schedule as distinct from the ministerial process in section 21F, also restrict a lot of this to possession and use. So, if it is just for entertainment purposes, you cannot get an exemption for the purpose of manufacturing or sale.

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: You understand. I will leave it with you. I will give you an early minute, seeing you have been so helpful on this clause. I cannot consent to it but, apart from the preceding discussion we have had, the rest of the bill has merit and we will, of course, agree to its passage.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

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) (17:57): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 17:58 the house adjourned until Thursday 13 November 2014 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***APY LANDS, EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

46 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (27 May 2014). How many families are participating in the Early Childhood Development Program for family home visiting in the APY lands and what success is it having?

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

The program has been utilised by 142 families across the lands.

To date, the program has been very successful, with between 80-90 per cent of families with infants and young children engaging with the service. Additionally, the service is having a positive impact on children's development. Of the 108 children screened to date, less than ten children have been identified as having a developmental concern.

The service continues to work collaboratively with other agencies to support children and their families.

South Australia has also built and operated four Aboriginal Children and Family Centres as agreed under the national partnership. Since all four Children and Family Centres became operational in 2013, they have provided high quality early learning programs for young children, parenting and family support and community development activities.

SKILLS FOR JOBS IN REGIONS

In reply to **Mr KNOLL (Schubert)** (3 June 2014).

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): The Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills has been advised:

In 2013-14, \$415,000 is being invested in the Barossa region through the Department of State Development, Skills for Jobs in Regions program. Ten projects, which will be completed at the end of December 2014, are being delivered which is expected to provide around 395 job seekers with the skills and connections to employers to transition into work.

DOWNER EDI PORT AUGUSTA

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (5 June 2014).

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety): The Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills has advised:

Assistance offered by the state government to affected workers includes access to the Skills for Jobs in Regions Individual Assistance Fund and local Career Development Services. This is in addition to assistance provided by the commonwealth government.

An information session was held on 3 June 2014 for workers. Information was presented by officers from the Department of State Development and the Commonwealth Department of Human Services.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (14 October 2014).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development): I have been advised of the following:

No concerns regarding the quality of care environments or the provision of care to children and young people under guardianship of the minister have been identified.

*Estimates Replies***ART GALLERY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The budget for phase 1 of the Art Gallery of South Australia's digital strategy is \$245,000.

Elements of phase 1 of the strategy are already underway. These include the installation of Wi-Fi across all of the gallery's spaces and the implementation of an online e-ticketing system, which will allow the purchase of tickets to exhibitions and other components of the Art Gallery's creative program over the Internet. The combined cost of this work is \$50,000. This has been sourced from existing Art Gallery funds and the work will be completed in the 2014-15 financial year.

In February 2014, the Art Gallery applied for funding for its digital strategy, through the Ian Potter Foundation's 50th Anniversary Commemorative Grants, but was unsuccessful. In a hopeful sign, the Foundation has advised the gallery that its application will be considered separately through the arts committee fund. The gallery is waiting for further advice from the Foundation on this.

Should this additional funding be secured, the remaining elements of phase 1 will be undertaken over the 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 financial years. This will include a review of the content management system, online content, digital rights management and the online collection; the further development and implementation of a social media and e-newsletter strategy; a customer data strategy; a mobile website; an online store business case; and an e-bookstore business case.

Phase 2 of the digital strategy includes the establishment of an integrated publishing platform, a suite of 'in-gallery experiences' and streamlining of business and administrative processes.

The implementation of the remainder of phase 1 and phase 2 of the digital strategy will not occur until additional funding is secured.

YOUTH MENTAL HEALTH FIRST AID

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (18 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The Mental Health First Aid program developed in Australia is now provided in 23 countries worldwide includes specific courses for youth, adult and Aboriginal community members. It was adopted and implemented as a community-based initiative by CAMHS in 2004. The courses are provided across the metropolitan area by two accredited CAMHS workers as part of their normal duties. Courses are provided on request, to staff of independent and government schools, school chaplains, headspace workers, youth leaders, scout leaders and mentors and other relevant staff working with young people.

Over the last two years more than two hundred community based workers have been trained in youth mental health first aid by CAMHS across Adelaide. There is no intention at this point to discontinue the service.

There is no specific funding provided in the CAMHS budget for the Mental Health First Aid program and participants are charged a small fee to cover the cost of the Mental Health First Aid Manual. Further information about the program can be gained from the Mental Health First Aid website www.mhfa.com.au.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (18 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A)

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

There are no referrals from the courts or Families SA in relation to the Police Drug Diversion Initiative, as in that program it is the police officers themselves who organise the referral for a health intervention.

In 2013-14, the number of episodes in which the referral source was shown as 'other community/health care services', which could include referrals from the courts or Families SA, was 353 relating to 339 clients. This number includes 114 episodes relating to the Driver Assessment Clinic, with referral made by the court.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (18 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A)

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

As at 24 July 2014, DASSA's activity report indicates that during the 2013-14 financial year there have been 1,315 inpatient separations and 39,491 outpatient attendances. It should be noted that there can be delays in the entry of client activity information at the clinic level and it is possible that these numbers may marginally change as records collated by the clinics are completed.

APY LANDS, MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (18 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The Australian government, through its Personal Helpers and Mentors (PHaMs) Program, has contracted CatholicCare Northern Territory based in Alice Springs to provide this service to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) lands. I have no information about the status of the funding arrangements as it is commonwealth funding and outside our jurisdiction. I am aware that this service is to be delivered to the community of Amata.

The Mental Health Illness Fellowship of South Australia also receives Australian government PHaMs funding for service delivery into the APY lands but only the Eastern APY Lands; again this is an Australian government funded program.

DISABILITY SERVICES

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (18 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A)

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

Western Australia has recently funded the Individualised Community Living Strategy (the Strategy). The strategy is a focused program that provides up to 100 people who have mental illness, and have been long stay inpatients of psychiatric wards, with housing and support dependent on their needs from both government mental health services and non-government organisations. Over time the strategy will become available to other people who have frequent inpatient stays.

To enter the strategy, people are referred through government mental health services. Funding for the strategy is based on individual need and is matched depending on whether the support is low, medium, high or very high. The level of support (and hence funding level) is approved and reviewed by an independent panel. The funding is attached to the mental health consumer and paid in advance to the respective non-government provider. The funding transfers with the consumer should they change location and/ or non-government provider. The strategy is still in the early stages of development and there has not been an official evaluation at this stage.

A person in the strategy participates in planning and can choose which non-government preferred provider they receive services from but does not determine how their funding is spent.

There are parallels between the strategy and programs in South Australia, such as the Housing and Accommodation Support Partnership, which provides housing, public mental health service support and non-government organisation support to 79 people. SA Health is keen to note the progress of the strategy as it becomes more established.

The NDIS differs from the strategy in that planning between the person and Disability Care Australia will identify two kinds of supports—fixed supports and flexible supports. Fixed supports are not controlled by the person and are those deemed essential to their health and safety, and flexible supports are controlled by the person depending on their support and engagement needs at the time.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (18 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy 2012-2016; Every life is worth living identifies many at risk groups. A community approach to raising awareness and reduction of stigma around suicide is critical for all at risk groups to seek help.

Within South Australia there are numerous services available for people who have experienced sexual abuse to receive care that will reduce the risk of suicide.

The South Australian government recognises the need to address the impact of sexual abuse. No one government department has all the answers so a coordinated approach across government departments and non-government organisations is required. The diversity of these services is provided below and describes a multiplicity of services which work collaboratively to address the impacts of sexual abuse on its victims.

A South Australian Government Suicide Implementation Committee will be established in the coming months to unite government departments, supporting them in the implementation and ensuring the objectives in the South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy 2012-2016; Every life is worth living, relevant to each government department are fulfilled.

Services available across government include:

The Commissioner for Victims Rights is an independent statutory officer who helps victims in their dealings with the criminal justice system, public officials and public agencies; as well as, consults public officials and public agencies on their treatment of victims. The commissioner can recommend public officials and public agencies make a written apology if they have not treated victims properly.

The Commissioner for Victims Rights provides a booklet 'What choices' which outlines options, what those options entail and services available to victims. The booklets are provided to victims by police.

Immediate support is crucial for early intervention into suicide prevention for the victims of sexual abuse.

The SAPOL Sexual Crime Investigation Branch (SCIB) provides a specialist investigation service for the prevention, detection and investigation of sexually related crimes. SCIB consists of sections which include:

- Sexual Assault Investigation Section
- Victim Management Section
- Child Exploitation Investigation Section
- Intelligence Section
- ANCOR (Australian National Child Offender Register).

Victim support is provided in South Australia through the Victim Support Service which is a non-government, non-profit organisation that provides many services for victims of crime, their family and friends, and for the wider community. These include counselling, provision of information about victim's rights and victim's compensation, court support and referral to other agencies where appropriate.

Crisis Care is the after-hours crisis information service. Qualified social workers and trained volunteers handle all calls. The service is available Statewide and operates from 4pm to 9am on weekdays and for 24 hours on weekends and public holidays.

The Witness Assistance Service is part of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). It provides information about, and support during, the legal process, and referral to relevant services for victims of crime and their close family members or carers. The Witness Assistance Service is only involved where the DPP has involvement in the case.

SA Health services include:

Yarrow Place Rape and Sexual Assault Service provides a variety of services for people who have been raped or sexually assaulted and for their partners, families and friends. Services are for people aged 16 years and over at the time of the rape or sexual assault.

Services include a 24 hour crisis response service for recent rape or sexual assault. This can include medical care, forensic medical examinations, counselling and advocacy. (People aged under 16 years should contact the Child Protection Services of either the Women's and Children's Hospital or Flinders Medical Centre.)

Yarrow Place also provides follow-up medical care and ongoing counselling, training for workers, prevention programs, a group work and seminar program, and systems advocacy. It conducts seminars about the criminal justice system for people who have experienced a rape or sexual assault. The seminar is free of charge and includes:

- information about the criminal justice system
- an opportunity to ask questions
- an opportunity to express concerns about reporting to the police and going to court
- a video about giving evidence in court
- a resource kit.

Child Protection Services within the Women's and Children's Health Network provides high quality assessment and treatment services to children from birth to 18 years and their families where there is a suspicion of child abuse, psychological treatment and/or neglect.

The Child Protection Services offers a range of services including:

- telephone consultation to professionals within Women's and Children's Health Network (WCHN) and outside, as well as to members of the public to discuss child protection matters, provide information and advice and where appropriate facilitate referrals to other services
- forensic medical assessments in relation to suspicious and/or unexplained injury and/or presentations of severe neglect of children/young people under the age of 18; forensic medical assessments in relation to allegations of sexual abuse of children/young people under 16.
- forensic psychosocial assessments of children under the age of 7 to assess situations where there have been allegations of physical/sexual abuse.
- parenting capacity assessments to assess the potential safety and wellbeing of children and young in the care of their parents/cares where Families SA is extremely concerned about abuse/neglect and/or psychological maltreatment.
- Sexualised Behaviour Treatment service which provides therapy to children 2-12 years of age and their families or carers where the major concern is problematic sexual behaviour and where recent sexual abuse has not been confirmed.
- Keeping Them Safe therapy service, which provides long term therapy for children aged between 0-12 years who are under the guardianship of the minister and/or of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent.

Suicide Prevention

In 2014-15, the government has committed over \$1 million to suicide prevention.

This includes:

- \$200,000 to Lifeline, to provide crisis support to South Australians;
- \$278,000 to *beyondblue* for continuing work in suicide prevention;
- \$150,000 funding for Suicide Prevention Networks to address suicide at a local level to raise awareness, breakdown the stigma, promote community education, increase knowledge about help available and encouraging help seeking;
- \$150,000 in small grants for local suicide prevention and postvention initiatives and activities;
- \$125,000 for a Suicide Prevention Officer to work in the establishment of Suicide Prevention Networks; and
- \$115,000 to Centacare for the Youth Suicide Intervention Service (known as Ascend).

Mental Health Services provide counselling and support for adults who have been affected by child sexual abuse.

SA Health funding for support for people who have experienced sexual assault includes:

- Mental Health Services across the state: \$298 million per annum
- Suicide Prevention: over \$1 million per annum
- Child Protection Services
- Yarrow Place.

MENTAL HEALTH LIVED EXPERIENCE REGISTER

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (18 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A)

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

1. As at 1 August 2014, the register's membership of 142 is comprised of 63 consumers and 33 carers, with 46 people identifying as both consumers and carers.
2. The Mental Health Unit, SA Health is the only agency which 'uses' the register for consultation. However, mental health agencies in South Australia are able to connect to the register for the purpose of information sharing, e.g. forthcoming workshops and support networks.

STATE BUDGET OPERATING SURPLUSES

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee B)

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

1. The first year for which there is accrual measurement of the state's operating position is 1998-99.

The largest reported surpluses since that time were \$448 million in 2002-03 (0.8 per cent of GSP) and \$464 million in 2007-08 (0.6 per cent GSP).

The surplus projected for 2016-17 is \$776 million (0.7 per cent GSP).

The surplus achieved in 2002-03 is larger than that projected for 2016-17 when measured as a share of the economy.

2. The first year for which there is accrual measurement of the state's operating position is 1998-99.

Budget Paper No. 3 does not include net operating position data prior to 1998-99.

There are no recorded accrual figures for the period in question.

TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014).
(Estimates Committee B)

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

The Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) expenditure budget for 2013-14 was increased from the original budget of \$105 million to a revised budget (2013-14 Estimated Result) of \$120 million.

The primary reasons for the increase in the DTF 2013-14 expenditure budget of \$15 million are:

Additional payments to Consolidated Account (\$10.769 million)

- \$6.108 million in additional expenditure authority for the payment of surplus cash to the consolidated account under the cash alignment policy;
- \$4.661 million in additional expenditure authority for the return of RESI Corporation cash to the consolidated account on the winding up of the corporation;

Additional activity fully offset by revenue (\$4.846 million)

- \$1.170 million in additional expenditure authority to offset revenue from the Commonwealth Bank of Australia (CBA) towards the cost of transitioning agency bank accounts from Westpac to CBA;
- \$2.000 million in additional expenditure authority to offset recoveries for the WorkCover improvement project and the Motor Injury Insurance Reform project.
- \$1.676 million in additional expenditure authority for SAFA;

Carryovers into 2013-14 (\$1.562 million)

- \$1.000 million for the property sales program;
- \$0.562 million for the RISTEC project;

TVSPs

- \$1.538 million in additional expenditure authority for the payment of targeted voluntary separation packages;

New Policy (\$0.200 million)

- \$0.200 million in additional expenditure authority for the payment of grant funds to the Port Pirie RSL for the Huey helicopter display

The additional expenditure budget in 2013-14 was offset by:

- \$3.4 million reduction in expenditure authority relating to the return of depreciation budget;
- \$1.4 million reduction in expenditure authority due to the transfer of the Ministerial Chauffeurs and MP Fleet to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet effective 1 April 2014.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014).
(Estimates Committee B)

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

Pursuant to the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987 the Treasurer accepts deposits from government departments (section 8) and other persons (section 21).

The Treasurer places these funds on deposit with SAFA.

The Treasurer has borrowings from SAFA. These gross borrowings include liquidity borrowing that funds the cash held on deposit by departments. The Treasurer has a legal setoff arrangement with SAFA which allows the netting off of these offsetting borrowings and deposits.

This is analogous to the home loan offset arrangements commonly available to the public from financial institutions.

At 30 June 2014 the amount of deposits held by SAFA relating to departmental liquidity needs was expected to be \$2.720 billion. This amount rises over the forward estimates to around \$3.5 billion.

Consistent with the set off arrangement the general government sector balance sheet in table A.4 reflects an offsetting reduction in both borrowings and deposits of \$2.720 billion for the 2014-15 budget.

There is no impact on net debt from this approach.

The 2014-15 budget includes a net off of the interest revenue and expense relating to this arrangement. The reduction in each year of the forward estimates is detailed in the table below.

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Interest expense impact \$m	73	100	134	155

The set off arrangement only relates to funds held on deposit relating to the liquidity requirements of government departments. On this basis there are deposits that are not set off, these deposits appear in the projected balance sheet, and the interest revenue accruing to the Treasurer from these funds is reflected in the operating statement. For example, industry funds deposited with the Treasurer pursuant to S21 of the *Public and Finance Audit Act 1987*.

CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (18 July 2014). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development): I have been advised of the following:

The figure of 2,615 in the annual report refers to the total number of children under the guardianship of the minister at 30 June 2013.

For budget reporting purposes a figure of 2,678 is cited for children in out-of-home care as at 30 June 2014. This includes 21 clients aged over 18 years to whom Families SA provides financial support.

I am advised that of the 2,678 young people the department supports:

- 1,115 in foster care;
- 1,203 in relative kinship care; and
- 360 in community residential care or other care facilities.