

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 19 November 2014

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:02 and read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

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

(Continued from 12 November 2014.)

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:03): Sir, I would like to make some comments on the report. The Public Works Committee, as you are aware as a former member, is an important committee of the parliament. My view is that since the election the committee has ramped up somewhat, and the new committee is keen to get out and go to places, look at things, visit, and generally fulfil its task particularly well. Unfortunately, in the last couple of years prior to the election we had multiple changes on the committee, which meant that it, to some extent, was not stable in its intent, not by any fault of the members, but just the fact that the continual changing of membership made it difficult.

This current committee has taken an interest, as I say. We have been out and about quite a bit. The most recent visit we did was to the Riverland to look at some of the projects that are being undertaken up there, which is in the report that has been tabled. I think there are a couple of things that I need to add that are of concern to me and have been for two or three years now, and I know they have been of concern to former members and maybe current members of the committee, and that is the new Adelaide hospital has never had any opportunity to be scrutinised by the Public Works Committee. I think that is not good.

The argument has been that it is a public-private partnership and that it is commercial in confidence, but for a project of that size to have no scrutiny from the Public Works Committee is in my view erroneous and it is not good politics. It may suit the government, it suited the former premier and the former treasurer, and it may suit the incumbents; however, in my view, it is bad policy, secretive, and not in the best interests of the people of South Australia. I say that, sir; it is not contained within the report, of course, but that is very much the view that should be in place.

I also notice that, interestingly enough, there are some photographs contained within the annual report and one is of when the committee visited the Seaford Railway Station and the electric system down there, which was a good trip. We saw the new trains, had a good look around and got a lot of information. I note that Mr Rod Hook, of blessed memory, is in a photo in the annual report, so he is not out of favour with the committee, although he may have been out of favour with the Premier and departed.

I look forward to numerous projects. The committee sits without hesitation, and I thank the chair of the committee, because we do have an agreement within the committee that, if there are projects of between \$4 million and \$11 million, if any member wishes to have a look at those projects, we will do so. Indeed, tomorrow we are looking at a project of just over \$4 million, which I think is interesting and has widespread connotations for South Australia.

The annual report is an interesting read for those of us particularly who are on the committee, but it should be an interesting read also for members generally speaking on the activities of the Public Works Committee. It is a longstanding committee of the parliament. For the life of me I do not know why we continue on with the numbering, with this being referred to as the 507th report; I do not know when the first one was—many years ago, I suspect. Why we have to do that and why we do not just start at the start of a new parliament and finish off when the parliament finishes and then start again I do not know. It is some obscure reason; perhaps someone may be able to answer that question.

I found one particular project which was of great interest to me because, to be perfectly honest, I really did not even know it existed, and that was the Drill Core Library. We went out to the current one and that was absolutely fascinating. I did not realise the extent to which South Australia has this fantastic Drill Core Library with these thousands and thousands of drill cores contained within it, going back I think it was 100 years, from memory.

We are going to build a new one, and this is why we went and visited the old one. We visited the site of the new one at Tonsley Park, and I will be interested to see the final project out there when it is finished. But the current one, to me, was a real piece of South Australian history that has been done properly. It has been kept quiet out there—it is great for the business sector and those interested in drill cores, etc.—but like I say, to my ignorance, I did not know it existed.

The report is good reading. I look forward to continuing my work on the Public Works Committee. I know there is a good level of interest within the committee on projects currently and we work well together. There will always be political bunfights in committee from time to time; they are all part and parcel of it. The opposition members from time to time will disagree with the government members on matters, but we have the opportunity to make minority reports, which we will. I urge members to read the report.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:09): I too would like to make a small contribution on the Public Works Committee annual report and note that I and another two members are newly elected members on the committee. The annual report highlights the good opportunity and the important work undertaken by the bipartisan committee. As the member for Finnis has just said, there is room for robust debate and there is room for discussion over different points of view, and that is what a good bipartisan committee is all about.

Obviously, the guidelines are to look at projects in excess of \$4 million and review submissions from government agencies, interview key witnesses and take evidence about projects, but I note that in 2013-14 the 25 projects that were referred to the committee ranged from about \$4 million up to \$152 million, so there is a diverse range of projects. It is, I guess, disappointing that some of the major projects do not come before the Public Works Committee, which does raise eyebrows on both sides of the table.

However, I want to focus on the combined effort of that bipartisan committee, which has heard of projects worth about \$446 million over the 2013-14 period, giving the committee an opportunity to analyse those projects and evaluate their worth to South Australia. The hearings that we hold, for all referrals, have a value of about \$11 million or over.

Site visits and looking at some of the projects that we analyse within this building are vital. It is vitally important that we have a good understanding of what the project is. You have to go out and get your boots muddy occasionally. You have to go out and pick up the dirt and have a better understanding of what you are evaluating and assessing to be a good project or how that project will be of benefit or how good an investment it is going to be for the taxpayers of South Australia.

The State Drill Core Reference Library I think will be great, having South Australian geological findings all in one place. If it is put together properly and managed and out there for the rest of the world to look at, it will put our mining and geological assets on show, and I think that is a great initiative. Also, visiting the Riverland (home to my electorate), we looked at some of the environmental works and measures that have been undertaken out there. It gave the committee an understanding of some of the shortfalls and requirements needed for some of these major projects.

I think, overall, the committee is going along beautifully. I think we have a very enthusiastic committee that is always looking to further their knowledge of the projects that are laid before us. I commend the annual report and look forward to its further continuation.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:13): Thank you to the members for Finnis and Chaffey for their contributions and I note their comments. I will speak on the 507th report of the Public Works Committee, titled Annual Report 2013-14. In its oversight role of government public works proposals, the committee reviewed 25 projects during this period, including the redevelopment of several schools, water repair and upgrade projects, and major road and transport upgrades. Project budgets ranged from \$4 million to \$152.4 million, with the committee also considering several high profile

projects, such as early works for the South Road upgrade and the rail revitalisation stage 2, the electrification of the Gawler line.

The committee continued to monitor previously approved projects through quarterly reporting by departments. In support of this, the committee also undertook seven site visits, including:

- the progress of the South Road superway, which was completed earlier this year and is now open to traffic and receiving many positive comments;
- the electrification of the Seaford rail line and the new electric train, now completed and operational;
- Playford Alive, the development around Munno Para and Andrews Farm, due to be completed in 2017-18;
- the Adelaide footbridge, which is now providing safe and efficient access to the Oval and is well supported during football matches in particular;
- the redeveloped Adelaide Oval, to the first cricket match last year, and this year to the first concert, being the Rolling Stones, which was a great event;
- the State Drill Core Reference Library at Glenside—and I support the comments from the member for Finniss: it was a really interesting visit and something that I really learned a lot about; and
- the Tonsley redevelopment, where TAFE SA has already commenced operations at the beginning of this year, and Flinders University will be teaching from there early in the new year. The State Drill Core Reference Library will consolidate on this site by the end of 2015. A number of businesses have also committed to establishing themselves there in the future, and many are there already.

As committee members, we find these site visits important to our understanding of projects and the ability to assess their progress. Last November, members of the committee travelled to Sydney to meet with key government and industry players involved with public-private partnerships. I am told it was a great opportunity to discuss the feasibility, workability and success of public-private partnerships in New South Wales.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and thank my fellow members of the committee, the members for Colton, Torrens, Finniss and Chaffey, as well as the previous members of the committee: the former member for Mitchell, Mr Alan Sibbons, who was the presiding member of the committee during this period; and the member for Ramsay and the member for Waite. I say a special thank you to the New South Wales hosts during the committee's study tour into public-private partnerships, and I also acknowledge the time they spent with the members. This was very much appreciated and members found it a most worthwhile visit.

Finally, thank you to the committee staff, both past and present, for their work in ensuring the smooth operation of the committee. I look forward to the continued bipartisan workings of this committee and also to further visits next year, which we have been discussing and are well and truly in the planning for. I recommend this annual 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 12 November 2014.)

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:17): In my initial three-minute contribution, I talked about the impact of the emergency services levy on communities and property owners who have contacted me. There has been support for the amendment moved by the member for MacKillop to ensure that there is further scrutiny by the Economic and Finance Committee of the emergency services levy now that full details are available.

I do want to take up some time, though, to put into *Hansard* some evidence about the impact on one of my shadow portfolios, being local government, and emergency services levy increases. I will read out some names and figures, but I will only talk about the increases and the percentages, not the dollars of what it was and what it is, to make it a bit simpler. For example:

- Adelaide City Council has gone up by \$101,421 or 32 per cent;
- Alexandrina Council, \$15,000 or 136 per cent;
- Barossa Council, \$5,890 or 53 per cent;
- Barunga West council, \$1,331 or 36 per cent;
- Berri Barmera Council, \$3,616.80 or 58 per cent;
- Campbelltown council, \$15,904.25 or 74 per cent;
- Ceduna council, \$2,577.10 or 80 per cent;
- Charles Sturt council, up by \$87,065.15 or 198 per cent;
- Clare & Gilbert Valleys Council, \$4,319 or 55 per cent;
- Cleve district council, \$1,192.70 or 60 per cent;
- Copper Coast council, in my own electorate, \$14,391.25 or 79 per cent;
- District Council of Coober Pedy, \$610.15 or 50 per cent;
- The Coorong District Council, \$1,255.80 or 26 per cent;
- District Council of Elliston, \$1,284 or 49 per cent;
- The Flinders Ranges Council, \$777 or 37 per cent;
- District Council of Franklin Harbour, \$5,650.35 or 70 per cent;
- the Town of Gawler, \$6,656 or 60 per cent;
- the Regional Council of Goyder, \$1,720 or 39 per cent;
- the District Council of Grant, \$3,851 or 69 per cent;
- the City of Holdfast Bay council, \$48,518.70 or 115 per cent;
- Kangaroo Island Council, \$3,489.40 or 72 per cent;
- the District Council of Karoonda East Murray, \$483.56 or 29 per cent;
- the Light Regional Council, \$2,868 or 54 per cent;
- the District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula, \$3,204 or 68 per cent;
- the District Council of Mallala in Goyder, \$1,232.15 or 52 per cent;
- this is a rather large one, the City of Marion council, up by \$43,000 or 269 per cent—an amazing 269 per cent in the Marion council alone;
- Mid Murray Council, \$8,491 or 74 per cent;
- City of Mitcham council, \$31,872.25 or 144 per cent. It is interesting that the member for Waite, I believe, has Mitcham has part of his electorate. I would be interested to see what his response is to his councils.

Mr Pengilly: What about the Port Adelaide council?

Mr GRIFFITHS: I will get to Port Adelaide, don't worry.

- City of Mt Gambier council, \$16,955 or 110 per cent;
- The Rural City of Murray Bridge council in the member for Hammond's electorate, \$11,191 or 162 per cent;
- The Naracoorte Lucindale Council, \$4,859 or 70 per cent;
- The Northern Areas Council, \$1,590.65 or 30 per cent;
- City of Onkaparinga council—our largest council in South Australia with 180,000 people—has gone up by \$56,694.95 or 149 per cent;
- District Council of Orroroo Carrieton—the smallest in the state with only 932 residents—\$413 or 23 per cent;
- for the City of Playford council, \$26,026 or 193 per cent;
- the City of Port Adelaide Enfield council—the member for Finniss wanted to know—\$89,351.15—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRIFFITHS: —or 155 per cent.

Mr Pengilly: Can't afford tourism.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Finniss!

Mr GRIFFITHS: That is the challenge, in many ways, the Port Adelaide Enfield council has. Good luck to them in working out their issues.

- Port Augusta City Council, \$7,338 or 63 per cent;
- City of Pt Lincoln council, \$9,861.55 or 90 per cent;
- Port Pirie Regional Council, \$5,827 or 67 per cent;
- City of Prospect council—David O'Loughlin, former unsuccessful candidate for the—

Mr Pengilly: Labor land.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRIFFITHS: —Adelaide electorate—that has gone up by \$9,778 or 229 per cent.

- Municipal Council of Roxby Downs, \$2,711.05 or 87 per cent;
- City of Salisbury council, \$37,424 or 237 per cent;
- Southern Mallee District Council, \$862 or 32 per cent;
- District Council of Streaky Bay, \$1,964 or 64 per cent;
- Tatiara District Council, \$2,601.05 or 65 per cent;
- City of Tea Tree Gully, \$30,784 or 170 per cent;
- District Council of Tumby Bay, \$2,478.85 or 78 per cent;
- City of Unley council, \$29,000 or 179 per cent;
- City of Victor Harbor, \$6,889.80 or 67 per cent;
- Wakefield Regional Council, \$2,793.02 or 36 per cent;
- Corporation of the Town of Walkerville, \$12,274 or 99 per cent;

- Wattle Range Council, \$6,269.95 or 69 per cent;
- City of West Torrens, \$31,637.15 or 92 per cent;
- The Corporation of the City of Whyalla—the member for Giles will be interested in this one—\$16,828.75 or 157 per cent—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: 157 per cent, member for Giles.

- Wudinna District Council, \$1,062.75 or 75 per cent;
- District Council of Yankalilla, \$2,014 or 57 per cent; and
- District Council of Yorke Peninsula, \$10,211.85 or 45 per cent.

I have only got 57 responses out of the 68 councils. The Local Government Association and mayors have been quite public on this in recent days. It is a real reason why the Economic and Finance Committee needs to relook at the emergency services levy increase, so that it can actually provide a full report to the parliament, and I look forward to the success of this amendment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hammond. Member for Hammond, I am just informed by the table that you have already spoken on this, so you can't speak again.

Mr PEDERICK: Have I, seriously?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unfortunately, those are the rules, so I will have to ask you—

Mr PEDERICK: That is a real shame, because I was about to launch into it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I know.

Mr PEDERICK: That is a real shame.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Never mind. Sit down and we will see who would like to take your notes from you and read with gusto. Member for Flinders.

Mr Pederick: I got shafted.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you didn't get shafted: you were being greedy and were caught out.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:25): I rise today to speak in support of the amendment by the member for MacKillop to the Economic and Finance Committee's 85th report entitled Emergency Services Levy 2014-15. Mr Williams, the member for MacKillop, moved to amend the motion by deleting the word 'noted' and replacing it with the words 'referred back to the Economic and Finance Committee for further consideration in light of the 2014-15 state budget'.

I am supporting this amendment. I think it is vital that we understand the role of committees in this place, that they are in fact committees of the parliament and not of the government. They have an important role to play and, even though a lot of our standing committees are dominated by the government of the day, they are not committees of the government. They are in fact committees of the parliament and it is important that they consider their very important role in that light.

The emergency services levy has been an extraordinary act of ill will by the government which, in fact, has imposed a land tax on all of the households, the property owners, the farmers right around this state. We have heard the member for Goyder read into *Hansard* the increases that our local governments have had—57 of them who have all seen increases often in the range of some hundreds of per cents, so it is very important that this report does go back to the committee. I note that one of the conclusions in the report is that:

The Committee notes the prescribed rates of the fixed property and mobile property levies and in the absence of the remission information, the Committee is unable to comment on any change in the effective rate.

I think this is really quite a damning conclusion. I will read that again just so that everybody in this chamber knows exactly what the conclusion of the finance committee was:

The Committee notes the prescribed rates of the fixed property and mobile property levies and—
importantly—

in the absence of the remission information, the Committee is unable to comment on any change in the effective rate.

For this reason, we urge the house to send this report back for further consideration of what really has become a very important part of the budgetary measures of the state government and highlights, in fact, the ineptitude of this state government in handling this state's finances. It needs very much more consideration.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:28): I am thrilled to rise to support the amendment provided by the member for MacKillop because I too support the committee process in this parliament. I remind the parliament of the importance of having a committee to examine, in this case, economic and finance matters for the benefit of ensuring that the parliament is kept abreast of what is going on and the mischief in presenting this report, and not dealing with the bombshell that came with the state budget this year in giving us the backdoor land tax on every piece of property and our motor vehicles. We have not even started on motor vehicles yet. What a joke!

To have kept that a secret prior to the election, announced it during the state budget and then try to push through a report here in June without having come through and actually identified what the new paradigms is. The new paradigm is nothing to do with the Premier's great vision for South Australia: the new paradigm is all about how he can greedily grab money out of the pockets of every South Australian who has the audacity to own a piece of property or a vehicle in this state. That is the shameful position the government has taken in failing to present an update.

We have just received the annual report from the Public Works Committee, which provides quarterly reports on their projects—and I think it is shamefully inadequate for departments to provide quarterly reports—but this is the purpose of these of committees, to keep an eye on the government's spend. The member for MacKillop's amendment is not only appropriate, it is necessary to keep the government to account in respect of its expenditure. In this case, the money grab from South Australians, as has been said, is shameful, but has also been completely removed. Upon having another brief perusal of this matter, I note the report states:

The committee notes the prescribed rates of the fixed property and mobile property levies and, in the absence of the remission information, the Committee is unable to comment on any change in the effective rate. The Committee notes the details of any remissions will be provided in the 19 June 2014 Budget.

As a committee, they are on alert of the fact that it is to come, and it needs to be considered because they cannot even deal with the remission information. We are in the dark; the public is in the dark, and the government has all the knowledge on this. It has an obligation to report to this committee, and as the member for MacKillop has pointed out in his amendment, this is necessary to occur so we know what is the truth of what the position is.

Secrecy will not resolve this problem. The public is angry—as is evident on every radio station, in every newspaper publication and in every television story—in respect of this obscene tax grab, and we want this remedied. We want the detail provided, and we want the committee to convene and have that evidence presented to them—fully and frankly.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:32): I thank all the members for their contributions, particularly the member for MacKillop, but I oppose his amendment. The member looks surprised. This is not a debate about the merits, or otherwise, of the emergency services levy. This debate has been going on since budget day with varying levels of passion and intelligence.

This was a motion which simply called on this house to note the report of the Economic and Finance Committee. The member for Flinders, in his contribution, pointed out that committees need to take their work seriously, and the member for Bragg reiterated that. It is worth going over the process which led to this report in the five minutes available to me.

Section 10(5) of the act requires that the minister must refer to the committee a written statement setting out the determinations that the minister proposes to make in respect of the ESL for that year. Determinations will be made in respect of: the amount that needs to be raised in the opinion of the minister; the amounts to be expended on emergency services and other purposes specified;

and, as far as practicable, the extent to which the various parts of the state will benefit from the application of that amount.

Ms Chapman: The first one was missing.

Mr ODENWALDER: I am not going to respond to interjections. I seek your protection.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You should not; you absolutely should not.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! He is behaving.

Mr ODENWALDER: The minister complied with his statutory obligations, so he provided us with a briefing paper containing determinations which formed the basis of a recommendation to the Governor in respect of declaring the emergency services levy. So, the Treasurer and the department complied with their obligations. The committee complied with its obligations which was simply to receive the report, hear it and report to parliament.

We had a public hearing on 12 June in which the matters raised in respect of the remissions not being included in the report were publicly available prior to that hearing. These remissions were not raised by any member of the opposition at either the hearing or at any subsequent meetings of the Economic and Finance Committee, and they were not raised until after the budget, so they had ample time. I do not know why they want to refer it back to the committee. The committee cannot change the decision anyway, even if it wanted to, so it is completely pointless.

Mr Williams: The committee can inform the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams: That is its job.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ODENWALDER: The member for MacKillop is trying to tell me what the Economic and Finance Committee's job is.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop will be called to order if he is not careful.

Members interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: I am reading from the act. We have complied with the act. Member for MacKillop, the Economic and Finance Committee complied with the act as did the Treasurer.

Mr Griffiths: The report notes the information was available.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ODENWALDER: It is becoming very difficult for me not to respond to interjections.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well you must not respond.

Mr ODENWALDER: Once again, varying levels of passion and intelligence.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The book is out and I will have no hesitation.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will close by opposing—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I do not want noise in the chamber. I want to be able to hear what people are saying. I would ask you on the other side, on my left, to please respect the dignity of the house. Finishing off, member for Little Para.

Mr ODENWALDER: Sure, I will close. I oppose this amendment for any number of reasons but primarily because the committee does not have the power to change what has already happened anyway, regardless of what any of us think about it. So it would just be another hearing where

members may or may not raise the subject of remissions. They had the chance before and they did not raise it. I oppose the amendment and I propose that the motion be moved in its original form.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes 19
 Noes 23
 Majority 4

AYES

Bell, T.S.	Chapman, V.A.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P.	Knoll, S.K.
McFetridge, D.	Pederick, A.S.	Pengilly, M.R.
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. (teller)
Wingard, C.		

NOES

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

PAIRS

Marshall, S.S.	Weatherill, J.W.
----------------	------------------

Amendment thus negatived; motion carried.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could members either leave the chamber or take their seats. There is too much noise—looking at you.

An honourable member: The member for Elder?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, Schubert.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

SELECT COMMITTEE ON A REVIEW OF THE RETIREMENT VILLAGES ACT 1987

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr McFetridge:

That the report of the committee be noted.

(Continued from 29 October 2014.)

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (11:43): It has taken quite a while to get to this point, so long that in fact I thought I might be in a retirement village before I had the opportunity to deliver the—

Members interjecting:

Mr SPEIRS: No sarcasm! I am not responding to interjections. I rise to add my personal support for the work that was undertaken by the select committee during 2013 on the Retirement Villages Act. I believe that this body of work is an example of the good pieces of work that can be achieved when members of this place work together in a bipartisan spirit. I note that the recommendations of this committee were unanimous and I hope the government decides to progress these recommendations because, from reading through the report and from my own experiences assisting constituents in retirement villages, there is much need for reform in this sector.

I note that three members of the previous committee, Ms Breuer, Mr Sibbons and Mr Hill, have moved on from this place and I thank them for their involvement with this committee and report. Likewise, I thank the other members of the committee who remain here: the member for Morphett, the member for Heysen and the member for Frome.

The need for reform in the retirement villages sector appears to arise simply because the legislation has been surpassed by changes within a sector which has grown rapidly through the nineties and 2000s. When the act was created in 1987, the retirement village sector was far less mature and complex than it is today, with the average retirement village being just a cluster of small cottages or units which were owned by a church or fairly unsophisticated not-for-profit organisation. Today, it is well known that the retirement village sector is a far more substantial beast.

In South Australia approximately 24,200 people live in retirement village accommodation, according to the select committee's report, with this accommodation ranging from properties which cater for a wide range of needs, from the elderly who are from low socioeconomic backgrounds through to wealthy apartment complexes in inner city and coastal locations. In my electorate I have many hundreds of constituents who live in retirement village accommodation, with some of these establishments catering for the poor, some for the more affluent and some for the very affluent.

Having doorknocked these establishments extensively, I have come to know their ins and outs, their successes and failures and the challenges faced by both tenants and management bodies. I have seen the immense diversity in the sector firsthand and since becoming a member of parliament I have also heard firsthand the difficulties some residents of retirement villages can come up against and ask me, as their MP, to assist them with.

I have sat with one constituent as he cried in my office about losing \$70,000 to a retirement village operator. His situation was unique in that he had entered the retirement village after falling seriously ill and being unable to care for himself or his large property. However, in a fortunate turn of events, he made a remarkable recovery and found himself in a situation where he could leave the village after only a few months there. However, the price for leaving and returning to accommodation that better suited his healthy lifestyle was \$70,000, which amounted to a huge chunk out of his life savings and potential future financial security.

One has to ask oneself about the ethical basis of such a decision. Although it met all the contractual obligations that the retirement village operator had set down, he had only lived in the village for a few months. On a commercial basis, his time there amounted to only a few thousand dollars in rent but he lost many, many times that amount when the village decided to keep a large portion of the bond that he had put down to enter the property. The operator in question claimed that they were able to do so because those terms were included in the complex contract he had signed to enter the property.

The story which I relate above is one of the reasons I am so supportive of recommendation No. 4 of the committee, which is:

That the Act be amended to introduce a standard disclosure document, prescribed by Regulations, to assist residents in comparing villages and in understanding their rights and obligations.

Recommendation No. 4, part (c), outlines what any standard disclosure document should include, and that is:

...all fees and charges which residents will be responsible for:

- prior to entering a village
- while residing in a village

- upon leaving a village;
- examples of exit fee scenarios;
- definitions of fees, charges and funds;

should be included in the standard disclosure document. I understand from members who worked on the select committee that this was a concern raised many times by the witnesses who turned up for the hearings, and that the fees involved in entering, staying in and then (potentially) leaving the retirement village, as my constituent did in the aforementioned story, posed significant concerns for many people living in retirement village accommodation in South Australia. There is no doubt that more disclosure is needed in straightforward, accessible language so that those entering retirement villages can feel comfortable and assured that they are fully informed of the financial obligations potentially facing them as a result of entering a village.

I return again to the story of my constituent that I recounted above, because I think it is worth remembering and reflecting on the circumstances which surround people moving into a retirement village. Often these circumstances occur following bereavement, illness and family difficulties, and can be skewed by emotion and grief that comes with these circumstances and that comes from leaving a long-term family home where the resident has a sense of place and attachment. Often these situations arise suddenly, unexpectedly and without the time given for prior planning and often without family support in place, possibly due to the death of a loved one.

So, this can seriously colour the judgement and capacity of someone entering a retirement village to make the correct decisions and to fully inform themselves, despite the unexpectedness of having to enter into such accommodation. We should remember that, while it can be good to have plans in place to downsize and move into these retirement villages a long time in advance, that is often not the case, due to ill health, and sudden bereavement or vulnerability that can beset older people.

Again, I come across many people in my electorate who are considering moving to retirement villages, but their difficulties in understanding their contractual obligations discourage them from doing so. In these cases they actually spend more time in their larger home than is necessary, leading to increased vulnerability and potential welfare issues. I am pleased to note that the government has indicated its support for recommendation 4, parts (a) to (c), and in part supported recommendation 4(d), which will give retirement village residents an extra 15 days to cool off when signing a contract.

I would like to close at this point. There are many other recommendations contained within the select committee report, but I wanted to highlight that recommendation 4, which outlines the need for the standard disclosure document, because I think, from my own experience as a local member of parliament with lots of such accommodation options like these, and having come across many people considering downsizing through the relative demographics of my electorate being quite a bit older than the average South Australian electorate, this is something I really think needs to be addressed urgently.

I commend the select committee's report to the parliament. I thank the members who were involved in it, and I urge the government to follow up on those recommendations and look at undertaking the required legislative change to ensure that some of the recommendations, particularly around financial disclosure and the need to look at the contracts for these retirement villages, take legislative effect in this state.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:52): I also wish to make a brief contribution to the tabling of this report and I also support it. In not quite a past life but at least before the last election in a shadow portfolio I had responsibility for consumer and business services, under which much of the implementation of the control of retirement villages falls. During that time I had constituents contact me with concerns, which involved some personal visits. Certainly Mr Brian Atkinson contacted me. He and his wife live in a facility not that far away from Gawler. He raised some legitimate concerns that were part of the report and investigation carried out by the select committee.

I am a bit closer to retirement than is the member for Bright; I am only three years away from being 55 years of age, which I believe that you have to be before being able to move into these

places. The ones I have visited are outstanding facilities, seemingly very well cared for and the community spirit that exists within them, and the facilities available, are quite good. I recognise that in some there are challenges for people who live there, and predominantly it is around the fees, the concessions, that might otherwise apply for the properties they own, the physical infrastructure, but it is based upon leased land.

We need to ensure this the parliament considers this seriously, which is why I recognise and support the comments of the member for Bright when he talks about the level of support provided by the government already to some of the recommendations from the report. The baby boomer generation and the retirement challenges that will present to all Australians confirms in my mind quite clearly that this will be an expanding industry and one in which the government needs some tight involvement to ensure that the regulations that are in force are as far as they possibly can be.

I can quote to the house comments provided to me by a person very well known to me. A friend of hers moved into a retirement village on the understanding of what the cost implications were, but chose to leave after about six months because they did not necessary enjoy the lifestyle that it provided to that person. The cost for that person to get out after such a short time was \$60,000. The member for Bright shared a story of a \$70,000 cost, so there seems to be some consistency in the short-term occupancy of a very high level of cost.

It depends on the age of the property and things like that, but that is an area over which there needs to be some greater control. I know in my discussion with various people there have been concerns about when properties are to be sold, the number of agents involved, and some controls about trying to ensure that the maximum price is achieved at all times. This is an important area, and I think, with the parliament's involvement via the select committee, there can be some improvement opportunities. The parliament has worked well in this case and the government has responded.

I also look forward to the report's adoption and the implementation of changes, not just in the short term but over the next five to 10 years, because there will be some very serious work that the parliament needs to do in ensuring the legislation is sound, viable and will negatively impact as few people as possible, and that, no matter what their socioeconomic backgrounds or financial capacities are to fund, members of our communities get the facilities they deserve.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT LINCOLN, ADELAIDE WOMEN'S, MOUNT GAMBIER PRISON EXPANSIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 506th report of the committee, entitled Proposal to Expand Three Prisons: Port Lincoln Prison, Adelaide Women's Prison and Mount Gambier Prison, be noted.

(Continued from 15 October 2014.)

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:56): I do wish to make a brief comment on this particular report. Prisons are an interest of mine, and I have visited nearly all of them. However, the concern at the moment—although it was not the officers' concern and they were unable to make comment on it—is that South Australia is going to have to have a new prison or a major prison extension fairly soon. That became painfully obvious during the questioning of Mr Brown and others at the hearing. Put simply, we are running out of space.

In my view, the continual adding of containers to various prisons to house inmates is a short-term solution to a long-term problem, and the fact is that although the containers seem to be suitable for human habitation and are now in place at various prisons, including the Adelaide Women's Prison and Mount Gambier Prison, surely to heavens they cannot be the ideal solution. The prison population is increasing, as we all know.

There are no votes in prisons for either side of the house; I am fully aware of that. But, as SAPOL continually gathers up a collection of villains and people involved in other nefarious activities that get a custodial sentence, the reality is that—I seek leave to continue my remarks at another time.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Parliamentary Procedure***SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (11:59): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business set down on the *Notice Paper* for Thursday 20 November and 4 December to take precedence over Government Business on Thursday 20 November after the completion of grievances, with Private Members Business Bills taking priority over Private Members Business Other Motions unless otherwise ordered.

Motion carried.

*Bills***PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT (TREASURER'S INSTRUCTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 October 2014.)

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:00): I rise to speak on this amendment bill and to say that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. I do not think that I will trouble the timekeepers with everything that is entitled to me. While I am sure it can be dealt with quite quickly, this Public Finance and Audit (Treasurer's Instructions) Amendment Bill 2014 is nonetheless an important piece of legislation. I say that the Liberal opposition supports the amendment bill. It is nonetheless very important, as I said. It will be dealt with certainly more fulsomely by the opposition in the other place, by the Hon. Rob Lucas, who is the shadow treasurer.

Essentially, this is about internal operating instructions clarification. It is perhaps about hierarchy as well. Treasurer's Instructions via the Public Finance and Audit Act in a certain way can take priority over other acts with regard to spending, entering into contracts, use of funds, acquisition or disposal of property, incurring liabilities, etc., by public authorities. It does this by essentially saying that the Treasurer's Instruction under the Public Finance and Audit Act are deemed to become part of and additional to the public authority's obligations under its own act.

This is generally for very good reasons, because it might well be that the Treasurer, or in fact the Minister for Finance, who at the moment is the same person, might have some accounting practices or might have some ways of conducting financial transactions on behalf of the public of South Australia which are very important, and those things might evolve over time. A new standard might come in that needs to be adopted by all public authorities, and so it makes good sense for the Treasurer to have the capacity to give instructions that all public authorities, acting under a range of different acts, should adopt in relation to these new and positive ways of operating.

In some ways, while these are actually Treasurer's Instructions, in some ways it might even be more relevant to the Minister for Finance and that minister's responsibilities in terms of having an oversight in not just where the money is coming from and going to, but in fact the process of how it is spent, and having to deal with the Auditor-General's questions later on.

It does throw up one important question, though. What happens if there is a conflict between the Treasurer's Instructions to the public authority and that public authority's existing obligations under their own act? I will come back to that shortly, but, while I say again generally that there are positive reasons why the Treasurer's Instructions would have this authority, that is a critical issue: what happens if there is a conflict?

I am advised by the Hon. Rob Lucas that one of the reasons that this amendment bill has come forward at the moment is because of an example that has arisen with regard to WorkCover. WorkCover is a public authority for the purpose of the Public Finance and Audit Act. It is therefore intended to be subject to the requirements of that act and Treasurer's Instructions. However, WorkCover obtained legal advice that indicated they believe provisions of the WorkCover Corporation Act means that they do not have to comply with the Public Finance and Audit Act or Treasurer's Instructions. The government has advised that the Solicitor-General disagrees

with WorkCover's advice and their interpretation of the bill, so this bill is intended to ensure that WorkCover and any other public authority does have to comply with the Public Finance and Audit Act and the Treasurer's Instructions.

That is one example that has been brought forward by the Hon. Rob Lucas, and I am sure that the Treasurer would be aware of that situation. However, it does beg the question of what other examples might be out there, so I ask that the Treasurer, when he makes a further contribution to this debate, share with this house any other examples that might have come up or any other issues that may have led to the need for this clarification that we are working through at the moment.

What is the current problem with the scope of the Treasurer's Instructions that has meant the government needs to make these changes? Has the Auditor-General ever raised an issue that has led to a need to clarify this; if so, what was the issue or issues? Is there an example or examples of a particular provision of an act that is inconsistent with the Treasurer's Instructions? Assuming this legislation is passed, if the parliament has passed an act that provides that a body should be independent of the minister, does this give Treasury authority to override that and make the body subject to the Treasurer's authority via the Treasurer's Instructions? Of course, that then gets me back to the question I raised previously: what happens when there is a conflict?

I would like to point to a couple of clauses in the bill. I would be more than happy to come back and ask these questions in the committee stage, although I would be equally happy if the Treasurer, when he contributes further remarks in the debate, could clarify these issues. Essentially, looking at part 2, section 41, four additional clauses, which will replace the original subsection (4) in the act, are proposed to be inserted into the act by this bill. I will read the last two of them:

- (6) Treasurer's Instructions are to be interpreted as being consistent with an act conferring functions or powers on a public authority if it is possible for the public authority to comply with both the act and the Treasurer's Instructions in the performance or exercise of the functions or powers.

The second clause, which I will refer to in a moment, provides:

- (7) In particular, if an act confers on a public authority power to enter a contract or manage or apply a fund or other powers relevant to the receipt, management or expenditure of money, the acquisition or disposal of property or the incurring of liabilities, the authority must, in exercising the power, comply with Treasurer's Instructions—

which is all straightforward, but it then goes on to provide—

...unless it is not possible for the authority to do so and to also comply with any requirements relating to the exercise of the power under the Act.

So this bill clearly recognises that there may well be instances where there is a conflict.

Certainly in my reading of the bill (and I am happy to be advised otherwise), there is nothing that actually stipulates how these issues would be dealt with where a conflict does exist. It might well be that it is contained in another act that the Treasurer or his advisers are aware of, and I would be very grateful if that information could be brought forward because, clearly, where there is no conflict it is quite easy to understand that this would all be done for very positive purposes, as mentioned before; however where there is a conflict, that presents a very difficult situation with regard to how that public authority should conduct its business when it is caught between Treasurer's Instructions and the responsibilities and obligations of its own act.

One other hopefully very small question—it might just be that it is a term I have never come across myself—relates to part 2, clause 3—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation, which provides:

...after the definition of local government indemnity scheme insert:

Property means real or personal property and includes—

- (a) a chose in action;

I am just not sure what 'a chose in action' means. It might well be a perfectly legitimate legal term that I have never come across. If the Treasurer could answer that question for me, and for the rest of the house because it appears that nobody else here knows what it means either, it would be helpful. It may well be quite a straightforward technical or legal term that none of us have come across. I will finish up here.

This does seem to be very sound logic, but we would like to know whether there are any other examples in addition to the WorkCover example that have meant that the government has decided to bring this bill forward. We would like to know whether there are any examples the government is aware of where there is or could possibly be a conflict between Treasurer's Instructions and that public authorities act. We would also like to know, please, how the government proposes to deal with those situations when and if there is a conflict.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:11): I rise also to speak on the Public Finance and Audit (Treasurer's Instructions) Amendment Bill. This is a bill that is short in stature but quite interesting in its application, which has led me to do a bit of digging. Again, as one of the new kids on the block, whenever I see things like this come before the house, I use it as an opportunity to expand my meagre knowledge and understand better the processes of this place and of the state government.

As a voracious reader of the Auditor-General's Report, Treasurer's Instructions Nos 2 and 28 are becoming more and more familiar to me as obviously they relate to financial management and also to the Financial Management Compliance Program relating to government departments. The Auditor-General goes through and looks through these two particular TIs but also references a number of other Treasurer's Instructions throughout the report looking at whether or not government departments have complied with these.

It is interesting to note how often there is a grey area, and certainly the Auditor-General's Report uses language of a more gentle and understated nature. For instance, within the Department for Education and Child Development, with reference to procurement, the Auditor-General says of the department that their policies are not consistent with the requirements of the Treasurer's Instructions. At the end of his report on the education department he said, 'Audit asks the DECD to review their policy with regard to TIs, especially in relation to the timeliness of payments made.' I highlight those two as merely a couple of comments that I came across while reading through the document, where the Auditor-General gently tries to suggest that, yes, there are these Treasurer's Instructions and, yes, they should be followed, but there are probably some instances where we need to tighten up on that.

I also note that throughout the report, not just within the education department but right across the report, he makes these gentle recommendations to the government. But there is one instance where it gets a bit more specific. In relation to the member for Stuart's comments earlier regarding what are the problems, page 121 of Part B, Volume 1 of the Auditor-General's Report goes through the Art Gallery board's financial dealings. I came across something interesting, because again I knew nothing of what the Art Gallery board did before I read this, and I would like to bring it to the attention of the house because it may be something that is being dealt with through this bill. It talks about the significant purchase of an artwork, 'On 7 November 2013 the Board purchased a significant work of art,' I am not going to get his name right, but it is Camille Pissarro, and I am sure that is an abuse of the way I should say it, 'titled 'Prairie à Éragny', and again I apologise to all French-speaking people.

This work was purchased for a total of USD4.253 million from Sotheby's in New York, which equated to a price paid by the Board of \$4.593 million.

There was some discussion around how much the board should authorise to pay this, but before we get to that I would like to point out, 'The purchase of the Pissarro,' and I am reading again from the Auditor-General's Report, 'by the board outside of the monetary limits detailed in TI 8'. Treasurer's Instruction No. 8 says that there is a monetary limit of \$1.1 million put on the amount that the board, or I assume government entities, can spend on significant pieces of infrastructure, or artwork in this case, without needing to go back for further approvals. Again, I am reading from the report:

From discussions with Board staff, it was not clear whether the requirements of TI 8 apply to the Board or whether specific Board powers detailed in the Gallery Act prevail.

So here is an instance where there is some ambiguity as to the primacies of the Art Gallery Act versus Treasurer's Instructions, and it meant that the Art Gallery board made the decision to purchase a piece of art worth \$4.593 million, which may or may not have been at odds with Treasurer's Instruction No. 8. The Auditor-General goes on to say:

As a result, significant artwork purchases greater than \$1.1 million may not be appropriately authorised for purchase by the Board if the purchase requirements of TI 8 are applicable to the Board. The Board responded that it acknowledges that it would be useful to seek formal clarification on the applicability of TI 8 for the purchase of artworks.

In this instance, I think the board itself is asking for the clarification which, hopefully, this bill seeks to redress, and I think that would be a very good thing. I will detail a little bit more about this purchase because the board approved the purchase price including the buyer's premium insurance and freight of \$4 million.

The final purchase price of \$4.593 million, which was the hammer price plus the buyer's premium only, exceeded the total amount that was approved by the board. Board staff identified that at the time of bidding an anonymous bidder was present who agreed to pay the amount in excess of \$4 million. The Auditor-General obtained documentation to support these receipts from the anonymous donor but noted that two payments, totalling \$500,000, were received in relation to the artwork.

One of those, the \$150,000 contribution, was received on 28 October 2013, prior to the auction, so it seems as though—and I think what the Auditor-General is trying to say—the total purchase price exceeded the approved limit by \$593,000 and that, of that \$593,000, \$500,000 was donated by an anonymous donor but, of that \$500,000, only \$350,000 was actually part of the top-up amount. Again, it seems as though the Art Gallery board has exceeded its own limit and certainly well exceeded Treasurer's Instruction No. 8. The Auditor-General goes on to say:

A lack of clarity in financial arrangements for major acquisitions may result in the Board making purchases of artwork that exceed Board approved purchase prices.

I think a lot of work needs to be done there in terms of not only how Treasurer's Instruction No. 8 applies but also how the board goes about making purchases.

Another fun fact I learnt while trawling through the Auditor-General's Report about the Art Gallery board is that they receive about \$9 million a year in revenue from the state government, but on behalf of the people of South Australia look after a staggering \$602 million worth of artwork that the state government, through the Art Gallery board, owns. That is something that really startled me.

I have come to learn that we have some beautiful paintings as part of that collection. There is a Tom Roberts in there. It really is going to spur me to go on and pay my gold coin donation and go down and have a look at some of these artworks and really appreciate the great expense and the fantastic pieces of artwork treasure we have in the Art Gallery and to make full use of them, given that they have come at significant cost to the South Australian taxpayer.

With those comments, I indicate that I am very much in favour of this bill, certainly in terms of how WorkCover, as a public body, deals with the Treasurer's Instructions, which is an issue this bill seeks to address. I also hope that the amendments in this bill help to clarify the arrangements under which the Art Gallery board operates. In clause 5—Amendment of section 41—Treasurer's Instructions, under subclause (2)—Section 41(4), it provides:

- (6) Treasurer's instructions are to be interpreted as being consistent with an Act conferring functions or powers on a public authority if it is possible for the public authority to comply with both the Act and the Treasurer's instructions in the performance or exercise of the functions or powers.

I think that is very much the operative clause we are talking about and I hope the operative clause helps to deal with 'the lack of clarity', as the Auditor-General calls it, in relation to the Art Gallery board.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:21): I rise to support the Public Finance and Audit (Treasurer's Instructions) Amendment Bill 2014. This is a bill that was introduced into parliament only on 29 October. The bill is attempting to clarify matters relating to the application and scope of Treasurer's Instructions and makes minor amendments of a statute law revision nature. The amendments seek to improve general understanding about the relationship between Treasurer's Instructions and provisions of an act providing a public authority with functions and powers.

I was very interested in the member for Schubert's information in regard to the Art Gallery of South Australia's buying art and operating outside of its own parameters. It will be interesting to see whether that is something that can be captured under this bill.

I am of the understanding that WorkCover has obtained legal advice that indicates that it believes that provisions in the WorkCover Corporation Act mean that it does not have to comply with the Public Finance and Audit Act or Treasurer's Instructions. I find that interesting when WorkCover is a public authority for the purpose of the Public Finance and Audit Act and is therefore intended to be subject to the requirements of that act and Treasurer's Instructions.

The government has advised our shadow treasurer that the Solicitor-General disagrees with WorkCover's interpretation and that the bill is intended to ensure that WorkCover and any other public authority have to comply with the Public Finance and Audit Act and Treasurer's Instructions. I note from the second reading explanation that it is about making a framework for the financial management of public finances. As I indicated earlier, it also provides:

The ability for the Treasurer to issue instructions binding public authorities is central to providing a framework that advances accountability, integrity and transparency for the benefit of the State.

It goes on to state that the main essence of the bill is as follows:

...to make it clear that a general provision in an Act establishing a public authority, such as a power to enter contracts (or even a more specific provision such as a requirement to have a particular body approve a contract), will not override a requirement of Treasurer's instructions applying to the public authority, for example, requiring an approval of the Treasurer or delegate to be obtained for entry into a contract.

As indicated, these amendments are designed 'to improve general understanding about the relationship between Treasurer's Instructions and provisions of an Act providing a public authority for functions and powers'.

There is an attempt to clarify the scope of Treasurer's Instructions so that it is clear that they may regulate any matter related to the receipt, expenditure or investment of money, the acquisition or disposal of property, or the incurring of liabilities by the Treasurer and public authorities. I note a couple of amendments that have been made to section 41(4) 'delete subsection (4)' and substituting several amendments in subsections (6) and (7). Subsection (6) provides:

Treasurer's instructions are to be interpreted as being consistent with an Act conferring functions or powers on a public authority if it is possible for the public authority to comply with both the Act and the Treasurer's instructions in the performance or exercise of the functions or powers.

Subsection (7) provides:

In particular, if an Act confers on a public authority power to enter a contract or manage or apply a fund or other powers relevant to the receipt, management or expenditure of money, the acquisition or disposal of property or the incurring of liabilities, the authority must, in exercising the power, comply with Treasurer's Instructions (including by obtaining any approval required by the instructions) unless it is not possible for the authority to do so and to also comply with any requirements relating to the exercise of the power under the Act.

I think there is some concern when I read words 'unless it is not possible for the authority to do so'. I would be interested in the Treasurer's comments in regard to that and why there would be certain instances where someone, as an authority, could not comply with this bill if it becomes law.

Apart from the fact that we are trying to tidy up the public audit functions of this act and the whole realm in regard to Treasurer's Instructions, we need to be absolutely certain that these are complied with and that there is no wriggle room. What I can see here is that there is wriggle room, so I will be very interested in the Treasurer's comments in regard to where authorities may still not need to comply, because that will lead into another legal argument similar to the WorkCover case, where they believe that they do not have to comply with the current legislation.

With those few words I support the legislation, but seek some explanation in regard to some of the comments made in the bill, and I wish it speedy progress through the house.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we continue, I would like to acknowledge the presence in the gallery this morning of a group of year 11 and 12 students from the Willunga Waldorf School, who are guests of the member for Mawson. We welcome them and hope they enjoy their time here with us today. Member for Hartley.

*Bills***PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT (TREASURER'S INSTRUCTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:27): I also rise today to support the Public Finance and Audit (Treasurer's Instructions) Amendment Bill 2014. My comments will be in a similar light to those of the members for Stuart, Hammond and Schubert. I will certainly support the bill, but I too will seek some explanation, as have the members before, from the Treasurer, hopefully in his closing remarks. Oversight of public statutory authorities is extremely important, and it is imperative for this parliament to do so. As the member for Stuart highlighted, there are a number of questions about the bill that remain unanswered, and I welcome the Treasurer's explanations.

The bill, which was tabled on 29 October, clarifies many matters relating to the application and scope of Treasurer's Instructions and does make minor amendments of a statutory law revision nature. I understand that the amendments do seek to improve the general understanding of the relationship between Treasurer's Instructions and provisions of the act, which provides a public authority with various functions and powers.

I understand that WorkCover is a public authority for the purpose of the Public Finance and Audit Act. It is extremely important and it is intended to be subject to the requirements of that act and Treasurer's Instructions.

I understand that we have requested details of the government's legal advice on this issue. The government advises that the Solicitor-General disagrees with the view on WorkCover's interpretation and that the bill is intended to ensure that WorkCover, and any other public authority for that matter, has to comply with the Public Finance and Audit Act and Treasurer's Instructions. I have been told that we have asked for details of the government's legal advice. Whilst I understand that these things are subject to all kinds of privilege, I would just seek a little bit more clarification in regard to this issue from the Treasurer.

Subject to this being noncontentious, I will be quite happy to support the bill. As I said, oversight of statutory authorities is extremely important. Otherwise, the bill is quite concise, it is common sense, and I would be happy to support what looks to be quite a pragmatic approach here. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (12:30): I want to thank members for their support and thank the opposition for taking a principled position on this. It probably will delight the public to know that the Liberal Party do not oppose everything the government does and a large majority of legislation we introduce is supported in a bipartisan matter. It is good to see that the younger members of the opposition are taking a much more fiscally responsible position than their older counterparts who they one day will be replacing.

It is important that Treasurer's Instructions are followed, for a number of reasons. I want to clarify to the house why it is important that the Treasurer's Instructions are there. We want to give guidance to statutory boards about how they procure things. The cabinet, and therefore the elected representatives of the executive, has a right to know what long-term contracts people are entering into. The reason we want Treasurer's Instructions there is that these boards are unelected. They have no mandate. The mandates they have are from this house.

There were some questions raised by members opposite about clarity between Treasurer's Instructions and where there might be some ambiguity about what would apply. Let me be very clear: the parliament is supreme. If the parliament has allocated a provision or a responsibility to a certain individual or organisation about whether to procure products or enter into contracts, that remains. What the Treasurer's Instructions in that case will do is service as a guide and make sure that we are always informed. I am not attempting in any way to subvert the democratic rule of the parliament where there have been past pieces of legislation enacted that have not been repealed which give people authority to expend money. Let me be very clear about that.

Public authorities—you wanted examples and WorkCover is an example that is important to note. It is important that all corporations which have, in effect, created monopolies because of legislation enacted in this house do inform the government of the day of what they are doing when they enter into commercial contracts. That does not necessarily mean that we would stop them, but what is important to note is that we know exactly what it is they are doing. They are not autonomous, and I mean that in the broadest way possible. I am not attempting to subvert the role of boards; I just think the taxpayer has the right to know how money is being expended by these boards. Also, the taxpayer has a right to understand before the event rather than after the event in an annual report.

That can be controversial for some board members. Some board members are selected for their expertise in a certain field. They go on to these boards and they do exceptional work for the government and the people of South Australia for very limited recompense. These board members are not in it for the money, let's be clear about that. They are in it because they want to benefit the people of South Australia and they want to be able to contribute back to the local community. I think the people on the WorkCover board, the Motor Accident Commission and the HomeStart board are generally giving back to their local community. Whether it be Funds SA, or any other board, these people generally have a very good level of skills, the state is utilising their skills and we pay them very little in return for that.

Some community expectations would think it is quite a lot of money but, when you are hiring financial experts to sit on the Funds SA board and you are paying them a certain level per year, the expertise we are getting for what we pay far exceeds that, so the benefit to the state is quite large. Treasurer's instructions are not there to try to tell them how to do their job; they are there to be a guiding principle about what the elected government and the parliament would expect as being good financial management.

Of course, being a Treasurer, it is important to note that there are people throughout government, which is a very large organisation, who are expending tax dollars and some of them are doing so in our name and we find out about it after the event. I cannot be in every boardroom in every board meeting in every office when a contract is being entered into, but Treasurer's Instructions are there to make sure that that money is expended in a prudent way. It avoids any complications or accusations of corruption or collusion. I think it gives a protection to people who serve us so well on these boards.

Is it perfect? No, it is not. Will mistakes be made? Yes, they will. Human nature is such that no instruction that the Treasurer sends out will be perfect, but I think it is important to note that what I am attempting to do, and what the government is attempting to do, is make sure that public authorities are governed in the most proper manner possible, with an eye always on the Treasurer's Instructions. Like I said earlier, if the parliament has already given authority to another organisation to act, this does not seek to subvert that. What it seeks to do is be a guide.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: So, if ever there is a conflict, the public authorities act would take precedence?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will take advice on that but I am pretty sure that is accurate. As my Treasury official just said to me, it is there to complement and offer a guide. Do you want to go into committee?

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: I'll sort it out now, if that's okay.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you probably shouldn't.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We probably should go into committee: it would be the proper process. I am happy to take questions on it, and you may want to do a deeper dive into some of the clauses, which is fine by me. I think it is an important piece of legislation, and I think it does show that the Liberal Party is maturing in its cooperation with the government and accepting that their job is to help the government introduce legislation that actually improves the financial outcomes. If you look at my second reading speech, and I do not know if it is disorderly to refer to it, Madam Deputy—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We've all memorised them.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'm sure you have, Deputy Speaker, because you are the most diligent member of the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are buying those calendars later, are you?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'll be buying the calendars later, yes, ma'am. If you look at the amendment bill report, it talks of the main purpose of the bill being to make it clear that a general provision in the act establishing a public authority, such as a power to enter contracts or even a more specific provision such as a requirement to have a particular body approve a contract, will not override the requirement of the Treasurer's Instructions applying to a public authority, for example, requiring an approval of the Treasurer or delegate to be obtained before entering into the contract. While these matters can be clarified in the relevant charters and directions of particular bodies, these amendments are designed to improve the general understanding about the relationship between the Treasurer's Instructions and the provisions of any act providing a public authority with functions and powers.

What the government is saying is that, while the act and the parliament is supreme, these Treasurer's Instructions which can be issued are a guide. They do not seek to override the functions and power. If there is some ambiguity or some need for clarification, crown law advice should be sought and crown law advice is what should be followed.

If the government has a particular problem, we can always return to the parliament to amend these acts, but I think the fastest and most efficient way of doing that is by clarifying what the role of Treasurer's Instructions are, to give people in these public authorities better clarity. It is not perfect. What would perhaps be perfect would be to individually amend every act, but I think that would take a very long time and waste the time of the parliament.

What this does is, I think, give a clear intent to what we are attempting to do. Even more importantly, the bipartisan nature of the support of this bill should send a very clear message to all our public authorities about how seriously the parliament takes Treasurer's Instructions, whoever the Treasurer is, and making sure that there is good financial management in place.

With that, I again thank the shadow minister and members of the opposition for their support and their remarks. I thank the Department of Treasury and Finance for all their work in preparing this. Of course, I thank parliamentary counsel, the Crown Solicitor's Office and all those fine, hardworking public servants who worked so hard to bring the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I acknowledge a group in the Speaker's gallery this morning, branch representatives from the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation, who are guests of the member for Ashford. We welcome them to the parliament this morning and hope they enjoy their time with us.

Bills

PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT (TREASURER'S INSTRUCTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I will start with some general remarks. Regarding the term 'a chose in action', which I was not familiar with and nobody else in the chamber was familiar with at the time, I thank the Serjeant-at-Arms for his quick work in clarifying that via the internet.

The CHAIR: Can you let the house know what the result was?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: It had to do with property rights.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Treasurer, I understand what you were saying, and we in the opposition fully support the principles and the intent. This is, hopefully, something that can be sorted out just by clarification. With reference to your second reading explanation—and I will go back to the bit that you read just a minute ago because it was quite useful—you said:

The main purpose of the Bill is to make it clear that a general provision in an Act establishing a public authority, such as a power to enter contracts...will not override a requirement of Treasurer's instructions applying to the public authority.

We got that clearly. Then in clause 5, the amendment to section 41, new subsection (6) provides:

Treasurer's Instructions are to be interpreted as being consistent with an Act conferring functions or powers on a public authority if it is possible for the public authority to comply with both...

New subsection (7) says something very similar:

...if an Act confers on a public authority power to enter a contract or manage or apply a fund...the authority must, in exercising the power, comply with Treasurer's instructions—

unless it is not possible to do both. My question, Treasurer, concerns the comment in the second reading speech that the main purpose of a bill will not override Treasurer's Instructions, but what I thought you said in your comments just very recently was that parliament is supreme and that where there is a conflict the responsibilities and obligations of a public authority under their own act would take precedence over the Treasurer's Instructions. The bit I read out of the second reading speech seems to be different from or opposite to those last words I just used, so I am just looking for that to be clarified.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: First of all, welcome to the midwives' association. Midwives were fantastic with my little girl when she was born prematurely and did a wonderful job. They gave me very strict instructions—and I never disobeyed a midwife's order.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Absolutely, yes. I will give you an example: let's say that the Treasurer and the mining minister have a conflict.

An honourable member: Never!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: True. The mining minister—a very good mining minister indeed, minister Koutsantonis—wants to change the royalty rates. Treasurer Koutsantonis says, 'Hang on a second, that will have a budget impact. You must follow Treasurer's Instructions about anything that has a budget impact.' The mining minister then says, 'Under the act, I have authority to change royalties without reference to anyone else. The parliament has given me the right to set those royalty rates.'

I, as Treasurer, cannot override an act of parliament with a Treasurer's Instruction, but I hope that the mining minister would say, 'As a guiding principle, the Treasurer's Instructions are there in place to maintain the integrity of the budget and to maintain integrity of spending.' I will have to follow a process as set out by the Treasurer's Instructions but, ultimately, I have that authority under the act.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: The authority not to follow the Treasurer's Instructions?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I have the authority to set my own royalty rates, but that does not mean I do not have to follow Treasurer's Instructions. If I want to go through every single act where there is a very specific delegation or authority given to an individual minister, a Treasurer's Instruction cannot override it because a Treasurer's Instruction is made up by me, crown law and the department sitting together and writing it out without reference to the parliament. The parliament has specifically given an authority to an administering authority. You cannot change that outside of parliament and nor should you be able to. That is the process.

Other than the Treasurer having very stern words with the mining minister about attempting to impact his budget, what I would say should happen is that the mining minister would say, 'Yes, the act does give me the authority to set royalties, to give royalty deferrals, to give royalty exemptions and to change the royalty rate; however, Treasurer's Instruction X says this, and I should go back to cabinet and have a discussion about it.' That is the conflict you are talking about with very specific examples within the act.

I hope that clarifies it for you because what I do not think we have time to do is go through and amend every single act by taking the authority out of every single act. There may be very good reasons why some acts have given specific expenditure authority to a certain person for a specific reason. As with any system, you need goodwill. You have the Treasurer's Instructions, you have the legislative authority and, hopefully, the two can work together. Nothing is going to stop someone being bloody-minded but, if you have a system, this is the best way to try to minimise any impact.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: So it is about really trying to establish a guiding principle that Treasurer's Instructions should be followed. I wholeheartedly accept that it is not practical to go through every act and try to deal with every potential possibility. I also accept that, typically under any government, you would expect the Treasurer and the relevant ministers, even if they were not the same person, to be working hand in hand through that cabinet process. Just for clarity, if by chance the principle were rejected by the minister, and if by chance there were some difficulty, would it be the act that took precedence?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, the act does take precedence, I am advised.

Mr PEDERICK: Treasurer, part of the discussion around this bill was around the legal interpretation around an act that the WorkCover board was going to take. Given your latest explanation, does that mean that perhaps this does not fully encompass the issue that was trying to be encompassed in regard to getting people to comply with Treasurer's Instructions with these amendments?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There is a general provision within the WorkCover act to allow the board to enter into contracts: that general provision remains. This puts alongside it Treasurer's Instructions which they must take into account by notifying the Treasurer or the cabinet through a cabinet process seeking expenditure authority. It does not remove their ability to enter into contracts: it just gives them a staged process. We do not remove the general provision.

Does that mean that the WorkCover board can enter into a contract for \$5 billion and then levy everyone across the state to pay it? No; that is not the parliament's intent. The parliament's intent is to allow the board to do its day-to-day running without us being there. What this does is lays alongside it a series of instructions that need to be followed, I am advised, that will give them clarity about that process. It does not stop them entering into contracts. It just says, 'You must now inform the cabinet and seek expenditure authority.'

Then if there is a problem in between, the cabinet can express its view to the board and, if need be, there are processes in place to either assist or stop that, I would imagine. That is what we are attempting to do. It is just basically to give greater control back to the elected government about expenditure authority which, I have to say, is one of the things the opposition is always banging on about with the government. They say, 'You set a budget and you exceeded that spending.' What we are attempting to do with these Treasurer's Instructions is to try to minimise that event occurring, unless it is a decision the cabinet has deliberately taken.

Mr PEDERICK: I appreciate the explanation. I could be extremely wrong but, given the previous explanation, would it still be possible for WorkCover to exceed their budget even if it is only by a small amount? Could they perhaps put in some purchase orders (or whatever they are spending on) and disregard the Treasurer's Instructions because of these clauses that talk about 'unless it is not possible' to abide by the Treasurer's Instructions?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the contracts we are talking about here are over \$11 million so, absolutely, they still could. They are a corporation. They are corporatised, so they are entitled to run their business. What I am saying is, I would like to know about some of the large contracts they are entering into.

There is no use getting a dog and barking yourself, is there? You have the WorkCover board: let them do their jobs and we will set the legislative framework. All I am saying is, 'I want to know what you are spending money on over a certain amount and, if you spend over a certain amount, this is the process I would like you to follow.' In the end, the board is corporatised. Yes, they can exceed their budgets. I hope they do not, and the government has recourse if they do.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (12:54): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Sitting suspended from 12:55 to 14:00.

Answers to Questions

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—

Campbelltown City Council Annual Report 2013-14

Port Augusta City Council Annual Report 2013-14

Tatiara District Council Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell) on behalf of the Minister for Disabilities (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology, Department of—
Annual Report 2013-14

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

Environment Protection Authority—Annual Report 2013-14

Wilderness Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2013-14

Zero Waste SA—Annual Report 2013-14

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

National Heavy Vehicle Regulator—Annual Report 2013-14

National Rail Safety Regulator—Annual Report 2013-14

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER (14:01): Under the heading, 'I was wrong'—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, it concerns the member for Goyder not the member for MacKillop, as he may think. Yesterday, in response to the member for Goyder directing a supplementary question to the Minister for Local Government, not being the minister who had just answered a question, I considered the matter of whether it was in order to direct a supplementary question to a minister other than the minister who had just provided the previous answer. After considering the matter, I reported to the house quoting from Erskine May, 24th edition, page 366 as follows:

A supplementary question may refer only to the answer out of which it immediately arises, must relate to government responsibility, must not be read or be too long or quote from letters, should contain only one question, must not refer to an earlier answer or be addressed to another minister.

It has been brought to my attention that, on 16 October last year, in response to a point of order concerning of whom a supplementary question can be asked, as Speaker I responded by stating that:

My view is that, just as any minister can answer a question, an opposition member can direct a question to any minister as a supplementary—

Mr Griffiths: That is why I stood up, sir. That is why I stood up; I remember that.

Mr Marshall: We hang on to every word, sir.

The SPEAKER: I find that very hard to believe. I stated that:

My view is that just as any minister can answer a question, an opposition member can direct a question to any minister as a supplementary, but it may be that that minister doesn't answer it and that it is answered by another minister.

Clearly there is inconsistency between the two responses. Members would be aware, as provided by standing order No. 1, that:

In all cases that are not provided for in the standing orders or by sessional or other orders, or by the practice of the House, the rules and forms and practices of the Commons House at Westminster are followed as far as they can be applied to the proceedings of this House.

As the standing orders do not provide for supplementary questions, the rules surrounding their operation have emerged over time through common usage and accepted practice.

Based on my advice to the house yesterday, unless I am apprised of any contrary practice that has occurred in the house previously, I would defer to Erskine May as establishing a practice to guide the house in the operation of supplementary questions. Like all rules, practices and procedures of the house, I am guided by the house and the opposition may wish to, in the next session, bring in a sessional order, or amend standing orders. In short, I was wrong.

Mr GARDNER: Can I ask a question of you at this point, sir? Is that in order?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr GARDNER: Sir, my understanding was that your ruling last year was reflecting the current practices and procedures of the house built up over, well at least last year!

The SPEAKER: Nice try.

Mr GARDNER: Given that, wouldn't it therefore be a practice and procedure of the house for last year's ruling to still remain?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education and the Treasurer are both warned, not for saying I am wrong, but for interjecting.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I just think that the house should take control of it in the next session by amending the standing order. I am amenable to having my ruling of last year included in the standing orders.

Mr GARDNER: And have your ruling of yesterday overruled.

The SPEAKER: Overruled, indeed.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Sir, if I may, I appreciate the clarification but I can assure you, indeed, that the reason I stood up and asked for a supplementary was because I remembered what occurred last year.

The SPEAKER: You'll get on.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:07): I bring up the 15th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

PORT ADELAIDE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation. Considering that since the Port Adelaide by-election there have been no government departments move to the area, the Newport Quays development has stalled, the promised \$7.2 million Lighthouse Square redevelopment has been shelved, and the Port Adelaide court is due to be closed, does the minister concede that the government's by-election commitment to reinvigorate the Port has been abandoned?

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) (14:08): As I started saying yesterday when this issue was raised by the leader, the commitment that the government has to move public servants down to the Port is yet another way that the government is supporting the rejuvenation of Port Adelaide.

It commenced back in 2002 or 2003 with the significant steps and the significant investments which the government has made to secure economic activity on the Le Fevre Peninsula—the deepening of the Outer Harbor channel to make sure that this would be our pre-eminent export facility in South Australia, the construction of the Port River Expressway, the construction of the Inner Harbour opening road and rail bridges, the construction of the \$300 million investment in the Techport Australia facility to build air warfare destroyers, and, of course, should federal governments maintain their commitments at the election, our next generation of submarines which, of course, there is remarkable silence on that side of the chamber about.

In addition, we have also made sure that we are committing to a very significant number of investments to make sure that there is greater social and community activity around the Inner Harbour as well. Also there is the recently finished redevelopment of the Hart's Mill precinct, the refurbishing of the heritage buildings, both Customs House and the council-owned Visitor Information Centre, the refurbishing of shops along Commercial Road and making them available to new commercial tenants at reduced rents—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —to get commercial activity.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Making it easier to both park and shop at businesses along St Vincent Street, efforts which will be replicated along Commercial Road. There are new activities like the laneway, first of all—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The construction of the loop path for walking and cycling around—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —the Inner West Harbour. These are all things, along with the recently released Port Master Plan, which will guide the rejuvenation and the regrowth of Port Adelaide. I note with great interest that we have heard a groan from the deputy leader, of course, because there was an article written about this very close to the March 2014 election which sought comment from both government and the opposition about their view of the master plan—and what did the deputy leader say, 'I haven't even read it.' That is what she said, 'I haven't even read it.' Such is their care for what happens down at Port Adelaide that the person responsible for planning policy on that side of the chamber couldn't even be bothered reading it.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, very gallant.

Mr PENGILLY: I would question and ask your advice on whether, indeed, the minister is debating the matter, sir.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. He was debating it rather well, I thought.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, sir.

PORT ADELAIDE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): I have a supplementary, sir. Can the minister update the house on the progress of this government's commitment to generate 2,000 to 4,000 additional homes in Port Adelaide?

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) (14:11): My understanding is that the land release around Dock 1 is imminent, being handled by our port initiative or that part of Renewal SA that is guiding the efforts down at Port Adelaide.

PORT ADELAIDE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): Can the minister update the house about precisely how many of these additional homes have already been built?

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) (14:11): I must say, Mr Speaker, in giving a series of financial commitments and initiatives that the government has made over the preceding 12 years for Port Adelaide, there was one that I neglected and that was the purchase, of course, of the Incitec Pivot site down there, the removal of which will enable housing development to occur in that inner port area, particularly around—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Which will ensure that we can release land available for residential developments, increasing the number of people who can live in and around the Port, as foreshadowed in the master plan which the deputy leader still, I assume, hasn't read.

Ms Chapman: None, so the answer is zero.

Mr MARSHALL: I have a supplementary, sir.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned a first time, and the deputy leader can leave us for 15 minutes.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you, sir.

The honourable member for Bragg having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I believe you warned him and the Minister for Education—

The SPEAKER: No, I called them to order.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I apologise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Colton to order for dibber-dobbing. I'm not sure what standing order that is. Member for Taylor.

CHINA-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:13): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Can the minister inform the house about how the new China-Australia Free Trade Agreement is going to impact on South Australia's agricultural sector?

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) (14:13): I thank the member for Taylor for the question and acknowledge the work that she is doing with the horticultural people in her electorate to make sure that not only do they all expand but that they can take advantage of this fantastic announcement by President Xi and Prime Minister Abbott, which is huge for all of Australia but particularly for South Australia where we have a huge agricultural base.

In the two years since we launched our China strategy here we have increased exports across the board by \$1.5 billion to China. If you look at the forward expansion trajectory, 47 per cent of the increased growth between now and 2020, in terms of agricultural exports to the world, will be taken up by China.

China buys more of Australia's agricultural produce than any other export market. Just to go over the China-Australia Free Trade Agreement, tariffs on dairy, beef and sheep meat, wine, horticulture and seafood will be phased out. It includes the removal of all tariffs on our dairy products, which can be up to 20 per cent, within four to 11 years.

If we look at the New Zealand example, since they signed their FTA back in 2008, they have seen their exports of dairy produce increase from \$500 million a year to \$4 billion a year, so there is some incredible growth there that we will be looking to replicate here in South Australia. It includes the removal of tariffs of 12 to 25 per cent on beef over nine years, the removal of tariffs on live animal exports of 10 per cent within four years, the removal of tariffs on sheep meat of 12 to 23 per cent—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: It's probably good if you just listen to what's happening. This is a really important moment. You represent an electorate, member for Schubert.

Mr PISONI: Point of order: responding to interjections.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is correct, and I uphold his point of order.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

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

Mr Tarzia: You should know it.

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

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The removal of tariffs on seafood, including 15 per cent and 14 per cent respectively on rock lobster and abalone over four years, an Australia-only duty-free quota for—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: It's quite disappointing, Mr Speaker, that the opposition, most of whom represent—

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the member for Unley. I anticipate his point of order and I uphold it, without even hearing it, which is how kindly disposed I am towards the member for Unley. The breach by the minister is responding to interjections.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thank you, sir. This is huge news for all people in the agriculture, aquaculture and fisheries sectors here. The advice that we have for the private sector is that, if you have been over to China and you have tried to export your goods into China before and it maybe didn't work out so well, this is a game changer. This is something that will open up new markets and bigger export opportunities for all South Australian producers. It would be very wise for people to go and have another go.

The team at PIRSA has developed some very strong ties, and the Minister for Investment and Trade as well has some excellent ties through the trade channels in China. We want to work with people on the other side of the house, as well as the private sector, to make sure that we take advantage of this free trade agreement, which will increase the amount of exports that we have to this very important trade partner of ours.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister explain why an application for a petroleum exploration licence from Ambassador Oil & Gas was accepted when it did not meet the 'stated criteria for evaluation of the applications' as required by the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:17): I don't accept that. I don't know where he is quoting from. Perhaps he can provide that to the house.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Mr Speaker, the act says in section 23, paragraph (b) that the minister must have regard for 'the adequacy of the applicant's technical...resources'.

The SPEAKER: And the question is?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: And the *Government Gazette*, which sought tenders, said, 'the most important criteria for assessment of CO2010 (a), (b) or (c) work programs are' and on the list is 'the applicant's past performance in fulfilling work program commitments elsewhere in Australia'.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In that question he asked earlier, he quoted someone saying that the applicant was not acceptable. I would like to know where he got that quote from and if he could provide it to the house, because he provided it to the house as evidence of his question.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I will read the question again.

The SPEAKER: No, you don't need to read the question, but you may wish—the minister will be seated—in framing your next question to include an answer to the minister's challenge, or not.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: It's not what I said.

The SPEAKER: Does the minister wish to give a further answer?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir, I do. The question the opposition are asking, in effect, is: how did Ambassador Oil win a bid? So, I'm going to run through it and try and give some technical advice to the opposition. Three new PELs in Cooper Basin were offered in 2010 by the South Australian government on the basis of work program bidding. The CO2010 acreage release was opened in April 2010 and, at close of bidding on 10 March 2011, 11 bids were received from six national and international explorers. Block C, which became PEL 570, attracted six bids.

All applicants were provided with details of the scoring system to ensure an open and fair process. The receipt and assessments of the bids is governed by strict policies and procedures. Ambassador's work program scored the highest of the six program bids. Ambassador's five-year work program bid included eight exploration wells of 200 square kilometres 3D and 300 kilometres 2D seismic, I am advised. PEL 570 has potential for accumulations of oil and gas in conventional reservoirs as well as gas in deep unconventional reservoirs.

In terms of technical capacity, Ambassador Exploration was represented by Tino Guglielmo, who subsequently became Director of Ambassador Exploration and who was appointed to be the managing director of the company subsequently floated on the ASX. Mr Guglielmo had many years prior extensive experience in the oil and gas sector, including 20 years at very senior levels with Santos, and then as managing director and CEO of Stuart Petroleum.

Further, Mr John Davidson was the exploration adviser, and he had over 25 years of experience at very senior levels within the industry, including Exxon. In terms of their financial capability, key personnel had demonstrable experience in raising capital in respect of the oil and gas sector at a time when share markets were relatively receptive to upstream petroleum capital.

I want to talk about how the tenders are done. Competitive tenders are opened by a bid receipt team (BRT) that extracts the bid details for scoring by a separate bid assessment team (BAT). The BAT assessment bids are done without the applicant's identity. Total bid scores for each bid are calculated and ranked by the BAT. The applicant's financial and technical capacity to compliantly and competitively conclude the guaranteed extent of the work programs is a routine part of the assessment process. A recommendation is then made to the minister's delegate. The delegate then makes the determination based on all criteria.

The applicants for these exploration licences include companies ranging from small private companies to ASX-listed entities with up to \$1 billion market capitalisation. The process is very robust. In terms of the question—which is why was this company awarded an exploration licence—it is because they won the bid, independently assessed by the regulator, who—

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. Member for Stuart.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:23): Given that in the minister's answer he referred to Ambassador's work plan, which I understand included \$33.5 million of expenditure and that they would drill eight exploration wells, can the minister advise the house whether any of that work has been done?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:23): What the shadow minister is getting to is the suspension. Suspensions can be enacted for a number of practical and non-disciplinary reasons, which I am sure he knows but is probably not going to tell us in the house. For example, where flooding impairs land access—flooding happens in Cooper Basin quite regularly—where reasonable availability of seismic crews is not available or drilling rigs are an issue, where there are significant costs, benefits can—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Have they done anything?

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, they did. I have to say that yelling out, 'Have they done anything?' is a really appalling way to treat the oil and gas sector by the shadow minister, who should be their champion rather than someone attacking them.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: For example, where flooding impairs land access, and of course I have spoken about that—and the Cooper Basin was extensively affected by unprecedented La Niña rainfall in 2009-11—flooding prevented access to major parts of the basin, I am advised, and stopped companies conducting on-ground regulated activities such as seismic and drilling.

The department proactively offered all affected licences a rolling six-month suspension until it was possible to enter the land to conduct operations safely without impacting on the environment—again, facts that you just won't talk about. A number of affected licences—

The SPEAKER: The minister is warned a second and final time for not addressing his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I apologise, sir. A number of affected licences, including those operated by Senex, Beach and Santos, as well as Ambassador, were put into suspension to manage flood impacts on work program timing. Delays caused by flooding led to major logistical issues securing crews to conduct programmed seismic surveys in this licence and other licences.

In August 2013, Ambassador succeeded in obtaining extensive US shale development experience by attracting Outback Energy Hunter to take up 70 per cent interest in their petroleum exploration licence No. 570, the one that the shadow minister, Mr Speaker, was so interested in. Outback Energy Hunter agreed to pay all costs, including funding Ambassador's remaining 30 per cent share, associated with the exploration work program to satisfy the first five-year term of the PEL (petroleum exploration licence) up to a maximum of \$50 million.

This strategic farm-in led to Outback Energy Hunter taking a 52 per cent interest in PEL 570 in February of this year, a good outcome for the state. Outback Energy Hunter's parent company, New Standard Energy, purchased producing and prospective acreage in both Eagle Ford Shale in onshore Texas from Magnum Hunter Resources (another very important company to have here in South Australia) and 52 per cent of PEL 570 in the state's Far North funding, the first \$42.5 million of the primary work program.

In terms of the current state of play of PEL 570, based on market announcements, New Standard Energy acquired Outback Energy Hunter's stake in PEL 570, as announced on 10 December 2013—again, Mr Speaker, facts the opposition will not talk about. On 29 October 2014, Ambassador was delisted following compulsory acquisition by Drillsearch.

On 29 October, New Standard announced that it completed its farm-out of 35 per cent of petroleum exploration licence 570 to Santos. In return, Santos will meet 75 per cent of New Standard's expenditure commitment associated with New Standard's \$42.5 million farm-in obligations to Drillsearch (formerly Ambassador Energy), of which \$300,000 was already spent.

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:27): Second supplementary, sir: given that in his initial answer the minister referred to the importance of the new managing director, can he explain why, on 11 April in his media release when he announced that Ambassador Exploration had won PEL 570, none of the directors had that experience?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:28): Again, I will go back to the initial answer that I gave. These licences are bid through a process which is done by the department and allocated by the minister's delegate. I have to say there is nothing that the opposition have offered the government, or anyone else, to show that there has been any impropriety in this process at all.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Just answer the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am answering the question, but I am going to defend the industry against accusations you are making. I have to say that the regulator in this state is held in the highest regard and I, sir, take a lot of offence at the implications the opposition are making.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I know what your views are about oil and gas. I understand.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is very close to leaving the chamber.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I don't mean to be disruptive and I'm not trying to be disruptive. I am simply attempting to answer the questions.

The SPEAKER: Your responding to interjections is itself a disruption.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I look forward to you putting those interjections down, sir.

The SPEAKER: Well, it would help if the minister would not goad the opposition.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. The process is independent of government and is done so. They assess the capability of the companies.

Mr Whetstone: Two hands in his pockets.

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned a second and final time. If I hear another comment like that, I will name him.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I don't make the winning bids. They are made by our delegate. The reason we choose a delegate is because they have the expertise within the industry to understand the capabilities of companies. What we are attempting to do in the Cooper Basin is create a competitive tension to try to get larger companies who have the expertise in the United States to come and bring their expertise to South Australia. The reason we do that through this petroleum exploration licence program—

The SPEAKER: Point of order?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 98: I ask you to direct the minister to come back to the substance of the question, which is why when he made—

The SPEAKER: If you go on any further, I will remove you from the chamber. You have made a point of order; you are now going into an impromptu speech. Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think it's fair to say, was the bid assessed on the company's ability? It was. Was it awarded on their ability? It was. If the shadow minister or anyone else wants to question their ability, I say they can make those accusations. I will defend the department. I will defend the ability of this company to have won the bid because I trust the regulators who awarded them the bid, because they are the best in the country.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:31): Again for the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy: can the minister confirm which companies which were unsuccessful in their tender for PEL 570 he wrote to advise them of that, as per the act?

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is called to order. He has been doing it all day.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:31): I assume it was done by the minister's delegate, but I will get an answer back to the house. Given that I delegate all my powers under the act for this process, all I simply did was make the public announcement.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:32): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Minister, can you update the house on the status of the national partnership to deliver 15 hours a week of preschool in 2015?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:32): We spoke about this issue during the last sitting week of parliament. Unfortunately, the uncertainty surrounding the ongoing Universal Access to Early Childhood Education program continues and is taking its toll on parents, preschools and staff. Access to preschool is an important

part of a child's early years, which is why I have been lobbying to get answers from the Abbott government on the future of the program.

For the most part, the response I have received has been, 'You won't know until 2015 what we intend to do'—that is the federal government. There was no certainty in the federal budget and, after months of lobbying by the state and territory ministers, the Abbott government announced on 5 September that the national partnership would be extended for a further 12 months.

The penny had dropped. They clearly wanted to get Victoria over their election. They were most unhappy—that is, Victoria—at the prospect of losing 1,500 people in their system. But as is so often the case with the Abbott government, the devil is in the detail. The formal offer was finally received nearly two months after this press release. It was clear that funding had changed and that the terms and conditions had changed. In short, it wasn't the same deal.

So, when minister Ley committed to roll over the existing national partnership during a radio interview two weeks ago, I was surprised to say the least but happy to have the same money under the same conditions. As she said, SA had met all of its requirements in the previous year. I wrote to minister Ley on Friday 7 November to hold her to her word that the existing agreement will be rolled over, but a week and a half later I am still waiting to receive any form of confirmation from minister Ley.

I understand that the other states and territories are following our lead and seeking answers from the minister, but we now seem to be getting the silent treatment. I hope that minister Ley will stand by her public commitments and that we will have an answer for South Australian parents, preschools and staff sooner rather than later.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader asks if her slate is wiped clean. Yes, it is. Member for Morphett.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:35): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer stand by his comments made in September that there will be no community impact due to protesting CFS volunteers as 'there are thousands of other volunteers to take their place'? Echunga CFS has today announced they will not commit to fighting fires on government land, including Kuitpo Forest and Mount Bold Reservoir due to the ESL increases.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:35): I was asked this question previously by the opposition and I apologise to members if they misunderstood my remarks. I do not want to in any way offend any volunteer. I value our volunteers and, of course, people are entitled to political protest by withdrawing their labour. That is a principle that many of us on this side of the house have always supported. Whether they be a volunteer or in paid employment, they are entitled to do that.

Obviously, we would not like to see them not volunteer, but I do say this: the removal of emergency services remissions in the most recent budget was not a decision that the government wanted to take. It was one we had to take. I call on the commonwealth government to reverse their cuts to our health services, education and pensioners and I will immediately return those remissions to our regional communities and metropolitan communities.

I do point out to the shadow minister that there are discounts that remain in place for regional communities, from 20 per cent for people who live in regional towns, 50 per cent for people who live outside those regional towns and up to 90 per cent for people who live in unincorporated communities, so they are still getting discounts. But I do point out that the ESL is a Liberal Party tax that they invented.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:37): My question is also to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer confirm that his department held a meeting on 6 May this year with the company Prophecy IT to discuss upgrading the online billing system to facilitate the rise in the emergency services levy a full week before the federal budget was handed down?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order. 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) (14:37): No, I cannot confirm that. I will go back and check, but I can inform the house that the government did not make a decision to remove the remissions on the emergency services levy before the commonwealth budget. If the member has evidence contrary to that, I would ask him to provide it to the house immediately.

Ms Chapman: You could ask your department.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order. Leader.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): Supplementary, sir: the Treasurer has indicated to the house that no decision was made prior to the federal budget, but was there active consideration of removing the remission from the ESL prior to the federal budget being handed down?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:38): We were given five weeks to respond to the commonwealth budget. The processes that we had in place to deal with the response were very difficult indeed. We were faced with some very significant cuts from the commonwealth.

Ms Redmond: We're talking about before.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I understand that but, like I said earlier, we had not contemplated an increase in the emergency services levy prior to the commonwealth budget. But of course, in all budgets, all options, whether they be tax increases or decreases, are canvassed. No, there is no snap.

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is warned for false laughter.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. We were not in any way looking to increase the ESL. However, given that they have raised this, we can talk about what the government was faced with. Within five weeks we had to plug into our budget cuts totalling \$898 million—that is a \$444 million reduction in health for special purpose payments—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: the question was specifically whether there had been any consideration prior to the federal budget.

The SPEAKER: So he is not answering the substance of the question. I uphold the point of order.

MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES

Mr GEE (Napier) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister provide advice on the recent progress in establishing Adelaide as a national ICT hub for the mining and energy resources sector?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for his question.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not think EPAS deals with the mining sector, but I am sure it is going to be a very good system.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will not respond to the interjections of the refreshed deputy leader.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. Recently, the state's leading information and communication technology providers met to discuss potential projects and innovations to support our state's mineral and energy resources sector. These discussions were held during a meeting of the ICT Roadmap Industry Round Table. The round table is a key project of the state government's Mining and Petroleum Services Centre of Excellence.

The ICT roadmap initiative links together two of the state government's key priorities of growth through innovation and unlocking the full potential of South Australia's resources and energy and renewable assets. The round table is about providing a platform for information sharing as an integral first step in creating connections that will see real progress in the ICT sector for the resources sector. It also helps identify key issues and problems in the resources industry that might be addressed using ICT solutions and build the necessary collaborative relationships to start delivering the solutions.

Keynote presentations at the round table looked at a number of real, practical examples of how innovative ICT applications can assist the mining industry. For example, Mr Steve Sullivan from Maptech talked about the potential to use unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) as an innovative tool in minerals exploration. As members will know, geophysical data collection by aerial survey is crucial when exploring for ore deposits obscured by groundcover.

At the moment, gathering data requires the use of dedicated aircraft flown by a commercial pilot accompanied by a highly specialised geophysical operator. This is expensive for a lot of junior mining explorers. The development of a UAV data collection system has the potential to improve the speed of acquisition and increase the data density at an affordable cost for explorers to be able to operate themselves.

Mr John Kamuchau from Startup Adelaide also discussed ways of celebrating industry innovation and problem solving in the resources sector. Current methods of problem solving in the industry are time consuming and expensive, and Startup Adelaide talked about where opportunities might exist for South Australia's young entrepreneurs to develop more cost-effective, innovative solutions.

They propose an industry 'hackathon' event that brings together industry problems, domain experts and solution developers, software developers, data scientists, mathematicians and academics. The aim of the event would be for developers to build prototype solutions to industry problems under the guidance of domain experts and present this solution at the end of the event for the opportunity to win a prize or have further conversations about implementing the solutions.

I am sure all members of this house will, hopefully, agree that a globally competitive resource sector is integral to the state's continued prosperity and support this important initiative.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house on the release of the 'Better public transport. Better productivity' report by the Tourism and Transport Forum?

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) (14:43): I thank the member for Torrens for her question and for her keen interest in this area. I welcome the release yesterday of a report by the Tourism and Transport Forum, together with the national firm of PricewaterhouseCoopers. The report, entitled 'Better public transport. Better productivity', demonstrates the benefits that investment in public transport infrastructure has on our economy.

Specifically addressed by the report is the value that higher investment in public transport infrastructure has on this service-based economy, particularly the positive effects on wages, business profitability and economic zones throughout the nation. Through a case study of Sydney's Epping-Chatswood rail link, the report highlights the direct effects on productivity from a government focus on the efficient transport of the workforce between home and work.

Mr KNOLL: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr KNOLL: The report to which the minister is referring to is probably available online.

The SPEAKER: Can the minister confirm that that's so?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It probably is, sir.

The SPEAKER: In that case it is readily available. The deputy leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Other than the Renewal SA board, did any other state government agency or officer advise the government against entering into a deal with ACP without going to public tender?

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) (14:45): I am not sure if the first part of the question is a fair and accurate representation of what happened. Although I wasn't minister at the time, my recollection of the matter is that, ultimately, there was a recommendation from Renewal to the effect that the government did enter into that agreement, as I recall. So, I am not quite sure what the first part of the question was.

As to the second part of the question, I am not aware of any other agency having offered any particular advice about that matter. In context, I would be puzzled as to what agency, quite frankly, would have been in a position to have offered any other advice because the matter was a matter which was in the hands of Renewal. I would assume they were the only agency that was dealing with the matter.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Supplementary to the Treasurer: are you aware of any officers in the treasury department who advised the government against the ACP deal without going to public tender?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:46): No, I'm not, but I'll go back and ask. If I know Treasury officials, they would just want the government to make—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Just to sell it off.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just to sell it off! Treasury don't get emotional when it comes to government assets; they don't have the same view as probably most of the public or the rest of us. It maybe the same as most of you—that is, the opposition, Mr Speaker—about the ownership of public assets. I don't have any information but I'll go back and check for the member and have a look.

The SPEAKER: Having ruled at the beginning of question time today one way, I just applied it the other. I call myself to order. Deputy leader.

Ms CHAPMAN: And I agree.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:47): My question is again to the Minister for Planning. Has the government granted Adelaide Capital Partners an extension of time to purchase the first section of the Gillman land deal?

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is clearing his throat, and he is called to order.

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): He does a very good job of it too!

The SPEAKER: He is warned, actually.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The situation as I understand it is this: there was an initial phase of the arrangements between the government and ACP, which required that ACP satisfy certain criteria by a point in time. It is my understanding that part of the agreement has been and gone. In other words, they did reach their initial milestone. That then means they have a further period within which to, in effect, enter into the arrangement. So far as I am aware, there has been no change as to the time during which they are to make that determination. Again, to the best of my knowledge, there have been no requests of me that there be any change made to whatever date had been set some time back.

Ms CHAPMAN: Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: A further supplementary.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): In respect of the ACP agreement which required compliance with certain aspects, including the purchase of the first section of land by 30 December this year, has that time limit been extended, and/or extended to April next year?

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) (14:49): I will have to make absolutely certain that what I am about to say is correct, so I will have to check with the relevant officers, but it is my understanding that there has neither been a request to make such an extension—certainly to my memory it has not been made to me—and to the best of my knowledge there has been no extension either offered or suggested. So I am operating presently on the understanding that they will either be in a position to execute the first phase of the agreement by that date or they will not. And, if they do not, then that means that aspect of the agreement has come to an end.

BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION VOUCHER PROGRAM

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation. Minister, can you update the house about the Business Transformation Voucher Program?

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Did the member for Schubert get that? Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:50): Thank you for your assistance, Mr Speaker.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: It is an important topic. The South Australian government is committed to supporting South Australian manufacturers as they enhance their competitiveness, productivity and profitability. The \$4.5 million Business Transformation Voucher Program has been developed to help high-value South Australian manufacturing businesses identify opportunities to accelerate their growth through innovation. The Business Transformation Voucher Program is one of the first initiatives to be rolled out as part of Our Jobs Plan which is the state government's \$60 million response to the looming closure of the automotive vehicle manufacturing industry in 2017.

The Business Transformation Voucher Program provides up to \$50,000 for manufacturers to gain expert advice and implement—

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert.

Mr KNOLL: Sir, everything in the minister's answer is clearly outlined on the statedevelopment.sa.gov.au website.

The SPEAKER: Can the minister say whether that is true or not?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The existence of the vouchers naturally is publicly known. I would be very surprised if it is word by word on the website. I would like the member to say if he believes that to be the case.

The SPEAKER: If the member for Schubert can anticipate any of the minister's answer, I will have to rule it out of order but the minister has the call.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Otherwise I may continue? Thank you, because this is an incredibly important program—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned a first time, again. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: If we were unable to talk about anything that exists outside of this chamber we would all be terribly bored. All we can know is what exists outside, and what matters to the businesses in South Australia is the kind of support that they are getting from this government in challenging times and, may I add, in spite of the kind of support that is completely absent from the federal government.

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated. The minister has hardly resumed and the member for Unley is on his feet taking a point of order. What could it be?

Mr PISONI: The minister has moved away from the substance of the question and is now debating standing orders.

The SPEAKER: I don't uphold the point of order. This better be a point of order.

Ms DIGANCE: No, it is not; I just wanted to re-read the question.

The SPEAKER: If the member for Elder continues, I will suspend her. Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am not sure the minister has finished.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I was asked to sit down and I did so but I have not yet finished. Thank you, sir. Two of the companies that the member who asked the question may be interested in, who have recently won these vouchers—and I will point out to those who are not currently looking at the internet that it is a one-for-one offering of up to \$50,000. One of them is a company called Tucker's Natural which has won a number of food awards over the past seven years.

Mr KNOLL: Point of order: the information the minister is referring to is in a press release that was put out on 12 November detailing the four companies that received these vouchers.

The SPEAKER: Well, I'm online so they can flick it through to me. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I actually regard this topic as too important to allow this kind of trivial interruption to go on.

The SPEAKER: Point of order. The minister will be seated. Member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: Point of order: the minister has moved away from the substance of the question and is again debating standing orders.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order, and the member for Unley is very close to departure. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: As I was trying to indicate before people started shouting, I am not prepared to discuss this matter in a way which trivialises it through constant interruptions.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Minister, can you inform the house of recent government initiatives to activate regional main streets?

Members interjecting:

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) (14:55): I want to give the member for Schubert a few minutes just to adjust his equipment. Mr Speaker, if it's alright with you, I might start to answer my question and then I can throw to the member for Schubert to see if he can answer the next sentence because I suspect he hasn't got quite what I've got here. I think this is unique.

The SPEAKER: Well, let's see. Let's test it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think this is unique material. The South Australian division of the Property Council—of course, now led by a very dear friend of those on the other side of the house, Mr Gannon—with whom I met recently, by the way—we sat down and had a very nice chat—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can you just keep searching for what I'm saying? See if you can find this on there.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is called to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I beg your pardon. We had a very nice chat, Mr Gannon and I, and I gained the distinct impression that the Property Council, with his assistance, is going to depart from their behaviour before the election of being basically an extension of the opposition and they are going to be completely objective and straight down the line.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The views of the people of South Australia. The Property Council endorse capping of council rates and putting local government back in charge of five-storey buildings in the suburbs—I don't think so. Anyway, they won't be doing that anymore. They have worked out—

The SPEAKER: Could you come within the range of the member for Schubert?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I'm sorry, I will get back to you in a moment. At a community cabinet meeting held in the Riverland in June, the government committed to delivering a \$200,000—

Mr Knoll: \$200,000 pilot program in Renmark called Made in SA.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Give me the next paragraph. Come on, give me the next one. You just had a lucky paragraph. Anyway, there have been over 75 local community members—are you up to that bit yet?

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It's new, okay—and public workshops on 23 October, and 70 people attended a second workshop on 6 November. These were held in the vacant Target building in the main street of Renmark. The member for Chaffey was actually involved in this and came out a couple of times during the event. It was very good. Participants in the workshop were asked what brought them there and answers ranged from 'economic growth' to 'energise and revitalise' and 'to identify what to do well'. Another one, and this is a quote, 'to strut our stuff with pride'. That is what they want to do.

Mr Pengilly: Don't keep looking at him. Read your answer.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I'm paying attention to him. He gets funny if you don't pay attention. If successful, the pilot program will be rolled out to other South Australian regions during the course of the coming years. It presents us with a chance to start again, understanding the Riverland's economic ecosystem, particularly around opportunities and challenges facing local businesses in regional South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Alas, the minister's time has expired, but he did a manful job of zigzagging to avoid the member for Schubert's fire. Deputy leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Planning. When did the members of Adelaide Capital Partners first express an interest to government in purchasing the entire Dean Rifle Range property at Gillman?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:00): There are a number of assumptions in that question, and I don't acknowledge any of those assumptions, to be honest, whether ACP ever expressed that view to government or whether them expressing a view had anything to do with the government undertaking any particular purchase of property.

I am aware that there is litigation currently going on concerning, I believe, the acquisition of the Dean Rifle Range. I understand that the Adelaide City Council is in some dispute with the state about that matter, and I am therefore very careful about what, if anything, I say about that matter in here. I think the safest thing for me to do is to take that question on notice, but in so doing I want to make the point that I don't necessarily acknowledge that any of the preamble to that question is in any way connected with fact.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): I have a supplementary question, if I may.

The SPEAKER: I thought the member for Bright had a question. He never gets one.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am sure he may, but I am just indicating I am seeking a supplementary, sir, if I may, given the answer of the Minister for Planning in respect of the ongoing litigation in respect of obtaining an answer as to when this entity was first inquiring into the whole of the property. There is no indication of—

The SPEAKER: Could we come to a question, please?

Ms CHAPMAN: —the existing dispute between the council and the government. That, of course, relates to value in relation to the acquisition value of that property.

The SPEAKER: No, I withdraw leave. You are getting nowhere near a question. Member for Bright.

SERVICE SA

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for the Public Sector. Can the minister advise if the cause of today's Service SA computer crash has been identified?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:02): I thank the member for his question: it is a very timely question. No, we haven't, to my knowledge, ascertained why the system broke down. What I can tell you is that it appears to have been resolved. What we are doing at the moment is allowing people to use the internet service and the telephone service. I have received that information since sitting here in this chamber and will be making sure that that information is going out to the public as quickly as possible.

Prior to question time, I was told that they thought it was something to do with the routers. I can give you no more detail than that, as I have no more. I am glad to hear that it looks like it is being resolved satisfactorily, and then we will find out how it happened and therefore whether there is any way to avoid such an occurrence in the future.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT LEVY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the minister or the department scoped or explored the prospect of an event organiser paying the public transport levy and then event goers still paying for public transport tickets to and from that event?

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) (15:03): I thank the member for Mitchell for his question. Maybe I will give this a sixth crack, trying to explain how this works so that eventually the information will sink in to the opposition.

The way in which the legislation works—the legislation which was supported by the opposition and voted through with the budget bills—is that the costs of public transport will be recouped from the venue manager. It will be up to the venue manager, the event organiser and perhaps the attendees, to meet that cost once we move to a regime where the full costs of public transport services are being recovered for those events.

How those costs are being recovered between those different bodies when we are indeed recovering the full amount of costs for public transport services for an event will be up to those different groups, those different entities making a contribution. There is no fixed formula, as I have been at great pains to explain to the parliament, both during question time and during estimates. Each event may well be different; it will be up to the venue manager, the event organiser and the government how those costs are recovered. There is no set fee, there is no set regime; it will be up to each individual event.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT LEVY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:04): Given there is no set formula for a set fee, can the minister guarantee that, if the transport levy is paid by the event organiser, event goers won't have to pay for public transport?

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) (15:05): I really don't know what I can do, Mr Speaker, to make this any clearer for the member for Mitchell. It will be up to the venue manager, the event organiser, about how those costs are recovered; that is, within their purview it is absolutely—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: They can all three of them pay.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That's right; everyone can pay, because the people who get the benefits of the public transport should make a contribution towards it. This is the kind of bold user-pays policy which has been advocated by people on that side of the house since the election. And since they finally have it—with such rapture they approach this, Mr Speaker—it's all suddenly too hard, too incomprehensible and too unattractive for them. It is absolutely extraordinary.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT LEVY

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (15:05): Supplementary, sir—

The SPEAKER: Supplementary from the member for Heysen.

Ms REDMOND: —to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure: could the minister explain why the full costs of sporting and other events have to be fully recovered when the full cost of public transport is generally not recovered?

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) (15:06): Well, what a great question. This goes exactly to the heart of the press release which was first put out by the member for Mitchell and the Leader of the Opposition when this was first mooted in the budget, and that's what seems to be a new Liberal Party position, that there should be full cost recovery for public transport services, a five times increase in public transport fares.

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

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

Mr PISONI: The minister continually refers to the opposition. The minister is not responsible for the opposition.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. Minister?

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has finished. The member for Hammond.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN REGIONAL ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:06): My question is for the Minister for Regional Development. When will the Murray Bridge Racing Club receive the \$5 million from the Murray-Darling Basin Regional Economic Diversification Program for its Gifford Hill project considering that the member for Reynell said in this place, on 13 November 2014—

The SPEAKER: It is just commentary. The minister.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:07): As the member is aware, and others on the other side there, that was a federal government initiative, an announcement, and that is being discussed between the Premier and the federal government at the moment.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN REGIONAL ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:07): Supplementary: when will the government sign off on the 21 projects nominated for the Murray-Darling Basin Regional Economic Diversification Program so that the \$25 million allocated to South Australia can flow to these projects? It's your problem—your problem.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is called to order, and any further display of that kind will see him leaving the chamber.

Mr Williams: For the rest of question time, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, for the balance of question time—all of it. 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) (15:08): When negotiations are complete with the commonwealth we'll have an answer for the house.

The SPEAKER: Splendid.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned.

Grievance Debate

FRIENDS OF O'HALLORAN HILL RECREATION PARK

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:08): It is with great pleasure that I rise today to speak about the Friends of O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park, where I will take the member for Finniss, the next time he is around, to do some work with me, as I did with the Hon. Michelle Lensink from the other place just the other week. On a nice sunny morning, the Hon. Michelle Lensink and I made our way to O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park to work with a very friendly group headed up by John Bollinger, Toni Beaty and Peter Haarsma.

It is a wonderful group that does some marvellous work trying to revegetate and kill off the weeds at the O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park. It is a great venue, a great location and a really well kept secret of the southern suburbs of Adelaide and, in fact, the city of Adelaide for that matter. It has stunning views over the city, there are wonderful walking trails and there are some magnificent mountain biking trails as well.

John gave Michelle and me some gloves and a pick and we were off to give them some assistance for a few hours, removing the nasty olive weeds that vegetate a large part of the O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park. The volunteer group meets twice a week and they do a marvellous job in their spare time when they get out and about and do their best to rid the recreation park of these troublesome weeds.

I will outline how they do that in a few moments. By way of background to the recreation park, it has great trails, fire tracks, the bike veloway, the walking trails and horse trails. It also encapsulates the Sturt Pistol Club, the Southern Field Archers Club and a model aircraft flying club. Although the entire area was cleared and used for grazing some 90 years ago, shady trees now grow in the park as do some of the weeds. The reserve is located at the southern end of the Eden fault line: underlying rock formations are the Precambrian Umberatana Group. A bluestone quarry near South Road is still visible and was used to create many structures in the city of Adelaide years ago.

The flora and fauna abound. The entire vegetation of the park was cleared in the past but the natural vegetation is returning. There are some groups doing some marvellous work and returning the grey box eucalypt, the golden wattle, bull oak and a number of melaleuca species as well.

A number of groups work there. I must commend the Seaview Downs Primary School and also the Sunrise Christian School. Their working groups have been up there doing a heap of work to revegetate and replenish the flora and fauna of this recreation park—and they do an outstanding job. They wanted to erect a sign in the recreation park, outlining what they have done so they could take some pride in their wonderful work but unfortunately that was knocked back. I find that a touch disappointing and I will be following it up to see if we can get some sort of recognition for the wonderful work these two school groups do. There are others doing great work in this area as well and I think it should be noted.

I mentioned the olive trees a little earlier. The Hon. Michelle Lensink, from the other place, and I got to work with our gloves and picks and we worked away feverishly to try to remove some of them. They are very troublesome things and it is quite ingenious the way they can regenerate. They create a lot of work in trying to remove them. We worked on digging out some of the smaller ones and that was not so bad but the bigger ones are far more arduous to remove.

One of the techniques is quite amazing. Once they are chopped back Tony (I think it was) would drill holes a few inches deep into the roots of these trees and very quickly around the base of the tree he would squirt in the poison. These trees are quite remarkable in the way they protect themselves. Once you have drilled these holes, if you do not drop in the poison in a matter of seconds, they will create a seal to prevent the poison getting through. It is a lot of work to remove these trees and I very much admire the way these people are going about it.

I must also mention the president of the group, Don Webster, who has done a marvellous job over time. He really has been exceptional in what he has done. Collectively, they are a small group. If you would like to get involved and help regenerate this park it is a great piece of South Australia and a great piece of Adelaide, so get along and have a look and also contact them through their website or through my website. They would really appreciate your help and support and, hopefully, we can get rid of the olive trees from the O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park.

AUSTRALIAN INTERNATIONAL 3 DAY EVENT

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:13): Last Thursday I had the pleasure of representing the Premier at the welcome gathering for competitors and visitors to Adelaide for the international four-star three-day event at the Hilton Hotel that is also, I believe, a major sponsor of the event.

Karen Raffan, CEO of Brand SA, greeted me and other guests for this occasion held to mark the beginning of this prestigious event. It was great to see my former parliamentary colleague Karlene Maywald, and John Dawkins, a former MHR, among the very many distinguished guests assembled, who included, in particular, members of Australian equestrian family the Roycrofts, who have represented Australia so wonderfully for so many years; South Australia's own Copping family; and, of course, our current champions, Wendy Schaeffer and Megan Jones. The other South Australian champion, synonymous with the event, is Gillian Rolton who has put her heart and soul into making this event what it is. The esteem in which she is held worldwide provides Adelaide with the

opportunity to be put onto the world equestrian map. Her Olympic rides on Peppermint Grove are legend.

I was able to recall perhaps the only thing my riding career has in common with hers, and that is we have both had broken collar bones in falls from horses, but while I was carted off and played no further part in the day's proceedings, Gillian and Fred went on to win an Olympic gold medal. Gillian is event director and president of the FEI eventing ground jury, as well as a national advanced dressage judge and an Australian selector. She is in constant demand worldwide and a real credit to the sport she has represented so passionately for so many years.

Held annually in November, the Australian International 3 Day Event is Australia's premier equestrian competition. The event includes competition across three disciplines: dressage, cross-country and showjumping. The Adelaide International Horse Trials began in 1997 to replace the Gawler horse trials that had been staged there since 1954. Many of us would remember trekking down to Gawler and watching the jump that very much recalled the man from Snowy River's exploits off the side of the river.

The new event debuted in the Adelaide east Parklands with a three-star rating but was subsequently upgraded to a four-star rating in 2002. From 1997 to 2003, the Australian International 3 Day Event was owned and run by the South Australian government. From 2004 until now, the event has been managed by Adelaide Horse Trials Management Inc. The South Australian Tourism Commission, through Events South Australia, is the major sponsor of the event and has been since 2004.

In 2011, the Australian International 3 Day Event became part of a worldwide pro tour of eventing—the FEI Classics series—with a prize pool of \$330,000. It is the only CCI four-star event held in the Southern Hemisphere and one of only six in the world: Badminton in the UK, Burghley in the UK, Kentucky in the USA, Pau in France, and Luhmuhlen in Germany. The event is unique in the world, being the only one staged in the heart of a capital city, and must continue to meet strict criteria to maintain its four-star rating.

This year's event was held from 13 to 16 November. The biggest prize pool ever presented in the Southern Hemisphere for eventing was on offer with \$120,000 in prize money up for grabs. An exciting line-up of Olympians and world champions was announced for this year's event, including Australian Olympian and badminton winner Sam Griffiths, German Olympic gold medallist and WEG winner Dirk Schrade, and crowd favourite Chris Burton—an Olympian and WEG team member who won last year's Australian International 3 Day Event.

The event included Polo in the Park on Friday night, with teams featuring an elite spread of players from South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales battling it out for the Grant Burge Wines Polo in the Park trophy which was won by the Prydes Easi Feeds team, which was a composite group from New South Wales and Victoria. I refer to the article in *The Advertiser* of 17 November by Jesper Fjeldstad to advise that Western Australian Jessica Mason claimed her first four-star event after keeping Olympian Megan Jones to second place.

It actually came down to the last two rides of the day and kept the Victoria Park audience on tenterhooks. Mason, who held the lead from the cross-country the previous day, was the last rider of the day and had been put under considerable pressure by Jones, who was the local favourite. Placed second and riding second last, Jones finished with a clear ride aboard Kirby Park Allofasudden, but of course Jessica went on to also have a clear round and win the event.

Channel 7—another sponsor—crossed live to the event each day. I hope many more people get behind this event next year. I would like to thank too all the volunteers who make it possible. Without their help, an event of this size just could not happen. Each year, we welcome thousands of visitors to Adelaide for this event, and let us hope we can encourage some of them to return for some of the other fabulous events like the Santos Tour Down Under and the coming ICC cricket matches at the wonderful Adelaide Oval. There is truly something for everyone to see in Adelaide, and we look forward to welcoming all those international and interstate visitors back to enjoy more of our hospitality.

DONALD CAMPBELL

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:18): I rise today to speak about a very important 50th anniversary of the Donald Campbell world water speed record attempt at Lake Bonney at Barmera. It is an honour to be the patron for these celebrations. The committee have done a fantastic job to organise a commemorative dinner on the Saturday night and a Bluebird Splash-a-thon on the Sunday.

Donald Malcolm Campbell was born on 23 March 1921 in Surrey. The son of Sir Malcolm Campbell followed in his father's footsteps, with his father breaking 13 world speed records during the twenties and thirties. After his father's death in 1948, Donald showed interest in attempting to obtain new speed records on both land and water. This passion inspired him to design a jet-propelled hydroplane—the Bluebird K7. A British TV journalist once asked, 'Are you ever afraid, Donald?' to which he replied, 'Of course, I'm afraid every time I get into the Bluebird. Courage is not being fearless. Courage is overcoming and smashing through fear.'

Donald Campbell would go on to set seven world water speed records between 1955 and 1964. After becoming the first man to break the 400 mph (650 km/h) limit in a wheel-driven vehicle on Lake Eyre and receiving a Beatlemania-style reception in front of an estimated 200,000 people along King William Street, Donald set his mind to doing the double and achieving the world water speed record.

On 19 September 1964, Lake Bonney at Barmera in South Australia's Riverland was selected for a new world water speed record attempt. The weather, high river and physical limitations of the lake limited his maximum speed to 260 mph (347 km/h), but he still set an Australian speed record. Not long after the Riverland attempt, Donald was successful in breaking the world water speed record at Lake Dumbleyung in Western Australia at 444 km/h. Wanting to take one more shot at raising his water speed record to 300 mph (482 km/h), in 1967 on his return run at England's Lake Coniston, Campbell flipped the Bluebird at an estimated speed of 528 km/h where he tragically died instantly.

Donald Campbell's Lake Bonney attempt is an important part of the Riverland's history, and today there are plaques to acknowledge the Australian record he set. We also have the Bluebird Cafe which occupies the boatshed where the Bluebird K7 was once housed. There have been numerous efforts to set up a museum and create a replica Bluebird. Many international visitors travel to the region, following the history of Donald Campbell.

I look forward to the weekend's events and I am encouraging those who can to attend the dinner on Saturday night and the splash-a-thon on Sunday, where there will be displays of vintage boats, cars and bikes, demonstrations from wakeboarders, skiers, dinghies and powerboats, as well as entertainment and markets. It will be a great event.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank all those people who have been involved in organising this commemorative weekend: Mike Fuller, Brian Caddy, Lorraine and Graham Masters, Eddie Howarth, Robert Drogemuller and a number of other committee members and local volunteers who have dedicated their time and effort.

I will continue to work with the committee to establish a life-size Bluebird replica car and a museum to commemorate Donald Campbell's legacy, and I look forward to the 50th celebrations of a man who encapsulated the adventurous Riverland spirit. If anyone is in the Riverland over the weekend and does want to drop in to the 50th anniversary, do go to the Bluebird Cafe and ask Eddie for one of his famous Bluebird burgers, because they are sensational.

WHITE RIBBON DAY

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:22): I rise today to bring members' attention to White Ribbon Day, which will be marked this year on 25 November. Since 1991, the white ribbon has represented a global commitment to end the scourge of violence against women and girls. It is a campaign that began here in Australia more than 20 years ago and it goes from strength to strength due to the efforts of those who oppose such violence, support gender equality and promote community action and, with it, attitudinal and behavioural change in working towards a future free of violence and abuse.

Because the grave truth is that, every week, on average one woman is killed by intimate partner violence in our country—one woman every week. If this were the case for any other societal cohort, there would be widespread and widely-expressed abhorrence in the community. This is building, but the 2013 National Community Attitudes Survey, released just last month, demonstrates that more than 40 per cent of people believe that sexual assault is a result of men's inability to control their need for sex and that 20 per cent of people believe that loss of control can excuse domestic violence.

While the survey shows some encouraging signs—not enough—that young people's attitudes towards women are improving, that there is greater understanding of the forms that violence against women can take and that statistically speaking a large majority of our fellow Australians would intervene if they witnessed a woman subjected to assault, the figures I have cited are deeply concerning. It seems that a significant number of Australians remain to be convinced that hurting women and girls is completely unacceptable. They remain to be convinced that men choose to behave, to respond to situations, with violence.

There are many myths and misconceptions surrounding this issue. One is that violence against women is an issue that only concerns women. Violence against women is also a men's issue. In particular, it is a men's issue because it is men's wives, mothers, sisters, daughters and friends whose lives are limited by violence and abuse; it is a men's issue because some men's violence gives all men a bad name; it is a men's issue because, as community leaders and decision-makers, men can play a key role in helping stop violence against women; it is a men's issue because men can speak out and step in when male friends and relatives assault or attack women; and it is a men's issue because the minority of men treat women and girls with contempt and violence, and it is up to the majority of men to help create a culture in which this is unacceptable. By providing a clear message that men will not tolerate violence against women, the White Ribbon campaign starts the ball rolling in removing this form of human rights abuse from our community.

Another myth is that violence against women occurs only in specific groups. Violence against women occurs across all religious beliefs, all levels of education, all sexual orientations, occupations, community positions and cultural or ethnic backgrounds. A further myth is that violence affects only a small number of Australian women. According to VicHealth, violence is the biggest cause of injury or death for women between 18 and 45 years of age. The report also found that among women under 45, intimate partner violence contributes more to their poor health, disability and death than any other risk factor, including obesity and smoking.

White Ribbon Day is a positive thing. It provides men, and in fact the whole community, with an opportunity to play a positive role in preventing violence against women by men, and inspires men to challenge violent behaviours to show that they want to make a difference. It is important for us to get behind the White Ribbon campaign and show our support within our communities and beyond. In concluding, I ask members to consider the remarks of Lieutenant General David Morrison AO, Chief of Army, when, in June 2013, he condemned certain behaviours and attitudes towards women in our military. He said:

There are no bystanders—the standard you walk past is the standard you accept.

GRAIN HARVEST

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:27): I rise today to talk about this year's cereal harvest, which, of course, is underway right across South Australia. Some in the far west of the state are drawing to a close, some have completed their harvest out there, and I guess in the South-East, the Mid South-East and Lower South-East it is yet to get underway. However, for the most part the state's harvest is about 50 per cent of the way through.

The PIRSA Crop and Pasture Report for South Australia was released updated in November just gone, and there are some interesting figures to come from that. The total crop estimate for South Australia, according to that report, will be 7.48 million tonnes of grain from 4.05 million hectares. That is slightly below the long-term average, but I have to say that over the last half a dozen years or so South Australia's farmers have been remarkably consistent in their production of grain. Ever since the drought finished in 2009-10 we have averaged about 8.2 or 8.3 million tonnes of grain. This year is estimated to come in slightly below that.

Eyre Peninsula—which, of course, the electorate of Flinders covers a good part of—is estimated to produce around 2.6 million tonnes of grain, so just a little over one-third of the state's grain crop comes from Eyre Peninsula. That is pretty much in line with the average. It has not been a particularly easy year, so my congratulations go to the farmers who are producing this crop. It was characterised by good early rains right across the state. In fact, I remember hearing that Smoky Bay, which has an average rainfall of about 250 millimetres per annum, had achieved its entire average rainfall by the end of June. That set them up well with good soil moisture, and it occurred right across much of the state's wheat belt.

That was money in the bank, in a sense, because to follow up on good early rain and quite an exceptionally wet winter we have seen a very dry spring in recent months. That dry spring was characterised in some areas by the lowest rainfall on record. But the challenges went further than that: there were warm temperatures and a little bit of frost damage as well. So those warm days—those big highs that were sitting over the state—resulted in very cold nights as well as some frost damage throughout the grain belt.

It is a credit to the farmers to achieve what they have with a challenging season, and there are a number of reasons for that. Obviously, technology is advancing and farmers are at the forefront of adopting new technologies, whether it be in the area of machinery, varieties, or farming systems, and farming systems are always changing. One wheat variety, in particular, has been mentioned a lot. The former member for Stuart was talking to me yesterday evening about the wheat variety, mace, which is grown on a good part of South Australia's wheat belt and also returning remarkable yields.

Prices have kicked a little bit in recent weeks: APW wheat is around \$2.80, \$2.90 a tonne, export barley is performing well relative to wheat, returning around \$2.60 to \$2.65 a tonne; lentils are up around \$900; durum is a real star this year, and those growers who are still growing durum wheat (and most of that is in the lower and Mid North regions) are returning around \$570 a tonne; and canola is about where it normally sits at this time of the year, at \$450 to \$500 a tonne. So, prices have kicked a little bit in recent weeks, and that is good news.

We are \$10 to \$20 a tonne above our colleagues and competitors in Western Australia, and my understanding is that a lot of that is an advantage we have managed to gain through the allocation of shipping and the auction or bidding system the ports in South Australia adopt. So, 6.2 million tonnes of shipping were committed prior to harvest, which really set up a good situation going into harvest because, of course, the storage and handling system comes under pressure during harvest, but knowing there is shipping on the way is a good thing. Congratulations to the state's farmers on another great season.

ADVANCE CARE DIRECTIVES

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:32): It was interesting today to meet with representatives of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation (ANMF) and hear about their work. One of the reps was from Naracoorte, one from the emergency department of Lyell McEwin Hospital, and one from a mental health area, as well as union organiser for the ANMF, Rosie Ratcliff.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the union on their education program. I was told, I am pleased to say, having campaigned on this issue for many years, that the advance care directives legislation, as it is taking hold, has made life a little easier for health professionals, particularly nurses. People are being clear about their life arrangements and wishes, and it has been easier to deal with families who have different views from their patients, from their family member.

For example, it has made a lot clearer what people's views are on the issue of organ and tissue donation. Quite often the person who is at the end of their life has a different point of view from the family on a whole range of issues. The nurses were telling me today that in some cases, as I said, the legislation has started to become more well known, and when people make advance care directives it is a lot clearer what the person concerned thinks.

We also talked about voluntary euthanasia. Although there was no agreement about the choice of voluntary euthanasia, it was very interesting to hear about their first-hand experiences with people who were about to die. So I looked to a very good publication, *End of Life Choice*, and I think we are up to about our third or fourth newsletter. The 27 October issue talks about nurses supporting

the choice in dying, and it says that the nurses' position statement on end of life choice was reviewed and re-endorsed in May 2012. It reads, in part:

Society's approach to voluntary euthanasia should be informed by the moral dimensions of respect for self-determination, concern for quality of life and compassion for those who suffer. Registered nurses, enrolled nurses and registered midwives have a professional responsibility to stay reliably informed about the ethical, legal, cultural and clinical implications of voluntary euthanasia. We support legislative reform so that persons with a terminal or incurable illness that creates unrelieved, profound suffering shall have the right to choose to die with dignity in a manner acceptable to them and shall not be compelled to suffer beyond their wishes.

I think the other important point, and one I have always felt very strongly about, is that there needs to be policy with regard to doctors and health professionals in relation to people who conscientiously object to voluntary euthanasia, and so their policy also says:

Legislative reform must ensure that no individual, group or organisation shall be compelled against their will to either participate or not participate in an assisted or supported death of a sufferer.

I think these are really important points that need to be taken on board, especially for those of us who are keen to reintroduce legislation of this sort in South Australia. I also thought it was really interesting to talk to the nurses about the sort of work they do. They raised a number of issues with me that I have asked them to summarise and, hopefully, the nurses' union will take them up with the health minister.

I think they are things that would be quite helpful to improve the efficiency of our health sector. I also suggested that it is something where, if the grievance procedure in a particular workplace, any workplace, cannot be resolved, and you go through the steps of trying to solve an issue, then you can always talk not only to your union but also to your local member of parliament. I guess I am putting on notice that there are probably going to be a number of members of parliament in this chamber who will be receiving some complaints from their constituents.

Bills

CIVIL LIABILITY (DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

Adjournment Debate

ACH GROUP

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:38): I would like to speak today about the wonderful organisation ACH but, in particular, their facility called ViTA, an Italian-Latin word meaning 'life'. It was my pleasure to attend the opening ceremony of this particular facility on Wednesday 20 August at which the Minister for Health, the Hon. Jack Snelling, officiated. Also in attendance was the member for Taylor.

This facility is a state-of-the-art centre supporting the rehabilitation of older people. 'Living better' is the new and exciting platform with which this service and facility offers the approach through a fresh, progressive and innovative focus.

It is based on a partnership between four well-known organisations, being ACH, ViTA, Flinders University and SA Health. ACH, as members are probably all aware, is an experienced not-for-profit organisation which has been supporting older South Australians since 1982. On offer from the ACH services are such things as domestic personal nursing care support, as well as retirement and residential accommodation. At the heart of the ACH mandate is provision of good lives created through opportunities for older people.

ACH is responsive to community sentiment and endeavours to meet the needs of our important older South Australians through flexible and innovative care in the quest for them to be their best and live the best life they can. With hundreds of volunteers, the ACH Group has about 1,700 specialist staff. All who work with the ACH Group hold the belief that their older clientele should be valued and respected and connected to their communities, all the while facilitating empowerment of them to take control of their own lives to the best of their possible abilities.

With the opening of the ViTA complex was a tour of the facility and we saw that it was a progressive, light and bright building with a welcoming ambience. So that we know where it is, it is co-located next to the Repatriation General Hospital, in the same ground. It is an impressive facility which offers the latest technology and clinical and social practices aiming at outcomes that enhance recovery and rehabilitation from illness, particularly supporting the ageing.

Each person who enters and progresses through these services has their individual needs catered for to facilitate maximum health outcomes. The approach is that of 'reablement', meaning that those who access ViTA have the physical capability and confidence on a daily basis to carry out living activities. Therefore, they are supported to remain in their own homes and continue their programs.

Those staying in ViTA see residential-style care in a hospital-like setting. There are light-filled rooms, garden views, smart TVs, private ensuites and the latest interior designs. I must say, on the day we were there it was extremely warm but, as the carers explained to us, it needs to be warm to cater for the older people who do not move around much. All these factors in the environment are set to optimise a speedy recovery. There is also a concierge service to assist each person's needs in an effort to support their independence. This concierge will help plan their transport and meals, for instance.

ViTA also looks to support and is a dynamic environment for students and researchers in developing progressive health. It is also a teaching and research centre and uses new approaches to rehabilitation and restoration. This is achieved through training and development and looking at the future of the aged-care workforce in areas such as general practitioners, nurses, allied health workers, support workers, clerical staff and hotel services.

This approach will be facilitated by way of taking an interprofessional learning approach which will see students in various disciplines working side by side to improve the quality of care through collaboration. We witnessed this on the day we visited this particular facility, as we saw nurses working alongside other allied health professionals as they were case working particular individual cases. We also witnessed the videoconferencing technique that was taking place as well, so those in more rural and remote areas were receiving these services. For anyone who is interested in visiting the ViTA facility, I highly recommend you arrange a tour. They will be only too pleased to facilitate this.

ABC AND SBS FUNDING

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:44): I was going to speak this afternoon on the cuts to the SBS and ABC budgets heralded on *Media Watch* and confirmed by the Minister for Communications on Q&A on Monday 17 November. However, this afternoon, I understand, while we were in question time, the federal communications minister (Malcolm Turnbull) actually announced the figures. I understand at this stage that the announcement revealed \$254 million of cuts over five years for our national broadcaster, the ABC, and the SBS operating budget will be reduced by \$25.2 million over five years. It was on the eve of the last federal election that the Prime Minister said in response to a direct question on SBS news:

I trust everyone actually listened to what Joe Hockey has said: no cuts to education, no cuts to health, no changes to pensions, no change to the GST and no cuts to the ABC or SBS.

It is interesting that these remarks were prefaced with the word 'trust' because it was Mr Abbott who said on an earlier occasion that the only utterances made by him that should be perceived as gospel truth were carefully scripted ones made as part of a speech or policy announcement. Comments made during the heat of discussion—they were his words, 'the heat of discussion'—should not necessarily be regarded as truthful or reliable.

I cannot say that Mr Abbott's remarks on SBS, remarks that have been frequently broadcast and quoted since the election, appear to me to be made in the heat of the moment or under any particular pressure from his questioner. It is a pity that some of the voting public did not recall Mr Abbott's analysis of his own trustworthiness when casting their votes last year, because it is the case that there have been cuts to education; there have been cuts to health; there will be cuts to pensions; and, of course, now we know, and it has been announced, that there are cuts to the ABC and the SBS.

Mr Turnbull says that this action is not based on ideology, but when one considers the current Coalition government's fairly notorious reluctance to submit to scrutiny, one can hardly be surprised that the robust reportage and analysis for which the ABC and SBS are rightly respected is to be silenced by what, with these figures, one can only assume will be a death of a thousand cuts.

I understand that the cuts announced today will represent 4.6 per cent of the ABC's budget over five years, though this estimate does not take into account the recent loss of the Australia Network. It is also estimated that up to 500 jobs could be lost before Christmas; that the state-produced 7.30 programs (including our own) could go, and with them related local production capacity; that *Lateline* could be cut back; that overseas bureaus will lose staff; and that ABC radio will lose funds, although regional radio will be protected to a degree, as will Radio National.

I have to say that I am keeping a close eye on what eventuates. If true, there is obviously a strong possibility that network content from Sydney and Melbourne will dominate our viewing and listening here in South Australia, that our local voices and our local views will be subsumed. How does this adhere to the charter of our national broadcaster, one has to ask, to its responsibility to serve not only the large metropolitan centres but also rural and regional areas?

I urge all supporters of our national broadcaster, all who have a measure of trust in their integrity—who incidentally include 70 per cent of ABC viewers and 65 per cent of SBS viewers—to make their views known to the federal government. I got those figures from a 2013 Essential research poll. I think it is important that members of the public make their concerns known, and I would just like to point out that there will be a lunchtime rally at 12.30 on Thursday across from the ABC building. It is a community rally. All members of the public are welcome, and it will give them an opportunity to voice their concerns about the cuts, the \$254 million worth of cuts over five years that have just been announced by the federal communications minister, Mr Turnbull.

At 15:49 the house adjourned until Thursday 20 November 2014 at 10:30.

*Estimates Replies***HOUSING SA MULTI-TRADE CONTRACT**

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (21 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

The home modifications referred to by the opposition spokesperson in this instance were conducted by a Housing SA maintenance contractor on a Housing SA property. The matter therefore falls within my portfolio responsibility as Minister for Social Housing.

I am further advised that the Housing SA Multi-Trade Contract is a performance based contract, consisting of stringent code of conduct requirements, along with key performance indicators which are outlined in the Multi-Trade Contractors Conditions of Agreement. To ensure that all contractors are abiding by ethical and financial standards, their performance is measured monthly. The strategies used include monthly meetings on performance standards, and monthly reporting together with audit and compliance strategies.

Under the terms of the Multi-Trade Contractors Conditions of Agreement, where contractors do not meet the performance benchmark, an abatement amount can be applied. Housing SA does not pay for uncompleted work, or work deemed not compliant with the Accommodation Standards or Technical Specification. Where work has not been performed to the appropriate standard, or is not completed satisfactorily, a Non-Conformity Report is issued to the multi-trade contractor and further investigated by Housing SA. A Non-Conformity Report may impact on their performance indicators and abatements.