

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 4 December 2014

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Bedford)** took the chair at 10:31 and read prayers.

Bills

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY ON WATER PRICING BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for a commission of inquiry into water pricing; to provide evidentiary powers and immunities in connection with the inquiries; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The people of South Australia have grave concerns about the water prices which they are currently paying. We also, on this side of the house, have grave concerns about the water prices that South Australians are paying. They are the highest in the nation. The Rann/Weatherill government's water legacy has been to deliver South Australians the highest prices in the country.

In 2002, when the Labor government came to power, water consumers were paying 38¢ per kilolitre. That price is now \$2.32 per kilolitre, and many pay a higher rate because Labor changed the threshold for the cheapest water, from 120 kilolitres per annum to just 30 kilolitres per annum. So you see that we have real concerns, grave concerns, about the massive increases in water prices in South Australia.

As the millennium drought took hold, Labor scoffed at the Liberal Party's suggestion to build a 45-gigalitre desalination plant in South Australia. They said that this was unnecessary and extraordinarily expensive, but as the drought continued on, and then there was talk in the media of us having to truck water into South Australia, the government decided that they themselves would introduce this concept of desalination to South Australia. Yet, unlike our proposal for a modest 45-gigalitre plant, the government said that they would introduce a 50-gigalitre plant, which they ultimately increased to 100 gigalitres.

This plant that they have installed in South Australia cost water consumers \$2.2 billion and has had a major impact on water prices in South Australia. This compares with the 45-gigalitre plant which the Western Australian government put in at around the same time in Kwinana and which cost just \$387 million. It begs the question: why was it that, first of all, the government fought so hard against it and then decided not only to put it in but to put in a very expensive system which was double what had originally been envisaged—by them and certainly by us on this side of the house?

Of course, we would think with a big capital project like this there would be an enormous cost-benefit analysis done for the people of South Australia, and was there? The answer to that is no, there was not. We know this because the commonwealth Auditor-General said in his report that there was no business case, no cost-benefit analysis and no case whatsoever for doubling the size of the desal plant. We know for a fact that Infrastructure Australia recommended against it. This is just one level, one layer, of the absolute mismanagement that we have seen in water in South Australia over the life of this government.

Acting Speaker, you will also recall that this is the government which introduced the Essential Services Commission of South Australia. This was an initiative which was supported by those of us on this side of the house. We think it is a good idea to have somebody independently regulating the price of water in South Australia so that water consumers can be assured that we not paying one additional cent for water than we need to be paying, so the government set up the

Essential Services Commission. I think the people of South Australia said, 'This is good. We have an independent regulator.'

In recent weeks, the independence of this independent price setting has been called into question, not the independence of ESCOSA but the independence of the price-setting has been called into question. We know for a fact that approximately 70 per cent of the water price calculation is determined on what is referred to as the 'regulated asset base'. The regulated asset base is not something which is determined by the independent regulator, so 70 per cent of water prices are determined by the regulated asset base, yet the regulated asset base is not determined by the independent regulator; it is determined by Treasury, and Treasury make up their mind on what the value of that regulated asset base is in South Australia.

You can imagine our concern, Acting Speaker, when we received notification via the media that Dr Paul Kerin had put in a scathing letter of resignation to this government over this precise issue of reform and the value of the regulated asset base. I will read briefly from his resignation letter which was addressed to Dr Pat Walsh, Chairman of the Essential Services Commission. He said:

I joined the Commission principally because I had understood that, amongst other things:

1. the water industry would undergo considerable economic reform;
2. the Commission would play a key role in driving that reform;
3. the Commission's independence from government, as enshrined in the governing legislation, would be respected; and
4. the Commission would be able to serve its primary objective—the long-term interests of consumers—as its governing legislation requires it to do.

He goes on to state in his letter of resignation:

My experience over the past three years has shown that that understanding was incorrect. Instead, the government and its senior bureaucrats have clearly demonstrated that they have no interest in genuine reform, nor in serving the long-term interests of consumers. Indeed, they have stymied all efforts on those fronts at every turn. Furthermore, I have also been appalled by the behaviours that both Ministers and senior bureaucrats have engaged in to stymie those efforts.

They were powerful words, and that is why the Budget and Finance Committee asked Dr Paul Kerin to appear before it, and that was done on Friday of last week. Can I just say that the evidence which was presented to that committee was explosive—it was explosive on many fronts. Part of the evidence provided to that committee included that Stephen Mullighan, then chief of staff to the treasurer at the time (who of course was also the Premier) had gone to the Essential Services Commissioner and asked him to, within a 24-hour period, model up the maximum revenue into SA Water of a 5 per cent, 10 per cent and a 15 per cent increase in the regulated asset base.

It begs the question: why would he do that? Surely the regulated asset base valuation is determined with a methodology based upon the actual value of those assets. Why would he be asking what the impact upon water prices (and therefore revenue to the state government) would be with a 5 per cent, 10 per cent, and 15 per cent increase in the value of those assets? You can imagine our shock when we saw that the increase this year in water assets was 5 per cent and the increase this year in sewage assets was 10 per cent; they seem amazingly rounded-off numbers.

We have come into this parliament this week asking respectful and reasonable questions of this government regarding how it determines the regulated asset base valuation. Have we got one single answer from this Treasurer?

Honourable members: No!

Mr MARSHALL: Not one single answer—'Oh, it's the way it has always been done.' I have asked the Treasurer: will he table the methodology? We would like to be assured, on behalf of water consumers in South Australia, that the regulated asset base of SA Water is determined in accordance with a methodology based upon the value of those assets. I will tell you why we are concerned: as part of the evidence that Dr Kerin provided to the Budget and Finance Committee last week, he said that water prices in South Australia were artificially inflated because the government had artificially inflated the asset base by \$2 billion and that had a flow-on effect of increasing the price to water consumers of a massive \$100 million per year.

According to Dr Kerin, water consumers in this state are paying \$100 million extra per year because of the inflated value of our asset base. We have asked questions and we have not had any answers; therefore, we come before the parliament today and I introduce this bill establish a commission of inquiry on water pricing. We need somebody to clear the air. We need somebody independent to tell us the truth. We need somebody independent to give us the facts.

This bill does a number of things. First of all, it provides that an inquiry will take price into water pricing in South Australia. When we refer to water pricing, of course, we are referring to water pricing related to SA Water. It provides a number of terms of reference: first of all, why water prices are so high here in South Australia; and secondly, how can we lower those water prices in South Australia? It also provides for a commissioner to be to be appointed, and for that commissioner to have the appropriate powers to collect evidence to make sure that his inquiry comes to conclusions that we can then implement. Finally, the commissioner will prepare a report, and that will be completed by the end of next year, to be laid on the table within three sitting days.

It is a simple bill. It is a bill that the government should have no fear over. We would like this bill to be implemented as a matter of priority. The government can actually set this up themselves without it passing this house but, either way, if it does not, we will pursue this.

We understand that the government will continue with its folly of proroguing this parliament, its expensive and untimely folly of proroguing this parliament this week, but we do not support that whatsoever. If it does we will reintroduce this, and we will reintroduce it because it is important for water consumers in South Australia to understand why we have a government that does not have an interest in water pricing reform here in South Australia, why we have the highest water prices here in South Australia, why it is that a former chief executive of ESCOSA and two former commissioners all have grave concerns about the determination of the regulated asset base, the flow on cost of more than \$100 million to water consumers each year, and why the Treasurer, when asked questions in this parliament, cannot give straight answers to straight questions. That is why we have brought this before the house today.

I must say that I have also been concerned about evidence provided to the Budget and Finance Committee of serious allegations against ministers. The allegations were that ministers had made false claims. That is a very serious case. It will not be pursued as part of its inquiry, but it is something I think this parliament needs to get to the bottom of. The other point that was made in this evidence, of course, was that there is bullying of and intimidatory practices against officers within ESCOSA.

I raised these questions in the parliament yesterday in what I thought was a very respectful way, but did I get a respectful answer? No. All we get from those opposite is rhetoric; 'Oh, these are politically motivated.' Well I can tell the house that Dr Paul Kerin, in his own resignation letter, said that he was a long-term Labor supporter, that he was not politically motivated but that he was employed in this state under false pretences. He thought he was coming to work for a government that wanted reform, he thought he was coming to work for a government that cared about water prices here in South Australia, but he was wrong and he resigned.

I will finish by stating that the reason water prices are so important is that at the moment families are doing it tough, and so are businesses. Water is a major input into the productive capacity of our state. We are in hard times at the moment, our unemployment is rising and our young people are leaving our state, and it is incumbent upon all of us in this place to do everything we can, every day that we are in here, to make sure we create jobs, and keeping our water prices as low as possible in South Australia is a very commendable objective.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

COURTS ADMINISTRATION (DIRECTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (10:48): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Courts Administration Act 1993. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (10:49): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The evolution of the Westminster system, from which our traditions of government originate, involve both the separation of powers and checks and balances upon them. The parliament has the power to legislate and the power of the purse. Executive government is accountable to the parliament; it cannot purport to make laws, impose taxes or otherwise coerce obligations or spend public moneys without the approval of parliament. Equally, parliament may only ultimately direct the executive through legislation or, according to the constitutional convention, by the lower house expressing a lack of confidence in the ministry.

Similarly, both parliament and the executive are subject to law as administered impartially by the judiciary. Parliament may not impinge upon judicial power and the executive may not intervene in the deliberations of the court. Indeed, the concept of the separation of powers in Australian constitutional practice is wider, placing limits on parliamentary sovereignty by allowing for unconstitutional laws to be invalidated. We were, in fact, the second country in the world after the United States to empower our superior courts in this way.

I mention all of this because it is germane to the bill I bring before the house. Decades ago, in an attempt to better delineate the way in which the executive, legislature and judiciary intersect, the parliament enacted the Courts Administration Act. The purpose behind this law is to clarify the roles of the courts and the executive government in relation to the administration of the courts system and, in particular, the management of court properties and the delivery of court services.

In effect, this act provides the courts with substantial autonomy on matters which would, in the ordinary course of affairs, be within the purview of the executive. It does this through the creation of the Courts Administration Authority, overseen by a Judicial Council consisting of the Chief Justice, the Chief Judge of the District Court and the Chief Magistrate. Under section 10 of the act, the Judicial Council is:

...responsible for providing, or arranging for the provision of, the administrative facilities and services for participating courts that are necessary to enable those courts and their staff properly to carry out their judicial and administrative functions.

The authority, which in effect means the judges who sit on the Judicial Council, have a series of powers enumerated in the legislation. It is notable that, while they can enter into contracts under section 11(2), they are specifically prohibited from acquiring or disposing of an interest in real property without the Governor's consent, which means the agreement of cabinet. Instead, under section 15, they are invested with the care, control and management of the real property of the Crown that has been reserved for the use of the courts. Land and buildings may be reserved for court uses by a proclamation of the Governor.

All of this is generally a good thing. If judicial independence is to be maintained, it must be funded without political interference, and an autonomous Courts Administration Authority made up of senior judicial officers from the state's principal courts is a good way for this to be realised. However, this should not come at the expense of the responsibility of the executive to manage the state's budget and assets, nor at the expense of the parliament's role in scrutinising how taxpayers' money is spent, or access to justice by the community.

Of course, I recognise that, like other statutory bodies, the authority is subject to general financial management principles and is required to provide an annual report to parliament. In recent times, the mooted closure of two court complexes has been proposed by the authority as a cost-saving measure. Putting aside the question of how real these savings would be, in my mind there is a distinct and fundamental flaw in the statutory scheme that simply exempts the authority from reasonable direction by the executive in the management of court properties and the parliament in the scrutiny of expenditure.

The taxpayers of this state have invested considerable moneys in both the Holden Hill and Port Adelaide court complexes. They were both purpose built and, in the case of Holden Hill, form part of an integrated complex with the nearby police station. In addition to agencies of the Crown

other than the courts, community services and members of the legal profession have also co-located around these sites.

My inquiries have established that legal practitioners do not want to see the courts close. All of these services and the legal practitioners, and the public who access justice at these sites, will feel the brunt associated with the closure of the courts by the authority under the current act. For example, I have no doubt that, if the Holden Hill court closes, police will have additional costs and time-consuming restraints.

Unlike governments or parliamentary representatives, the Courts Administration Authority is not subject to electoral accountability—the type of accountability that means you must consult widely before closing schools, hospitals or other significant public facilities. Consultation with the community is needed, as demonstrated by the petitions already tabled in this place by the member for Port Adelaide. The member for Torrens, in whose seat Holden Hill is located, is already collecting petitionary signatures to be tabled in the next session.

It is those in this place who represent and address community expectations who have a role in making sure justice is available to all. The current act already makes it clear that the Judicial Council does not have the freedom to acquire or dispose of property or buildings without the agreement of cabinet. I acknowledge that this is not what the judges are talking about. They are talking about the closure of the courts but not proposing to dispose of the buildings. They are leaving that unsolved situation to the government. Yes, this is technically consistent with the act, but it is very much against the spirit in which it was made. The provision of government services always relies upon the provision of facilities.

An obvious example, that my colleague the member for Port Adelaide will no doubt discuss in more detail, is the government's desire to regenerate Port Adelaide. This has been a complex problem that has confounded governments of all persuasions and the local council for many years. Similar considerations apply in the case of Holden Hill, which is located at a significant centre and has a wide catchment in the northeast. All of this because of an anomaly in the act. An anomaly, I might add, that no other state has because no other state, so far as I can see, has provided their courts with the level of autonomy in the administration of public assets as we have in South Australia.

My bill will address this anomaly by introducing a power for the Attorney-General to issue directions in relation to the management of properties assigned to the authority. This will enable the government to provide directions of a general nature to the authority and ensure that the closure of any court complex will require the agreement of the cabinet, which is otherwise responsible to parliament for the management of public assets and the expenditure of taxpayer funds.

Having concluded that part of my speech, I note that on radio this morning the Chief Justice, Christopher Kourakis—although I only have a copy of the transcript in electronic form—did discuss this bill being introduced in parliament today and did undertake to say that if funds were made available to him to maintain these buildings that he would in fact maintain them. So, that is something that I welcome. In the meantime, I look forward to discussion on the bill, which, as I said, I think is a very mild way of ensuring that the community, through the parliament, has a say in how courthouses and the properties around courts are used and continue to be made available to the public so that access to justice, which is what we all want to see happen, is as fair as it can be. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENTS (GARNISHEE ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 November 2014.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:57): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): I declare it carried.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Divide!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): I will put the question again. The noes have it. I have declared it in the negative. Do you wish to divide or not? The motion has been called in the negative; if you would like to divide, I will call a division.

Mr GARDNER: Sir, as I understand it, we have not adjourned because you called—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): In favour of the noes.

Mr GARDNER: Therefore, we are looking for an opportunity for another member to speak.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): So you do not want to divide?

Mr GARDNER: Nobody has called, 'Divide,' sir.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): I thought you called a division.

Mr GARDNER: There seems to be an argument as to whether we should divide on a matter that you have called for him. Given that we are not dividing, there surely needs to be attention drawn to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:00): The member for Hartley has brought a very important matter to the attention of the house and one on which I often get representations to my electorate office. It concerns the problem of small businesses and not just people in small businesses but people who have rental properties—and I am not absolutely certain whether this would cut across the Residential Tenancies Act. There is a whole range of people out there who seem to make an art form out of not paying their debts. There is a whole range of people who think that it is okay to go out and obtain a service, whether it be from a tradesperson or on some sort of credit account or for a rental property, and not pay their debt.

As a society, I think we have to recognise that somewhere somebody always pays. Somebody has to pay, and if the person who obtains the service does not pay surely it must be the person who provides the service who has to pay. What we need to recognise is that the person who provides the service generally has costs of their own. They have a family they have to look after, they have a table which food must put on, and they have children who have school fees and school uniforms and who need to be clothed and shod.

They have costs, but also, if they are running a small business, they have their creditors. They may well have had to purchase equipment and materials to undertake the work they have done. They have obligations and, by and large, if they stay in business, they meet those obligations, so the money comes off the table that provides for their family. This happens all too often, and we see the statistics about the failure of start-up businesses in this state, which are incredibly high. In many cases, those statistics reflect the problem of bad debtors.

Bad debts are one of the most difficult things to manage when operating a small business. I run a small business in another part of my life, and I have experienced this very problem. Somebody comes along—in my case, the business where I am selling a good—and picks up the good in their truck and takes it off to their place of business, where they probably on-sell it and get the money for it, but they fail to pay their due for the good they have taken possession of. It is a very difficult thing to manage within a business.

I know that in the case I referred to in my own circumstance—and it was a substantial amount of money a few years ago—that came off the bottom line, and I can inform the house that my banker was not very sympathetic. My banker was very forthright in saying that I could not pass on the bad debt to him, and that is the case for any other small business operator.

The member for Hartley is endeavouring to give some relief and some justice to the party who is doing the right thing. He is trying to give some relief to the party who has fulfilled their part of the contract. We know that the economy of this state is built on the back of small business. The wrong that this bill is trying to correct is perpetrated, by and large, against small business.

Large businesses, I would argue, generally have both the wherewithal and the facilities to manage bad debtors. I am not saying it is an easy process, but they generally have a better ability to manage bad debtors. A small business operator, who might be a sole operator running his carpentry or plumbing business, literally does not have the time to chase up the bad debts. He has to continue to go out and generate more income to keep his business going and to feed his family.

This bill would give some relief to those people who find themselves at the mercy of bad debtors, to have a court give them some relief. I can also cite the case, and I am sure many members of this place have had such circumstances brought to their attention, where bad debts arise in the rental property sector, when people move into a house or a flat and refuse to pay the rent. The process of getting an eviction order is incredibly tedious and the bad debt just accumulates. In the laws of this state, the parliament seems to have ignored the impact that has on the other party, that is, the party providing the service.

This is but a small measure to correct some of those ills, and I certainly will be supporting it. As I have said, it is a small measure in the right direction, and it is one that I think the house should support. I think there should be fulsome support for this measure. Let's put it into operation and let's then monitor the situation and see how it pans out in the real world and whether it achieves what the member for Hartley is seeking to achieve correctly and fairly. Maybe, if we need to tweak it a little bit, we can come back in the not too distant future and have another look at it, but we need to take that first step, in my opinion.

We all know—and I think even the members of the government know, when they go home at night and put their head on the pillow—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: They do go home pretty early—that the economy of this state is in a mess. As I said, about 85 per cent of the economy of this state is reliant on small business. Let's give small business a bit of a break. I commend the bill to the house.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the house to our visitors in the public gallery, students from St Bernadette's School, years 3 to 7, guests of the member for Waite. We welcome you to parliament today and hope you enjoy your time here with us this morning.

Bills

ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENTS (GARNISHEE ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:08): I rise and am motivated to speak on this very simple, very positive amendment bill on garnishee orders. Can I say from the outset that not long ago a wise man said to me that private members' time is a fantastic way to progress small matters that may not otherwise get attention during government business, that private members' time is a place for these types of bills to be prosecuted and put forward. That very wise man said that often opposition and independent members can do things that the government themselves cannot do or do not have the time or the priority to do.

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr KNOLL: Can I say, member for MacKillop, that the wise man I am talking about sits on the other side of the chamber. This is precisely the type of bill that I believe the member's advice pertained to. We are talking about a very simple amendment that simply seeks to give courts the ability to enforce the judgements they make and to enable the courts, with a great deal of flexibility and a great deal of scope given to judges in the way that they enact this amendment, to be able to garnish wages and salaries.

I have been through this process in a previous life. I have had to chase people for debts that have been duly and fairly owed. As the member for MacKillop stated, as a small business owner, every single cent of those outstanding debts would otherwise have gone on to paying debts that my business had, paying wages of people or re-investing further into the business so that it could grow and employ more people, and hopefully generate some much-needed tax revenue for this state so that members opposite can wilfully fritter it away.

However, I understand that the government is not going to support this amendment, and the message this sends is absolutely disgusting. The message this sends to those who wish to obfuscate and move away from their obligations is: 'If you are indebted to somebody and if the court gives judgement against you that you indeed need to pay up that debt, do not worry about paying. There are plenty of loopholes and mechanisms by which you do not have to pay your debts.' It is basically flouting the authority of the courts by not giving them the ability to effectively enforce their judgements. It is basically saying, 'We want an independent judiciary, but we do not want you to actually be able to follow through in this instance on the judgements that you make. We would like you to be as toothless as we can make you.'

I do not understand how the government believes that standing up for people who legitimately owe other people money is a valid way to go about business. I do not understand how they can stand up and say that it is okay not to pay your proper and fair debts, as has been judged by a court. I do not understand this logic; it is extremely flawed and it is something I believe the government needs to be held to account on, because it undermines our democracy, it undermines private property rights, it undermines our judicial system and its ability to create order and peace within our society, and for people to live up to their responsibilities and obligations, and to make good on court-enforced judgements.

I will close my remarks by saying that this is a fantastic, simple common-sense piece of legislation that the member for Hartley has brought to this place. He is a first-term MP who is making his mark and really helping, in small community ways, to improve the fabric of our society, and I think it is an absolute disgrace that this bill will not be supported by the government.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:13): Firstly, I would like to thank those who assisted in putting this bill together, from the government's legal team. I would also like to thank those who were readily available when I sought some consultation on this bill: the magistrates out there know who they are, the lawyers out there know who they are and residents know who they are. I would like to thank them all for their input into this bill, from both the profession and also outside.

Let me say that this was a bill that originated from the electorate. This is not a hobbyhorse of mine. Many members of this place do put their hobbyhorses into practice time and time again in this place, but I have not done this selfishly. This has come from the electorate and I reiterate to the house that this is a real bill that has been driven by someone—by many parties, in fact—who have gone to court and who have sought judgement, in their favour mind you, then when they apply that judgement and seek payment for something that is duly and legally owed to them, they are not able to obtain that judgement amount. It is not because the other party cannot afford to pay, it is because the system allows these people to get away with it.

What we are here to do is to stand up for the little person out there. We are here to stand up for the people who are mortgaged to the hilt, who are starting small businesses. It is not only them; what about the tradies out there who do plumbing work, electrical work, sewerage work and they do not get paid? They do not get paid because of scumbags out there who abuse and rot the system because we allow them to. And what are we doing? We put a bill before the house.

A backbencher in opposition puts a bill before the house in a statesmanlike manner. He goes to the Attorney, sits in his office and says, 'Attorney'—I admire the Attorney. The statesman will be on the bench before too long—that is okay—but while he is still here I say, 'Attorney, I plead with you, please help these people out.' He says to me, 'Vincent, I haven't got a problem with this bill. It should be okay. It shouldn't be controversial. Yes, we'll support it.' Then the member for Picton comes up, the member for—what is he?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TARZIA: I get confused—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TARZIA: —I am sorry, I get confused with—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is Thursday, but that does not mean that we have to be ridiculous. Let's conduct the business of the house in the manner to which the house is due, which is with dignity. The member for Hartley.

Mr TARZIA: The member for Kaurna presents an ignorant submission and tells me that welfare is going to be attacked under this bill. Welfare will not be attacked under this bill. We in this state parliament do not have the power to tap into something which is in the federal jurisdiction. It is ultra vires our power. It will not touch welfare. It will touch people's salaries in cases where a magistrate thinks that they are able to pay but do not pay, and at the moment they do not have that power in South Australia, and that is what this bill is about.

This government has absolutely no credibility when it comes to the economy. What do they do? At the eleventh hour of a by-election what do they do? They come up with some economic plan to reform taxes. This goes to the heart of the ignorance of this government. They understand absolutely nothing about business, about small business, about the engine room of the South Australian economy. And the Independents? Well, call it Independents' day. Call this moment right now the Independents' moment. Where are the Independents on this bill? Where are the Independents—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TARZIA: The member for Frome will be listening. He told me that he wanted to speak on this bill. Why has he not come up? I will tell you why—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is actually very poor form to draw attention to the absence of a member from the house.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

Mr TARZIA: I withdraw that remark. I—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hang on; the member for Morialta has a point of order.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: the member for Hartley at no stage has referred to whether members were in the chamber or not, only on whether they had spoken or not. We understood that the member for Frome wanted to speak on this bill and the government has denied him the opportunity by demanding that we do not adjourn.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will check *Hansard*. We will see.

Mr TARZIA: But I will ask the question: where was the member for Frome on this bill? Where was the member for Waite on this bill—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I do not know that we are really getting any further.

Mr TARZIA: Deputy Speaker, this is a bill that has gone out for consultation. It is from the electorate. And in the last 30 seconds let me just say that the government wants to have a go and say that this is a capricious bill. What government wants to put caveats on people's properties when they do not pay their overinflated ESL bills? This government. What government wants to clamp people's cars when they cannot afford to pay their fines? This government. Therefore, I ask the government and the Independents to stand up for the little guy out there on the street, the one taking a risk, the one who has done the work and deserves to be paid when a court of law says that they should.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 20
Noes 22

Majority..... 2

AYES

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

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Caica, P.	Close, S.E.	Digance, A.F.C.
Gee, J.P.	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.	Weatherill, J.W.
Wortley, D.		

PAIRS

Treloar, P.A.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
---------------	------------------------

Second reading thus negatived.

EMERGENCY SERVICES FUNDING (SACAT) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 November 2014.)

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:25): It gives me great pleasure to speak on the Emergency Services Funding (SACAT) Amendment Bill. This is a very important bill, and there would be nobody in our state who is not aware of what the government is doing with emergency services at the moment. We had presented to the public today very damning information with regard to the budget situation and the true impact of the federal budget upon our state's finances, which undermines the state government's entire argument for wanting to remove the remissions on the emergency services levy.

The government said that they had no choice. The government said that they had absolutely no choice but to remove the remissions on the emergency services levy so that every single property owner, whose remissions were removed, would have a higher emergency services bill to pay. That meant in the real world that every single additional dollar would go back to Treasury. It is a complete fallacy for anybody to think that the extra money charged is going to the emergency services sector, because it is not. However, what we know today is that the government's argument for taking money through the emergency services levy into Treasury to fund its own expenditure, which was based upon the fact that the federal government had an insurmountable impact on its own state budget, is completely false.

It is completely false, because we now know that the impact of the federal budget at a net level was \$4 million, yet the state government wants to pick up about \$90 million through the extra emergency services levy. This information has come forth because of questioning by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition, in estimates, asked the Treasurer time and time again, 'Yes, I understand the cuts, but what extra money has the federal government given to you?' What

is the net impact when you weigh up the cuts and the extra contribution from the federal government towards the state government budget? What is the net?' The Treasurer, in this house in estimates, refused to answer; but good work by the Leader of the Opposition who has continued to pursue the issue. We now know that the truth is \$4 million. The government's argument for its entire tax take through the emergency services levy has been blown out of the water. The reason it gave we now know is completely untrue.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (11:28): I would like to thank all members who have made a contribution to this amendment bill. It is an important one, and it highlights deficiencies which need to be tidied up following comments that have been made in the other place. It will advantage the people of South Australia, and I commend the bill to the house.

The house divided on the second reading:

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Treasurer to order.

Ayes 19
Noes 23
Majority 4

AYES

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

PAIRS

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

Second reading thus negatived.

Motions

PORT PIRIE SMELTER

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (11:34): I move:

That this house—

1. Recognises and congratulates the Port Pirie smelter on achieving its 125th anniversary of operation;
2. Recognises the significant contribution that this facility has made—

- (a) towards the provision of materials for the Allies during World War II;
- (b) to the economic and financial security of the Port Pirie community and the surrounding regions; and
- (c) to the benefit of South Australia as a whole.

Today, I would like to talk about the highlights of the colourful history of the Port Pirie smelter leading up to next week's 125th anniversary celebrations.

Economic activity in Port Pirie first shifted dramatically in the late 19th century with the discovery of rich silver, lead and zinc-bearing ore at Broken Hill in 1883, coupled with the completion of a narrow-gauge rail from the town to Broken Hill in 1888. The following year, in 1889, a lead smelter was built by the British Blocks company to treat Broken Hill ore. BHP initially leased the smelter from British Blocks and then began constructing its own smelter from 1892.

By 1897, BHP had transferred all its smelting activities to Port Pirie and so the story of smelting in Port Pirie began, with millions of tonnes of metal being produced and many thousands of people being employed, often generations of the same family, throughout its continuous 125-year history.

Another milestone occurred in 1915 when the smelter was taken over by a major joint venture of Broken Hill based companies, becoming Broken Hill Associated Smelters (BHAS). Led by the Collins House Group, BHAS became the biggest lead smelter in the world by 1934, processing both lead and zinc ore from Broken Hill. By 1921, Port Pirie's population had grown to just over 9,800 living in about 2,300 occupied dwellings. There were also approximately 62 boarding houses in the town to cater for the labour demands of the smelter and on the increasingly busy waterfront.

Port Pirie was declared South Australia's first provincial city in 1953, and today it is one of South Australia's largest ports and still continues to be very busy. It is characterised by a gracious main street and some very interesting and unusual historic buildings.

The smelter has been in constant operation for 125 years. There is an adjacent dedicated port facility where concentrates are received, with final products despatched by rail, sea and road. The Port Pirie facility is a primary lead smelter which also has the flexibility to treat a small range of other metal-bearing feed material. Port Pirie is one of the world's largest primary lead smelter facilities and the third largest zinc producer, which allows it to benefit from significant economies of scale.

As we are all aware, the smelter produces lead and associated products. In hindsight, a crisis was averted during World War II when the smelter was producing products for the Allied forces. It used to produce the lead for the Allied forces for munitions. According to the older locals in the community, there was a period when Broken Hill workers were to go on strike during this time and, if the Port Pirie workers had joined them, it might have jeopardised the supply of ammunition or munitions to the Allied forces. Thankfully, the Port Pirie workers elected not to go on strike, and that secured supply for our troops.

There have been numerous owners of the Port Pirie smelter over its 125-year history. However, a turning point came when Pasminco went into voluntary administration and everyone thought that the smelter would close. Everybody thought it would not close; the smelter had been going for over 100 years. But then, all of sudden, no, it will not close, but it was not a nice feeling. To everyone's credit—and I really must emphasise that—management, unions and the community worked together and the company was eventually taken over by Zinifex.

These people did not only talk about it but they actually joined forces. They joined together and worked together, and the staff accepted the suggestions by the workers. The workers are the ones who actually got us through. The unions, in actual fact, cost themselves money but they secured the success of Zinifex moving forward after Pasminco's very bad decision.

The rest is history, and we are here today with a proposed new state-of-the-art facility giving security to Port Pirie, the regions of South Australia and the South Australian economy for many years to come. I cannot emphasise enough how important this was to the city of Port Pirie. Everybody likely to be affected by a possible (even a likely) closure came together, as I said earlier, to ensure the smelter's survival. But it was not very easy. It was a very emotional time for everyone involved, not just for myself but the whole community.

We talk about people maybe losing their jobs. I woke up one morning and it was just the realisation. The share prices were going down. The share price got down to a couple of cents, and everyone said it would never, ever happen. The feeling is traumatic and, for the people in the South Australian Submarine Corporation and any manufacturing industry in South Australia and Australia, I can feel for them. I have been through this and it is not easy for anyone at all. In this case, it was not only me who was going to be losing my job—I worked there for 30 years and it is on my record—but the community would have been devastated.

However, even with all the uncertainty and concerns surrounding the city, the community of Port Pirie still managed, at that particular time, to raise in excess of \$100,000 towards a helipad for the local hospital. That was a magnificent effort in a short period of time. I am sure members on all sides would agree that people in the regions are very supportive. No matter how hard things go, they see a positivity out of it.

Since becoming a minister, I have taken this approach of working together out in the regions. I believe that we can achieve great results across the whole state by working together and I have tried to embrace all parties—members opposite, local government, community and interest groups. I am convinced we can all achieve greater economic and social results for our regions and cash in on the innovation I am seeing if we take this combined approach.

The smelter workforce in its early years was in the vicinity of 2,000 workers and was by far Port Pirie's largest employer. The whole town relied on the workforce for its success, and still does. Today, through improved technology, the workforce is in the vicinity of 700 to 750 but the community and the regions are still greatly reliant on the operations of this plant.

One of the things that is not known very widely is that in the early days (and this has only ceased in the last 15 years) the company supplied large amounts of heavy equipment—trucks, graders and front end loaders—to the community to build various projects across Port Pirie. One of those projects was a community park which is now the biggest park in Port Pirie, and it was completed in just one day. The workers donated their time to these very valuable projects, which is still in effect today. Another one was the harness racing facility, the go-cart tracks and also lots of sporting clubs.

Over the years, there have been many great improvements at the smelter, not only in the working practices but also operating conditions. Port Pirie and the lead smelter have had lots of bad images from everybody, particularly the Adelaide and interstate media. Port Pirie, as are other communities in the state, are very proud of what they have got. They are very proud of what the issues are. We may have inherited some practices from years ago but, as we move forward, I am very confident that on both sides of the house we can see the great future of Port Pirie and get that image away. The member for Stuart would probably understand the issue because Port Augusta has the same issue, and also the member for Giles, because Whyalla had that image some years ago, but now it is going away. This is what we have to get. We have to look to the future.

Significant improvements have been achieved in the blood lead levels of the children of Port Pirie with the continued support of the South Australian government, and also the Port Pirie Regional Council, the community and the assistance of the EPA. This will improve dramatically with the new proposed plant which is due to be commissioned in 2016-17.

The Port Pirie redevelopment has the ability to transform Port Pirie, providing certainty and confidence to the community and the whole wider region. I must also reinforce that it will also be of great benefit to this state, because if we had lost another industry it would not have been going too well. The redevelopment ensures Nyrstar remains Port Pirie's major employer, the most significant private sector contributor to the economy and to the region, and a substantial contributor to the South Australian economy.

The redeveloped facility is expected to have an operating life in excess of 30 years, and will feature state-of-the-art proven technology currently installed at more than 25 sites globally. The redevelopment will replace an out-of-date sinter plant, with a state-of-the-art oxygen-enriched enclosure bath, smelting furnace technology and a new sulphuric acid plant. The sinter plant was built as a pilot plant over 50 years ago, and that is still going, but it needs to be replaced and this new technology will replace that.

The application of the new proven technology will also deliver a range of environmental benefits. The redeveloped site will deliver step change reductions in lead in air and sulphur dioxide emissions, leading to significant improvements in community health. Recognising their responsibility to the local community, Nyrstar provides direct and indirect support through a wide range of programs and initiatives. I must put on record here that Nyrstar (and Zinifex prior to them) took responsibility for the issues that they had inherited, addressed those issues, took them on board and spent many millions of dollars to address that without any economic gain.

Again, I reinforce my support and gratitude to the South Australian government and the EPA for the consideration. The primary focus is to provide support and manage initiatives that make a direct impact on reducing blood levels in our community, and this will happen eventually. Specifically to date these include sponsorships for breakfast programs within schools and childcare centres, assistance to community support agencies, such as Uniting Care Wesley, donations to local organisations, community events, and educational health promotions targeting young children and those disadvantaged in the community.

In parallel with the redevelopment project, a new targeted lead abatement program will be implemented. This program has been developed to assess current and potential future community lead exposure reduction strategies and assess those that are likely to have the greatest impact on reducing children's lead blood levels. Nyrstar has committed up to \$3 million a year for the next 10 years and a further \$5 million to accelerate the objectives of this program.

Many things have changed and improved throughout the smelters' diverse history. The commitment of its employees and the ability the site has to overcome the many challenges faced to ensure it has remained operational is a story in itself. Redevelopment of the Port Pirie smelter will develop a fundamentally different business model for Port Pirie. The redeveloped operation will be capable of processing a wide range of high margin, metal bearing feed materials. Government planning approvals have been granted, allowing the construction phase to begin this year, with anticipated commissioning by the end of 2016.

South Australia's Upper Spencer Gulf has a long history of supporting mining and advanced manufacturing, as well as providing key regional centres for the rural community. As a cornerstone employer, the Port Pirie smelter has been associated with South Australia's prosperity for 125 years, closely linked to the Broken Hill success.

This story has established the state's fledging economy. If the smelter had closed it would clearly have affected the entire community. I speak not just for myself as a long time employee, previously before I retired, but for the generations of families, like the Scarmans, who have worked at the smelters for many years. The staff and employees there were very loyal. We had people there with 50 years service. There were dynasties of families coming through, and many other members of the community would have suffered from through the knock-on effects of the closure, including people whose house's capital value would have gone down, and it would have been really bad. That is why the redevelopment of the smelter means so much to the people of Port Pirie.

This redevelopment would not have been possible without the government underwriting the project, and the community of Port Pirie, the surrounding regions, and the state are very grateful for the survival of a great regional city. In closing, I thank everybody as a person, as a resident, for all the assistance I have had from both the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier. As we have moved forward, we have had a great success story. It is great that we have secured the future direction of Port Pirie. I am very gratified because, as I say, I have been through it before and I do not want to see anybody else go through something like that, to have a whole city destroyed by global influences.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:50): I rise in support of the motion from the member for Frome and commend him for bringing this to the house. I appreciated the detail that he provided about the formation of Port Pirie, the industries associated with it and the community that has driven the town's growth in that time. I was most interested in the fact that in 1953 it became the first provincial city in South Australia.

It is a very significant place, and it is appropriate that the parliament has an opportunity to talk about the good things that have occurred, the challenges that have been presented in recent

years, and also the opportunities that are there for the community moving forward and the investment that is occurring as a result of government support—I acknowledge that—and indeed private enterprise very strongly in this multinational world in which we live where there is overseas ownership of industries that exist within Australia and South Australia.

I have a far-reaching connection with the town. My electorate is to the south of it. I used to live in Orroroo to the east of it, but my grandparents are buried in Pirie. I visited it just four months ago, actually, to go to my grandparents' gravesite. As a previous resident of Orroroo, I went there many times and I felt enriched by the quality of the people who live there. I think small towns, no matter where they are—and I class Pirie as a town still, even though it has about 14,000 or 15,000 people—have a strength of character to work their way through issues.

I think in the four times that I have had the privilege of going through Nyrstar and being shown the scope of works, meeting some of the contractors and employees who work there, seeing some of the old technology that exists and the need for investment to occur in new technology to provide the health requirements and the economic advantage to keep the business in a strong financial situation, it has been obvious to me that these are people who collectively just want to move forward.

There have been some challenging times. Some brave decisions have had to be made, no doubt. It has demanded good people to stand up and be strong in their opinion and to express that to others and to bring, in some cases, the industry that owns it, and the community, forward with them to recognise that they have to work through it. I know a long time ago I heard about the tenby10 project, I believe it was called. I know there has been a continued level of negative press attached to some health issues around the town, and we all want to see an improvement in that area. We all want to make sure that there is no risk to our young people in the community.

Bringing forward this motion about the impact that this industry has had upon the growth of what was a small place and a strategically located place, and what has occurred there over 125 years, is a good one for the member for Frome. On behalf of the opposition—and other members will speak in support of it—we commend him on that.

I understand and respect the commitment that he as a local has, having previously been an employee there himself and having relationships with so many people who are associated with it. It is something that is dear to his heart and like us, and presumably all members in this chamber, he wants to make sure that the industry is strong and flourishing, but importantly that the community which supports it, drives it and creates an opportunity for it is strong and flourishing and that Port Pirie continues to be a great place and one of the outstanding communities in South Australia.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): 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) (11:53): Thank you very much, Mr Acting Speaker.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: The father of the smelter.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I am not the father of the smelter; that credit belongs to the member for Frome. In this parliament we are meant to remove our identities. We are meant to address each other by our electorates or positions. The very strong fundamental principle behind that Westminster system is that when we come into this place we leave our individualism at the door and we speak for our communities.

The member for West Torrens, the member for Dunstan, the member for Chaffey, the member for Frome, the member for Colton; in this place we are not here as individuals, we are here as representatives of the communities we represent. In the to and fro of political debate and ideology, in striving to form government for our particular sides, sometimes—not always but sometimes—we forget the role that our founding fathers established for us in this parliament.

I think it is fair to say that the transformation of the Port Pirie smelter is a great example of a member of parliament who left his individual needs, his individual wants, at the door and walked into this place as the member for Frome to do the right thing by the people of the city of Port Pirie. I have to say that in my 17 years in this parliament I have never seen a member of parliament who is as

selfless and dedicated and who worked for the benefit of a city that was on its knees. It was on its knees because if the foreign direct investment was not stimulated, it would not have come.

Let's ask ourselves this: imagine today what would have occurred if the Port Pirie smelter upgrade had not occurred? What would we be dealing with now? We would be dealing with a town that had a limited future, a town that was given no time to transform to a new future, legacy issues that would have been beyond their capability, if not our capability, to deal with, you would have seen mass social dislocation, probably family break-ups, and you would have seen banks foreclosing on properties because mortgages would have been unviable due to changing property values and because salaries would not have been paid because those workers would have been out of work.

And then you go to the indirect jobs: the local communities around Port Pirie and those contractors who support the smelter. The confidence of a community, the confidence of the Upper Spencer Gulf, would have been hit very hard indeed. This parliament spoke up in their defence. When the government announced on 30 April that an important milestone had been reached with the South Australian government committing to a financial package to support Nyrstar's upgrade of its Port Pirie smelter, there are two people we need to thank for that: one is the member for Frome and the other is the Premier.

The South Australian government will underwrite \$291.25 million worth of investment in the Port Pirie smelter. Nyrstar will directly contribute \$102.75 million. Nyrstar will forward sell \$120 million of its silver to deliver the upgrade of the smelter and the remaining will be raised from external financiers supported by a guarantee.

Without wanting to anger the house, I read with interest the remarks of the member for Grey, Mr Rowan Ramsey. I have no doubt Mr Ramsey is passionate about his local community; I am sure he is. I am sure many of you know him better than I, but he said something publicly which I think was not accurate. He said that the commonwealth government would have given the EFIC guarantee regardless of what we had done.

I met with Andrew Robb three times—I think it was three times. The Premier met with him in China and in Canberra and, indeed, with the Prime Minister, and in all my discussions with minister Robb he made it very clear to me that that would not be the case. So the idea that Mr Rowan Ramsay can rewrite history is unfair. It is unfair to the people of Port Pirie and it is unfair to minister Robb, because minister Robb, to be fair to him, is one of the straight shooters in the Coalition. He is one of the smartest and most dangerous men in the Coalition. He was a former federal director of the Liberal Party. He is someone who knows how to win election campaigns and who has a very good political brain.

He was honest with me from the very beginning. At our first meeting he said, 'This is near impossible.' He was very clear about the hurdles he faced. He rang me and said to me that the commonwealth government would not be proceeding with an EFIC guarantee, would not be underwriting any investment, and that we were on our own. So I am not sure where Mr Rowan Ramsey gets his information from.

I am going to speculate for a moment. Let's say the member for Frome was unsuccessful at the election and let's just say the government still formed a majority. What would have happened to the people of Port Pirie? Would they have had the bargaining chip that they had to guarantee this reinvestment? Would they have had a Premier who was interested in the reinvestment? I think credit for this will go down in history to the honourable member for Frome.

Port Pirie has a proud history. It was one of the places that Greek settlers first arrived, and the site of the first Greek Orthodox church—they forget that sometimes—of St George, my patron saint, was erected in Port Pirie by the first wave of Greek migration. It is a melting pot of our country. The first flushes of multiculturalism were born in Port Pirie. They had a lot in common with the people they encountered in Port Pirie. They were both hardworking, they were both off the land, they were working at the smelter, they were market gardeners and farmers, and they wanted to build a better life. The community at Port Pirie gave that to them.

It is always amazing as a minister when you move around the country meeting and talking to people who are doing amazing things how they trace back their roots to either South Australia or Port Pirie. There are a number of those people throughout South Australia who trace their heritage

back to Port Pirie. It is a proud city. It is a city that does not have its hand out, it is a city that wants a hand up, and that is the difference.

I have to say I am exceptionally proud of the work that community has done to stand up for itself. It is often defamed unfairly by people. It is good that the member for Frome stands up and defends them when they are attacked. It is good that this house is recognising the settlement of Port Pirie, its establishment and achievements.

It is true that our regional towns sustained us during World War II. Broken Hill and Port Pirie played a vital role in making sure that the Allies were victorious in World War II and that this country was able to defend itself at its time of most need.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, a lot of that lead can still be found in Germany now, I imagine. It was put to exceptionally good use. It was our industrial might and our resources industry that were able to pay for the war and sustain us during that war. Port Pirie has a very proud heritage.

I also want to say that before the last election I flew to Zurich to meet with Nyrstar to discuss their ever-increasing lead emission levels and what the company was planning on doing about their investment. Through the entire stages of that first meeting, through the transformation process and through the Olympic Dam Taskforce taking this in, we had a constant ally with us—the member for Frome. For that, on behalf of the government, I thank the member for Frome for his actions, dedication, hard work and passion for his community. Just quietly, I think it is probably why they returned him. He humbly shrugs his shoulders because he is a humble man, but I think it is fair to say that the campaign that was run against him was intense—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I have never called him a saint. He is not a saint. He knows how to negotiate. He does very well for his local community. He does lots for his local community and he delivers for them. I am sure that they will reward him again. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:03): I too rise to support the motion wholeheartedly and I know that my colleagues in opposition do as well. The member for Frome has clearly put forward some very useful background information supporting the motion, which I will not go over, but I would like to say that we have a very strong bond in the Upper Spencer Gulf. I know that very well as the member for Stuart, and it is that often stereotypical family affair where there is healthy competition between our cities—Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Whyalla—but when it comes to dealing with the rest of the world we stick together. The Upper Spencer Gulf Common Purpose Group is a very positive, strong example of that. It is actually a great pleasure, as the member who represents Port Augusta, to strongly support the member for Frome, who represents Port Pirie, on this. I am sure that the member for Giles would feel exactly the same way with regard to his representation of Whyalla.

There is a lot in common between those cities. We are highly reliant upon primary industries and simultaneously upon heavy industry, and that is a fairly unique situation. As time goes by and as times improve, and as environmental responsibilities grow, as they should, that interaction between primary industries, a fragile environment (as we have in the Upper Spencer Gulf) and heavy industry becomes more difficult and more important to work through. Our three cities are extremely aware of that. In Port Pirie there is the smelter, in Whyalla there is the steelworks, and in Port Augusta there is the power station. Of course, there is much more to those cities than just those things, but they are the three iconic heavy industries in each of those cities. We all understand that very well.

The smelter has been operating for 125 years, under various different managements, and consistently contributing to Port Pirie. It is a significant milestone that is very worthy of support. As the member for Frome said, the smelter has supported intergenerational employment, and that is critical. Let's be plain: it is not because people love working in a lead smelter, or they love working in a power station, or they love working in steelworks. It is because, at the end of the day, we are all people with families, mortgages and kids. We need to buy books and shoes for our kids and look after our older people—all the normal things that all of us want to do.

These significant employers in our cities have provided the incomes to the homes that have allowed our communities to sustain themselves and to thrive. That is why it is so important. Our citizens know that, and our employers—these companies—know that as well, and they take their important responsibilities very seriously. Whether it is Nyrstar, Arrium, or Alinta, they do the very best that they can to contribute to our communities and they need to be acknowledged for that.

I support this motion wholeheartedly. I think it is outstanding that the lead smelter has operated for 125 years. There are still improvements to be made. Obviously, the very significant improvement at the moment is the upgrade that is going on which is, among other things, about reducing emissions. Everybody knows that lead emissions need to be continually reduced. When this upgrade is completed, a significant step forward will have been taken and it will be time to start thinking about how to do even better and how to reduce emissions even further for the health of the community and of the environment. That is absolutely critical.

Just very briefly on the comments the Treasurer made, I will not share with the house the knowledge that I have of the many negotiations that were going on shortly after the last state election, but suffice to say that I have information which contradicts what the Treasurer just said. I firmly believe—I know—that Nyrstar, Port Pirie and the lead smelter would have got the support required for the very important upgrade that is about to take place. It would have happened whether the Liberal Party or the Labor Party had formed government. It would have happened whether or not the member for Frome was re-elected.

It would have happened regardless because whoever was in government and whomever was the member for Frome would have known how incredibly important this project and this company are. As it happens, the current member for Frome was re-elected and he did his job exceptionally well, and as it happens, the Labor Party was re-elected, and they did what they should have done. This house should be under no illusion: if it had been a Liberal state government we would have had exactly the same outcome for the people of Port Pirie. It is very important to put that on the record.

I wholeheartedly commend the motion. I admit to not having known all the facts that the member for Frome was able to share with this house with regard to the history of the smelter, particularly in terms of its contribution to the war, and I think that is outstanding information for the house to have. It shows that not only the owners and managers but also the employees, union and community more broadly, who were all involved with the Port Pirie smelter at that time, understood what a terribly important time our nation was going through. They all made sacrifices so that the smelter could produce the lead to provide for the manufacture of the munitions that were required for our nation. That is clearly a shining example out of the last 125 years but, for me, the most important outcome of the last 125 years is the families of Port Pirie, who thrive directly and indirectly because of the fact that the lead smelter is there and is successful, and it will now be successful for decades to come.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (12:11): I do not know that I can contribute a lot more than what the member for Frome and others have already contributed, but this is certainly a good opportunity to recognise the contribution of the smelter over a very long period of time. More important is the fact that having a refining capacity at Port Pirie allowed the ore body that eventually became the backbone of one of the biggest companies in Australia, BHP, to thrive and survive and do everything it needed to do over an exceedingly long period of time. It was part of the process of building that company, BHP, which has gone on to make a large contribution to the wealth and development of Australia. That should not be forgotten; it is a very important point to make.

It is also important to note that the decision to make an investment to upgrade the smelter was basically an on/off switch for Port Pirie. If the smelter disappeared Port Pirie would, essentially, cease to exist in the form it currently does. With the continuing operations of the smelter, with investment, Port Pirie will continue, and that is a good thing.

South Australia is heavily Adelaide-centric, the metropolitan area, and that is not necessarily a good thing. I believe strong regional cities are good for the state; they make their own contribution. Having a really heavy domination by a capital city or metropolis might be the way it is, but it is not necessarily ideal. Having strong regional cities is definitely of benefit to this state, so this continued investment has contributed to that, along with all the jobs and everything else, which is a good thing.

It was certainly due, after 125 years of essentially unchanged operations. Obviously there have been upgrades and slight changes but, effectively, the essential process has not changed a lot. When you did a tour of the facility, as members in this house will have, you can see why that upgrade was needed. It was getting a bit Dickensian and was certainly long in the tooth. You can see it was needed, so I am very pleased to see that.

For so many reasons—the improvement in health, the improvement in environmental outcomes, the improvement in the profitability of the company, and in the end profitability is what secures investment and jobs and continued investment in communities—it is good to see. From all reports I have had about it, I think it will be a very profitable investment for Nyrstar, and that is a very good thing. I had a very small part to play in that, and I am very pleased to have played that role.

The final point I would like to make is to observe the importance of metal refining, or the refining of ores and value adding to ores beyond the mere shipping out of ore concentrates, because I do not believe, in the long-term, that the mere shipping of concentrates is the best way to develop the resource bodies we have in this state.

Actually, South Australia is quite fortunate in that we do have at least a couple of metal refining operations. We have Port Pirie, of course, doing the lead, zinc and other metals, we have the copper smelter up at Olympic Dam—and of course there is the steelworks at Whyalla, sorry. The member for Giles was just about to correct me there. I could feel the glare from my right, and fair enough too.

So, there are three and, in many ways, that is unusual. The proportion of mines in South Australia that are linked to smelters or linked to that refining and the value add is a good thing. It is something that we should be looking to see more of. That will require the application of technology, as we are seeing at Port Pirie with the upgrade of the smelter technology. That will make it profitable. You can see that the value of applying technology to smelting can make refining and smelting in Australia profitable and, if it is, we should do it, is my view on that.

I think that, in many ways, having made the decision to invest, Nyrstar are actually pointing to the possibilities for the future of our state and the country in refining and smelting metals and making the most out of those ore bodies that we have. Notwithstanding the fact that we are blessed with some very big and very longstanding ore bodies that will last for a long time, smelting and refining will allow us to make the most of them. I commend the motion to the house. I congratulate the member for Frome for his work over a very long period of time in support of the smelter and for bringing this motion to the house.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (12:16): Along with my colleagues and members on the other side of the house, I also support the member for Frome in bringing this motion to the house. I support the motion and add my congratulations to Nyrstar and the workforce at the operation in Port Pirie for achieving 125 years of incredibly important manufacturing in that centre.

As a number of speakers have been saying, it is incredibly important to have the ongoing operation of this smelter in Port Pirie, for a whole range of reasons, and I will come back to that in a moment. The member for Newland, I think, just said a moment ago that the reality is that South Australia is very Adelaide-centric, and that is the case. There are some major manufacturing operations in regional areas of South Australia, and the Port Pirie smelter is one of those. Obviously, the steel operations at Whyalla is another, and the paper manufacturing and timber milling and manufacturing businesses down in my part of the world are others.

One of the things that came to my attention a few years ago, which threatened all of those manufacturing operations, was the imposition of a carbon tax in this country. As the shadow minister for energy at the time, it became quite evident to me that, along with a couple of other major manufacturers—another one being Adelaide Brighton Cement—there was a very serious threat posed to those businesses by the imposition of a carbon tax in this country.

Much of the debate at the time of developing that tax was around how we might secure the ongoing operations of those specific manufacturers, in spite of the imposition of a carbon tax. I am delighted to be able to stand here in this place today and say that that threat no longer overhangs those manufacturing operations in South Australia or indeed in many other parts of this nation.

The reality is that the world is hungry for the products that come out of a place like the smelter at Port Pirie. The other reality is, no matter where those products are refined, they are going to produce carbon emissions. The other reality that we should recognise here in this parliament is that the carbon emissions produced per unit of electricity, which is one of the other big inputs into that operation, are probably lower in South Australia than they are in most other places, and that is largely because a fair proportion of our electricity is generated by using natural gas rather than coal, which is probably the preferred fuel in most other places in the world. So, we are in a beneficial place and I think it is important, for a whole range of reasons, that we keep this manufacturing operation in Port Pirie and in South Australia.

I totally agree with the comments made by the member for Stuart that, irrespective of the outcome of the most recent election, this operation would have been supported and, indeed, would be continuing and the outcome that has been achieved would have been the outcome achieved irrespective of who formed government and irrespective of who was the local member. I cannot imagine that any person would have been representing the seat of Frome without fighting absolutely tooth and nail to get the outcome that has been achieved.

Notwithstanding that, I congratulate the current member for Frome for the good work that he did. He did as his community would have expected him to do and he achieved the outcome that he sought to achieve, and that is good. I am sure the member will be able to feel happy about that for the rest of his days. If he does nothing else in his time in this place that achievement alone will stand him in good stead.

I want to comment about something that still disturbs me that has not occurred with regard to the city of Port Pirie, and indeed the smelter. There was a proposal a few years ago to undertake a water recycling project to enable the watering of some of the parks and gardens and other areas around the city of Port Pirie. As the shadow minister for water at the time, I was a strong advocate for that particular project. I think my memory serves me correctly in saying that we went to the 2010 election being obliged to fulfil that project and to put money towards that project. It was a project that was conceived as being funded by all three levels of government: federal government, state government and local government.

The local council in Port Pirie was certainly very forthright in its endeavours to bring that project to fruition. The opposition in South Australia, as I say, was committed to it and I think the federal government was at least warming to the idea. I think if the Liberal Party had formed government after the 2010 election that project would have been fulfilled. It is another important project for the city of Port Pirie. To the best of my knowledge, and I have not been a shadow minister for a while, that project is still languishing and it is one which I think had significant merit.

The member for Stuart and the member for Frome have talked about the community of Port Pirie. It is incredibly important that the community of Port Pirie is safeguarded, and that is what that project was about. It was about safeguarding the people who live in that community. It is one of the things that has fascinated me, that the Labor government in South Australia has failed to, I believe, meet its fundamental obligation to the people of that city and has failed to ensure that that particular project was funded and that the safety of the community in Pirie was enhanced. With those few comments, I also commend the motion to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:23): I am very happy to endorse this particular motion of the member for Frome. As the member for Stuart said, the community is in what is now referred to as the Upper Spencer Gulf, once upon a time the Iron Triangle. I am going to say it. We are talking about history here. I am going to mention the term 'Iron Triangle', but I am a very happy long-term convert to the term 'the Upper Spencer Gulf'. I think it is a term that we all live with and we all welcome.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: Yes, it is a long time ago. None of us up in our neck of the woods now refer to it as the Iron Triangle. You can pick an outsider when they call it the Iron Triangle. None of us do. As the member for Stuart said, we are like a family in the Upper Spencer Gulf, and maybe it is a family without any parents: we are siblings. We are definitely siblings, and like siblings we have had

our fights and our coming-togethers, and this has extended over a very long period of time. The sort of natural competition that siblings engage in was almost there from the start.

Whyalla is the youngest of the siblings. It has probably had some industrial steroids to grow beyond the others in terms of size, but both Port Pirie and Port Augusta were established before Whyalla got its guernsey and got its start. When you look at those very early days, before it was Whyalla, when it was Hummock Hill, Port Pirie was an essential part of that original community. While people were living in tents and what have you, across the gulf was a thriving town based on value-adding—

The Hon. G.G. Brock: It still is a thriving town.

Mr HUGHES: It still is a thriving town—based on value-adding to that enormous El Dorado up in Broken Hill. It is a pity that the border could not have been shoved a little further to the east, because Broken Hill really should be in South Australia. People in New South Wales might have something to say about that, but I think there is definitely a natural fit.

That link between Port Pirie and Whyalla goes back to those very early days. In fact, the iron ore from Iron Knob, which was the birthplace of the Australian iron and steel industry, was originally used as a flux at the smelters over in Port Pirie. That is where it went: just across the gulf, across those 22 kilometres—

The Hon. G.G. Brock interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: I thought it was actually shipped across. I think it was shipped across, because there was no rail line at the time linking Whyalla. It was shipped across, and in the other direction came the water. Port Pirie actually provided the water for Whyalla in those early years, and it was barged across until a small desalination plant was put in near what is now the power plant. The linkages go back a long way and the synergies between these communities go back a long way as well.

I might be a bit of a sad creature; I read some of the *Hansard* back from the 1930s to get a bit of a feel for the history of the place. I did this many years ago, and it was interesting how Port Pirie was advocating very strongly that the iron works, as it would have been, that was developed in the war years with the blast furnaces, should happen there. In fact, when the iron ore was being initially shipped out of Whyalla just before that, Port Augusta was arguing strongly that the iron ore from the Middleback Ranges actually go up to Port Augusta to be exported from that point. So that rivalry was there from the very early days.

People from Port Pirie, from the smelters—the workers and the families—used to come to Whyalla to holiday at the Point Lowly Peninsula, where you would find two of the most beautiful beaches in the whole of the Upper Spencer Gulf. One is Weeroona Bay and the one I just referred to is Point Lowly beach. The smelters actually built an incredibly impressive stone building to accommodate the workers and their families at Weeroona Bay, I think it was, and one of the reasons people used to come over, even back then (we are talking about in the 1930s and late 1920s), was partly because of that issue to do with lead contamination. It was essentially to give people a bit of a break from that in what is a very beautiful setting at the Point Lowly Peninsula.

It has had a long history, including that history of support for the war effort during the Second World War as an essential part of the building block of that whole effort that Australia undertook during those very difficult times. While Pirie was making its contribution, across the gulf in Whyalla there was a shell factory that produced shells for the Second World War. It was the start of shipbuilding in Australia, and it eventually became the largest shipyard in the country until its closure in 1979.

Both communities made this incredible and needed contribution to what was happening during the Second World War. We share other things as well. It sometimes has a bad reputation, partly generated by media response—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: Yes, but, also, I think it is a bit deeper than that. I have always been very up-front in my community. Some people, to their detriment in Port Pirie, used to be up-front as well.

When it comes to issues with pollution, whether it be lead pollution or, in my community, fine particulate (essentially, iron oxide), and the emissions from the power station at Port Augusta, I have always put the proposition to the companies and to my community that you do not want to sweep it under the carpet. You do not want to pretend that it is better than it is.

You have to address these issues because they have an impact—either a potential impact or a real impact—on your communities. Those communities deserve to live in a decent environment, so you need to be up-front about it and you need to work on constructive, practical approaches to address the problems. I think what is going to happen in Port Pirie over the coming years, with the very significant investment and the massive refurbishment of the plant there, is going to be good both in economic terms and also in amenity and health terms.

We also need to address the legacy issues of lead. Sometimes, because they are so dependent upon particular industries, communities do get defensive and you can understand why. I recall John Cornwall, when he was the minister for health many years ago—a quarter of a century, or more—having a stand-up fight with the then mayor of Port Pirie, who worked for the smelter—

The Hon. G.G. Brock: Bill Jones.

Mr HUGHES: Bill Jones—and that was on the front page of *The Advertiser*. In a sense, the minister was right: there is a problem here and we have to address this problem. It has taken a long time, but I share Pirie's experience with that because we went through the battle over the dust fallout, the fine particulate fallout, in Whyalla. A very constructive solution was found that enhanced the economic viability of the Whyalla community and led to a very significant improvement in amenity values and, potentially, some health issues in Whyalla with fine particulate.

That, in a sense, is the process that is now going on in Port Pirie and they will mirror that. I think it is very important. I do not want to get into the argy-bargy of who did what and who can claim the benefit, but I can say this: the member for Frome can put his hand up and say that he went that extra mile for his community to ensure the right thing was done for that community.

The cities of the Upper Spencer Gulf now get on like a house on fire. We have the Common Purpose Group, which has been slimmed down and will be far more effective, and there are enormous opportunities for our part of the world—for Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla. With those few words, I will resume my seat.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:34): I want to speak to the motion:

That this house—

1. Recognises and congratulates the Port Pirie smelter on achieving its 125th anniversary of operation;
2. Recognises the significant contribution that this facility has made—
 - (a) towards the provision of materials for the Allies during World War II;
 - (b) to the economic and financial security of the Port Pirie community and the surrounding regions; and
 - (c) to the benefit of South Australia as a whole.

The Port Pirie smelter has certainly been an icon in the Mid to Far North. It has around 750 employees and it smelts a variety of products, including precious metals, a copper plant and a zinc plant, obviously lead, copper cathode, gold and sulfuric acid. It does have an impact across the state and over the border, obviously, into Broken Hill. I know one of my local trucking companies from Coomandook has carted much material from Broken Hill down to Port Pirie. I also want to acknowledge that most of the ore that came out of the Terramin mine at Strathalbyn went to Port Pirie to be smelted, so having this type of facility within reach of getting these products refined for export has far-reaching implications.

I have been up there a couple of times to look around, and I have been through the facility. As the latest owners, Nyrstar have been very good in giving us briefings, especially in regard to the upgrade that is being commissioned. They have been great guides, and it is good to see what they are doing with the lead and those big silver ingots that come out of there. Over the 125 years, the smelter has been a real boon for the Port Pirie region and for the greater part of South Australia. Not

only are jobs there affected but so are jobs right throughout the state in the mining field and over the border, in the Broken Hill region.

I declare a very small interest in that my wife, when she was an environmental scientist working for Kinhill when Pasmenco owned the smelter, did a bit of environmental work—

Members interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, she always makes sure I am very careful with the environment.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: A small footprint.

Mr PEDERICK: That's exactly right, member for Stuart, I do have a small footprint on the earth—very gentle. Obviously lead, and the smelting of lead, is something that does have to be managed extremely well because, as we know in this place, it is the children—the very young children especially—who are the ones who are first affected if operations are not completed appropriately. We know there have been some issues around the smelter where they have struggled to get the limit of the micrograms per—

The Hon. G.G. Brock: Decilitre.

Mr PEDERICK: —decilitre—thank you, member for Frome—down below 10. When the Strathalbyn lead mine was being proposed and debated, environmental work had to be done in that area. Obviously, if there is a lead mine, there is a high background level of lead, so there had to be work done in regard to the background level of lead in the region and a lot of work done in regard to environmental monitoring to make sure things were managed. I know how it is managed at the smelter as well, where people change their clothes there and do not take home the clothes that are covered in lead because that has caused problems in the past, with the lead affecting children of smelter workers, and that is why they used the same practice at the Terramin mine at Strathalbyn.

I certainly do commend this motion, and it would have happened whichever government was in power; we certainly would have delivered on this. I will not see it, but I hope the smelter celebrates its 250th anniversary one day.

The Hon. G.G. Brock: We won't be here.

Mr PEDERICK: We won't be here. That's right, member for Frome, but it certainly is a real economic generator for the region and for the state, and I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (12:39): I will not hold up the house for very long. I feel compelled to stand up and support the motion brought to the house by the member for Frome, and I congratulate him on doing so. My relationship with Port Pirie goes back a fair way. Just to recount the story, when I was the secretary of the firefighters union, a former government (you can guess of which persuasion) looked at reducing the number of firefighters employed on a full-time basis in Port Pirie. As the secretary of the union, I then worked very closely with Mark Malcolm. You would remember Mark Malcolm; I think the organisation he worked for at that stage was the Port Pirie Economic Development Board.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, the Port Pirie Economic Development Board. He is an outstanding individual and a great contributor to Port Pirie. His role and the board's role was about generating economic income for Port Pirie through diversification. What he undertook was a study of the value of the smelter to Port Pirie. It would not surprise anyone in the house, of course, that the smelter's economic value to the town was quite amazing, but just as important was the economic value it contributed to the state. As I understood it, and it would not surprise too many people, it was the single highest economic generator for South Australia at that point in time with respect to its exports and the fact that it employed the majority of the town, and those it did not employ were still dependent upon the role and the function of the smelter. I am pleased to say that that was a good project.

As I understood it, the firefighting services up there were to be reviewed because we had 50 full-time personnel in Port Pirie and just over the water, in Whyalla, we had retained staff. So, it was about making sure that we continued to have a presence in Port Pirie, but at the same time, over years, increase the level of personnel in our other regional towns across South Australia.

Mark Malcolm and his mob did a terrific job there, and I learnt a lot about Port Pirie. Who would have thought that many years later, as the minister for the environment and minister for regional development, my involvement would be based on lead emissions in Port Pirie? It was a difficult process but the commitment was there, the commitment by the smelters, by the government and by the people of Port Pirie to reduce the level of lead emissions and the impact that had, and has, on the people of Port Pirie.

What I am extremely pleased about is the commitment that is now being made—in no short measure due to the effort of the member for Frome and others—to revamp the whole smelter up there. It has and will provide Port Pirie with a future well beyond what pure lead smelting and zinc smelting would have provided. It will also, in its own way, clean up the air. It will address the emissions. As my friend the member for Giles mentioned earlier, there is still a commitment there that needs to be made—well, a commitment has been made—to address the legacy issues that exist with respect to that emission of lead over an extended period of time.

I congratulate the member for Frome on bringing this motion to the house. By the comments that have been made by all speakers here, I think we all recognise the importance of Port Pirie to the South Australian economy. I am extremely pleased that that contribution will continue in a varied form in the future. I also want to congratulate those people who have contributed to the sustainability, if you like, of Port Pirie over a long period of time.

I have a lot of friends from Port Pirie. My very good friend who now lives at Port Hughes went to Solomontown Primary School. He used to refer to it as the Solomontown institute of knowledge. I am also pleased to tell the house that one of the few venues from which I have ever been suspended from service was the Solomontown Football Club, but I will tell you about that another time. I will let you wonder what that might have been about.

Mr Gardner: Are you sure you don't want privilege?

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, I don't need it. It was one of the few places where service to me was suspended, and I wear that as somewhat of a badge of honour. You can make up your own mind on what that was about; I am not going to tell you.

The Hon. G.G. Brock interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I can tell you after. I love Port Pirie. It has a great history. I congratulate Port Pirie on its 125 years and the contribution it has made to South Australia. Again, I thank the member for Frome and others who have been involved for the outstanding contribution they have made to ensure that Port Pirie will continue to be a shining light in the economy of South Australia.

Personal Explanation

MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (12:44): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr MARSHALL: I wish to apologise for comments which were made in the house yesterday, ostensibly towards the Speaker, during question time. I apologise to the house.

Motions

PORT PIRIE SMELTER

Debate resumed.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (12:45): I thank everybody very much for contributing to what I consider a very important issue of the success of the Port Pirie Smelter and the acknowledgement of the 125th anniversary. I sincerely thank members from both sides of the house for what they have said.

Member for MacKillop, can I also just mention that we do have a water recycling plant there now. It was a partnership between the Port Pirie Regional Council, the Nyrstar smelter and the federal

government. It was a \$6 million or \$7 million project, and 100 megalitres of water are being utilised. With the new plant, going forward we will be able to get new extra water. I wanted to let you know that that is already there due to the council, Nyrstar and also the federal government putting money into that.

Mr Williams: No support from the state government?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: There was some support from the state government also, but the point is that we have a plant there. The other thing is that, as the member for Giles indicated, the Upper Spencer Gulf is a great place to live; we are like a family. The rivalry there has been very vicious sometimes but, at the end of the day, what we want is to provide the best opportunity. Whether it is Port Augusta, Port Pirie or Whyalla, the Upper Spencer Gulf is working together—it is a common purpose group—to get the best opportunities.

The other thing is that I was not aware of the involvement of Whyalla in World War II, but certainly there was an Air Force training ground in Port Pirie, where 4,000 airmen trained during the Second World War. So, again, that is another thing that Port Pirie was involved in.

In thanking everybody who has contributed to the debate, I want to say thanks very much to all the people who assisted me following the last election—from all sides. We have a great outcome for a city that may have been decimated. We have a great outcome for the Upper Spencer Gulf and for our state. I am seeing that there are opportunities out there and, as I said in my speech, I think that, if we all work together, we will be able to get on top of these issues.

We have all been promised so many things, and Port Pirie over the years has been promised many things, over successive governments. We lost the brass factory, the container factory, the mineral sands factory, and we also lost the Coca-Cola factory, the railways and the oil companies and things like that. We lost about 6,000 workers all up, and yet Port Pirie is still vigilant and it is still going, as are other regional towns. They are very vibrant, and they want to continue going forward.

I am looking forward to the greater success of Port Pirie. I am looking forward to future generations—hopefully, I will be around for a while—being able to enjoy the security that this will give to Port Pirie and the surrounding regions, through the success of the new plant in Port Pirie, which will be able to treat minerals or material from all over the world.

I also want to say thank you very much to my family, because during that period of time when Pachinko was down, and leading up to the election, my family was there to support me and to go with me. Also, to the community of the Upper Spencer Gulf, no matter where they are and no matter who they voted for, I say thank you very much. Again, I appreciate the contributions made by all the people in this place, and I thank the parliament for the opportunity.

Motion carried.

EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:49): I move:

That this house urges the state government to urgently address the impending water supply issues on Eyre Peninsula, with specific reference to the final report and recommendations of the Natural Resources Committee's inquiry into the Eyre Peninsula water supply.

I rise today with just 10 minutes of the parliamentary year to go, really, to discuss this motion, and I know there are other members who would like to take the opportunity to make a contribution. This motion has been a while coming. It is really for me as a local member to keep this particular issue on the agenda, on the parliament's agenda, on the government's agenda.

I am very grateful to the Natural Resources Committee, which undertook a water inquiry throughout most of 2012 and into 2013. They certainly did an extraordinary amount of work, and a lot of that work was outstanding. They finished up producing a report which made 12 recommendations. Those recommendations were quite succinct, quite deliberate, and in the end the majority of them were disregarded by the minister.

Mr Williams: What's new?

Mr TRELOAR: Yes; what's new? Nothing surprising there. It highlighted to this parliament—and it has been spoken about many times before; my predecessor, Mrs Liz Penfold, the member for Flinders for 16 years, spent a lot of time talking about it—the water supply on Eyre Peninsula, the scarcity of the resource and also the quality and delivery of that resource. Nothing has changed.

The recommendations include that the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation replace flux-based water allocation planning and management with adaptive management. In other words, it uses carefully chosen triggers based on monitoring. The second recommendation was that the Eyre Peninsula's NRM board, SA Water, and DEWNR continue to fill the gaps in knowledge. Something that became quite clear very on in the inquiry was the lack of understanding about the resources. We are talking about underground lenses which are really quite confined, but there are a number of them. The interaction between those lenses was little understood—how they recharge, what the leakage rates were, whether there was movement between lenses or not. I think those questions are still to be answered.

There was also a time when the Ceduna council were very keen on using a private investor to install a desal plant at Denial Bay, which is slightly west of Ceduna. It is an area that the member for Kavel remembers very fondly from his time in the bank at Ceduna. We were only talking about it just prior to this debate. Of course, for Ceduna, being at the far end of the reticulated water supply on Eyre Peninsula, the delivery of that water is really stretched to the limit, and the quality declines by the time it gets so far west.

The Ceduna council, to their credit, decided to take some initiative and look to supplement their water supply, and maybe even offer water more cheaply than what SA Water can by installing a desal plant. Sadly, SA Water did not even have the courtesy to respond to the council's proposal. That project sits in limbo. It is still, as I understand it, under consideration by the council. It is something that they would still like to progress, but they do not have the capacity to do that at the moment.

The fourth recommendation was that the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation and planning review, the EPA, Planning SA and DEWNR make adjustments to the overlapping jurisdictional responsibilities for water management. I think a big part of the problem is that everybody is very good at blaming everybody else, particularly within government departments. There was a crisis looming during the first decade of the 21st century, because Eyre Peninsula, along with much of eastern Australia, faced low rainfall. It has become known since as the millennium drought. The water level in our basins was falling as a result of a lack of rainfall and also, quite possibly, over pumping by SA Water.

One of the understandings that the board came to was that it was probably a combination of both pumping and a decline in rainfall that led to lower water levels. However, since then, for the most part on Eyre Peninsula we have had six winters in a row of at least average or sometimes better than average rainfalls. We have actually seen an increase in water levels in many of our basins and an improvement in the resource.

That is not to say the urgency has gone out of this, and the reason I say that is due to housing developments, and I will highlight a couple of examples. There is one at Ceduna, known as Ceduna Waters, and one north of Port Lincoln, known as the Point Boston housing development. They are significant developments and quite well supported by investors and people seeking to build a new home and live by the sea. In both of those examples, SA Water either was not able, or not prepared, to provide reticulated water to those expanding housing developments. I think the real risk for Eyre Peninsula is that we will not have the capacity to provide for future growth and development.

There is no doubt that Eyre Peninsula is one of the bright spots in this state as far as economic potential goes. I know that the Premier and cabinet were over there last week and saw the opportunity that is about to come upon us, and I think these basic service utilities need to be in a position where they can cope with that. The Premier has begun to talk about productive infrastructure, and I think there is no greater enabler than water, and the ability of this state to provide water to those who need it and require it, not just for their households but also for their businesses, is critical.

The Tod Reservoir also came up in discussions, and there was a recommendation that DEWNR, the Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board and SA Water, along with the

Lower Eyre Peninsula council, investigate a potential for recommissioning the Tod Reservoir, a much-loved asset on Eyre Peninsula. Of course, it was the initial source of a reticulated supply, but it has been taken off line, mainly as a result of an increase in salinity and some agricultural residues.

I am not sure in my own mind what its future is. The water body is a product of its catchment; it is a product of the landscape around it. Given that it is predominantly an agricultural landscape now, there will always be ongoing problems with salinity and agricultural residues, particularly nitrates. That is not to say that managing this resource so that it can once again become a contributor to the water supply on Eyre Peninsula is beyond the realms of possibility.

It was also recommended that we investigate the key Lower Eyre Peninsula catchments, including Little Swamp and Big Swamp. They are a couple of catchments just outside Port Lincoln, and those areas of higher rainfall and steeper topography, feed into the catchments and, ultimately, result in a contribution to the underground lenses. It was suggested that DMITRE and DEWNR consider locating some of the field operations and water licence management staff on Eyre Peninsula. Of course, centralisation of resources is an issue that all government departments are faced with and, ultimately, it is the country areas that suffer. There is nothing like having people on the ground, I would suggest.

The recommendations go on—really practical recommendations—such as the installation of rain gauges and that active and ongoing monitoring is done on a quarterly basis to ensure allocations are not exceeded. Interestingly, recommendation No. 10 talked about the potential impact of mining and change of land use on the water resource. Obviously, if industry develops—and it may be mining, or it might be increased population, or something different again—the demand on the water resource will be much greater.

The 11th recommendation was that the NRM board and DEWNR consider their proposal to define April 1993 as the full-basin level. Obviously, that was not the full-basin level because extraction had already been occurring for some 50 years by that stage, so levels were down. I understand the need to draw a line in the sand, but there are many within the community who are not particularly happy with this recommendation.

Finally, recommendation 12 is that SA Water decommission its pumps at the Polda Trench. The Polda Basin is adjacent Elliston—in between Elliston and Loch—and a confined and much smaller aquifer than the southern basins. Historically, it has been used to access stock and domestic water for those landowners who sit above the Polda Basin, but since the mid-1960s it was utilised by SA Water to provide water into the reticulated system on Eyre Peninsula. This basin has now declined to such a point where we are no longer able to access water. In fact, some of the landowners have seen their wells go dry. Once again, in the last couple of years we have just seen those water levels come up a bit, so to me, at least, there is an indication that basins can recover given time, and that is what we need to do with Polda. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Condolence

SOUTHCOTT, HEATHER

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:00): With the leave of the house, I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of Mrs Heather Joyce Southcott, former member of this house, and places on record its appreciation of her meritorious service, and that, as a mark of respect to her memory, the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

The sad recent passing of Heather Joyce Southcott, Member of the Order of Australia, following a long illness, gives us pause to reflect on Heather's immense contribution to justice and equality in this state. A champion for women's rights through the last quarter of the last century, Heather served only briefly in this place but contributed so much in her efforts outside of parliament.

From their foundation in 1977, Heather was a prominent member of the Australian Democrats, holding the office of South Australian state secretary from 1977 to 1982. In 1982 she

won the by-election for the seat of Mitcham and was elected by members to the position of state leader and then national leader of the Australian Democrats. Though the honour is often attributed to her South Australian Democrats colleague, Janine Haines, Heather was the first woman to lead a parliamentary political party in Australia. Her friends at the Women's Electoral Lobby have told us that she was never concerned, though, at that erroneous attribution.

A pharmacological graduate of the University of Adelaide and a pharmaceutical chemist by profession, Heather left her mark on our society with her tireless work for groups which included:

- The United Nations Association of Australia
- Amnesty
- Adelaide UN Women's Australia Breakfast Committee
- The Morialta Trust Inc.
- National Council of Women
- The Women's Electoral Lobby
- The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
- The National Council of Women of South Australia
- National Council of Women War Memorial Fund Members
- PGC/Seymour for her dedication and commitment to the College Council of Governors and the Old Collegians' Association
- Older Women's Advisory Committee
- Graduate Women Australia

She served most of these groups for over 20 years. She was honoured by UNESCO for her services to the community and, in particular, as chairperson of the United Nations Association of Australia.

The breadth of her service is remarkable and, through it, you can see a common theme of fighting for justice, equality and promoting the rights of and opportunities for women. She will long be remembered as a strong advocate for social justice and children's rights.

Heather's leadership stands as an example to all, and I am sure that her legacy will live on in future generations, particularly the inspiration that her story can provide to young women. On behalf of all members and the state I would like to convey our deepest condolences to her daughters, Jane and Anne Marie, and the family at this time of great sadness.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): I second the motion moved by the Premier. On 21 November this year, sadly, South Australia lost one of its great female pioneers, Heather Joyce Southcott AM. On behalf of the state Liberal Party I extend our deepest sympathy to the family of the late Mrs Southcott, especially her daughters, Jane and Anne Marie.

Mrs Southcott was born in Adelaide in 1928 and for the next 86 years she lived a life embedded in community service and women's affairs. Mrs Southcott devoted much of her time to political activism and became an inspirational leader in her quest to bring about justice and equality. She was a founding member of the Australian Democrats and in 1982 Mrs Southcott became the first woman to lead a political party in Australia. In the same year, on 8 May, she was elected into the South Australian parliament as the member for Mitcham. She won the seat in a by-election following the resignation of fellow Australian Democrat Robin Millhouse.

Heather Southcott wasted no time in campaigning for changes to parliamentary procedures and processes and wanted a greater level of scrutiny. She expressed concerns that politicians were wasting too much time worrying about minor matters rather than putting all their energies into dealing with the important issues facing South Australia. Shortly after being elected, she was quoted in the local paper as saying, 'I am not naive enough to believe I can achieve anything on my own but I believe someone has to try, and it is up to others to decide whether they are prepared to work for changes, too.'

Despite losing her seat six months later in the state general election, Mrs Southcott continued to have a strong voice in the political arena and within the broader community. She served as the national president of the Australian Democrats for nine terms and was a valuable mentor for young, aspiring politicians, including former Australian Democrats senator and parliamentary party leader, Natasha Stott Despoja.

Mrs Southcott did not hesitate in sharing her knowledge and expertise with those who held similar values, principles and beliefs. She also did not hesitate in volunteering her time and energy to organisations close to her heart. She was an honorary life member of the National Council of Women in South Australia. She founded the women's pharmacists group while she was studying at the Adelaide University. Mrs Southcott led the South Australian division of the United Nations Association of Australia for 27 years. She was one of the founding members of the Adelaide United Nations Women's Day breakfast committee. Mrs Southcott was a dedicated and hardworking member of the National Council of Women War Memorial Fund, filling the positions of vice president, secretary and committee member.

Heather Southcott leaves behind a legacy enshrined in leadership, integrity and outstanding community service. She has been described by those closest to her as a woman of superior intellect and unflinching principles. She will be remembered for having strength and courage and for being a voice for women, a voice for justice and a voice for human rights.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:07): It is with great sadness I speak to this condolence motion because I feel that Heather Southcott has always been, if not in the foreground, in the background of any of the political activism that I have been involved in over many decades.

I first met her and got to know her when I was at the Working Women's Centre. The Working Women's Centre in those days was in Gilbert Place in a building that had Alcoholics Anonymous, Arthur Murray Dance Studio, Al-Anon and a number of other organisations, and the Women's Electoral Lobby met there as well. Quite often, Heather would be across from the Women's Electoral Lobby with the infamous Betty Fisher, who had her Raven Publishing business there as well. Interestingly, up the hall was a 'working woman' in the old-fashioned sense of the term, who we found out about a bit later.

One of the reasons I raise this issue was that Heather, along with Betty, was very keen for the Working Women's Centre to work with women in the sex industry to try to make sure that those women—women and men, but women in particular—had the same rights and responsibilities as other workers. I am sad to say that campaign continues, but Heather was certainly one of the people who understood the need for those changes.

She was also a campaigner for equal pay. Sadly, we have not achieved that yet but, certainly, she was one of the early people campaigning in the equal pay area. Also, in relation to some of the amendments that we managed to get up with regard to equal opportunity legislation, Heather, through the different organisations that she represented, along with a lot of other women's organisations, campaigned particularly with the trade union women for those changes to actually happen.

Heather was a close friend of my late mother. Heather replaced me on the board of an organisation called the Consumer Advocacy Program of South Australia, which was an advocacy program in the early eighties for people with disabilities and their carers, families and advocates. I had to resign from the Consumer Advocacy Program because it seemed to me that, when we were advertising for a new director, my mother was the perfect choice, so not only did I have to step down from the board, in my view, but I also stepped down from the selection panel.

Heather Southcott replaced me on both the board and the selection panel and I think made a very good choice of a director. They had known each other from Women's Electoral Lobby days, but this began a lifelong friendship on issues to do with advocating for people with different abilities and disabilities. Heather served with distinction for many years on what was then called Disability Action South Australia and, sadly, was part of the demise of Disability Action when it was defunded by the federal government.

She and my mother also served on the Older Women Advisory Committee which was set up in the early eighties. Women on that committee, some of whom are still around and still advocating, were trying to make sure that we had a focus on issues for older women in the community, not just on those for younger women. I think they did a fabulous job over those years, particularly adding a multicultural aspect to that advocacy, which certainly was on the agenda in the early eighties. They wanted to make sure that any of the multicultural campaigns included women, particularly older women.

We have heard from both the Premier and the leader with regard to her distinguished record with the Australian Democrats, and I was really interested to hear of her work with the Centenary of Women's Suffrage in South Australia in 1994. I remember her working very closely with the Hons Diana Laidlaw, Anne Levy, Carolyn Pickles and Sandra Kanck to make sure that we actually did have a celebration and also a commemoration.

One of the reasons these tapestries still hang in the House of Assembly is because of the work they did with a lot of other women to make sure that there was this commemoration. I know that we in this house now see them as a permanent feature, but there were arguments in days gone by that maybe they should go somewhere else. I do not want to start that argument again, but I think we all agree that they are a permanent fixture in this chamber. When there were different arguments about that, I know that Heather did a lot of advocacy in this place behind the scenes to try to make sure that was the case.

She was also involved with former senator Rosemary Crowley, as has been mentioned, particularly in making sure that we do have the UNIFEM Breakfast, and that has been a tradition that has been carried on for quite some time. Being an early riser, Heather was very pleased that the breakfast started at, in my view, the indecent time that it does, but she was very keen, as I know Rosemary Crowley was, that we have the maximum number of people at those breakfasts. These days a lot of school classes actually come to the breakfast, as do the usual people who would go to that breakfast. So, the group has widened, and I really commend Heather and Rosemary in particular for that innovation.

The National Council of Women was mentioned. Heather has always been a stalwart in that peak organisation. It is seen as the peak women's organisation in South Australia, and I think it is really important that, amongst the fantastic women who are on there and who have served on there, we have the contribution Heather made.

Heather was also involved in the United Nations Association of Australia (SA Division). I must say that in the very early days of getting involved with women's issues and women's affairs I thought that the UN association was little distant from Adelaide and not really accessible, but a lot of innovation came from that organisation, connecting up South Australia on an international level.

The leader mentioned former senator Natasha Stott Despoja. This is really, as part of the UN youth organisation, where she started to get involved in politics. Sadly in some respects, I have been around long enough to remember her being supported not only by Sandra Kanck but also by Heather Southcott, Janine Haines and a number of the other distinguished women who were associated with the Democrats.

In Heather's field of pharmacy, I think starting the Women Pharmacists Group was quite an amazing innovation in those days. A lot of the professional women's associations that we now take for granted were not so common then, and I remember Heather saying that it took a long time to get women to think about being in the Women Pharmacists Group, but they have worked to become a very important organisation.

One of the first times I met Heather Southcott was at a Women's Electoral Lobby meeting, and it was very interesting. My mother took me to the meeting—I think I was nearly 16 at the time—in Bloor Court, and some of the women will remember Bloor Court as a place where women's organisations would meet. There was also a Women's Liberation meeting happening at the same time, so it was interesting to see who went to the Women's Liberation meeting and who went to the Women's Electoral Lobby meeting.

From my experience with the Women's Electoral Lobby in particular, they went on to get support from I think just about every woman who has been in state parliament. I know that in more

recent times the member for Bragg and I were involved with the 40th celebration of the Women's Electoral Lobby, and it was very interesting to see the mixture of women from different political backgrounds who came to our celebration at Government House which was hosted by Governor Kevin Scarce.

As I said, it is going to be very sad not seeing Heather at so many different events, rallies and functions. Her influence went on to one of the organisations that I must say I have always been really impressed with: the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, which still operates today. I know the member for Florey and I have always been supporters of theirs and the fact that they keep on keeping on, but we have found it hard to keep up with all the events they hold. Again, Heather was always involved with that organisation.

I have not really done Heather justice, with all campaigns and everything she was involved with, and I am very sad that she is not with us anymore. I would like to pass on my condolences to her daughters, Jane and Anne Marie, and her family, and to all her friends in the women's movement, particularly those who are over 80 with whom she would have worked for decades and who I know will miss her terribly.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I rise to commend and support the motion of the Premier in acknowledging, with condolence, the passing of Heather Southcott. Mrs Southcott's contribution to the parliament was relatively brief; however, her pioneering spirit and contribution to community service, and the advancement of women in particular, has been outstanding and over many decades.

If the Hon. Joyce Steele—who watches over us in this house in the Versace blue up there—were here with us today, she could probably tell us many stories of her and Heather's activities during the 1960s. Mrs Steele, of course, came into this parliament as the first female representative in this house in 1959, joining with Mrs Jessie Cooper who was in the Legislative Council. Heather had been a pioneer in supporting the advancement of women in their employment and certainly in community and public life.

She represents for me everything that our parents and particularly our mothers' generation stood for. They were generally pioneering in their own way but certainly in a patient and pragmatic way. She was the victim, as many of our mothers were, of the obligation to retire from employment upon marrying, most particularly in relation to Public Service employment. Heather was a member of the commonwealth Public Service and, in 1952, under those rules, was required to resign from her employment. There were other types of employment, such as air hostessing, as it was then known, for airlines, where women suffered the same fate. For the generations that followed, we really have no comprehension of the sacrifice that generation of women made in giving up their employment in those circumstances.

Just recently, we heard the Clerk in another place telling her story of being obliged under a contract to commit to not marrying for five years upon taking up a position here in the parliament. When she, I think, announced her engagement within 12 months of that, there had to be some quick renegotiation of those arrangements. This is something that our generation of women and our children and granddaughters really have not experienced, and we are thankful for Heather Southcott. I hope her pioneering spirit has ensured that she is a leading light to her daughters, and my condolences are with them.

I too would like to commend her particularly for two activities: one is working in 1994 to recognise the Centenary of Women's Suffrage. These tapestries, as the member preceding me has already indicated, were the unstinting work of a number of women on the committee, including Jenny Cashmore. The former member for Stuart was hell-bent on making sure that they did not stay here in the chamber, but I am pleased to say that they remain here and he is gone.

For as long as there is breath in me, and I am sure in many of the other members here, they will stay. They recognise the significance of the passing of the suffrage legislation in 1894 and, of course, the unique aspects that South Australia has pioneered in this parliament. Heather was one of the active committee members—I think it was chaired at that stage by the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore—who commissioned these tapestries. They were held across the road in

the then bank building, and every woman in South Australia was able to go along and put some stitches in to commemorate this important occasion.

Apart from disputes as to whether we are second or third around the world regarding women's right to vote, we were clearly the first chamber in the world where women had the right to stand for parliament. It did take us 65 years to get here, but we were here.

Whilst my father described Heather as a 'difficult woman'—that was his view of most women in politics, I might say—nevertheless, she marched on undeterred by people like my father. I want to say that her work in that regard is testament to her perseverance in ensuring that we have a legacy that is on display for the world showing the very proud achievements that have been made in this chamber in respect of women's suffrage and representation in the parliament.

The second activity is the United Nations breakfast. It started with about 20. I think the member for Ashford and I were amongst the younger two or three who were there at the time with the old guard. Now, some 2,000 go to those breakfasts. It is a remarkable achievement. Young women in our schools are invited annually to attend. Even the premiers and leaders of the opposition are there, which I think is a fine tradition. They would not dare miss it now, would they?

It is important. Every year, Heather Southcott would be at that event. Her signature headband will not be forgotten. She was a very pragmatic lady who was not really big on fashion. She decided that this was the hairstyle for her and she kept it I think for 50 years, or for the time that I knew her. May she rest in peace. I thank her for her contribution to South Australia's women.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:24): Like many people here today, I want to add to this motion. Many people leave a mark for the better on the landscape of their community, none more so than the late Heather Southcott. I, of course, always knew about Heather but only met her shortly after my election in 1997 because, as a worker bee from the suburbs, I could not lay claim to the longstanding connections that other members have had with her.

Heather was born on 15 November 1928, a Scorpio, like many politically active people such as Penny Wong, me, Muriel Matters, Susan Close (member for Port Adelaide)—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: I'm sure—well, you're not a woman, but you're accepted in the Scorpio clan. Sadly, though, Heather did pass away on 21 November at the age of 86. Heather was a true activist, active in the South Australian Division of the United Nations Association of Australia. She led that association for 27 years in its passionate work for justice. She was always present at their dinners, and I remember buying many raffle tickets from her over the years.

She was a founding member of the UN Women Australia Adelaide Breakfast Committee (formerly the UNIFEM Breakfast) and is described by them as 'an extremely dedicated and hardworking committee member for over 20 years'. Like the member for Ashford, I find breakfasts intrude on garden time and other pursuits, but I fondly remember her in the basement of the Masonic Building when we only had sandwiches, and we have come a long way from then. We could hardly move, though, in those days in the room, which was still packed; now we pack a much larger room.

Heather was an esteemed and respected life member of the Morialta Trust, which acknowledged her long-term contribution to the trust's work in assisting disadvantaged children and young people. But perhaps her work on behalf of the National Council of Women SA and the National Council of Women War Memorial Fund, where Heather was an honorary life member and had served as vice president, executive committee member, adviser and delegate, exhibits her commitment and dedication to causes close to her heart, because they could make a difference to the lives of women and, in turn, society in general.

Heather has been described by others as 'a very remarkable woman of courage, a person of great integrity and superior intellect'. As has already been mentioned, in 1982, Heather was elected in a by-election to the House of Assembly for the district of Mitcham, which is now Waite, becoming the first woman leader of a political party, as she was the leader of the Australian Democrats. Sadly though, she only held the seat for a very short time but became a mentor to young members of her party and 'gave decades of unselfish and unstinting service'. Heather served nine

terms as national president, a testament to her powers of communication and endurance in keeping the bastards who keep the bastards honest a force in Australian politics.

Heather had been badly affected by polio as a child and suffered from its effects later in her life. Heather was a woman who supported other women, so it was a thrill but no great surprise when she joined the fledgling Muriel Matters Society and offered great support to myself and Steph Key as we began to promote Muriel's example as a way to generate interest in not only the significant history of this South Australian female activist but the importance of the democratic process, in which it is vital to have good people of all persuasions involved in making the laws aimed at changes to improve society.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom was, again, a shared passion, and I hope a cause many of us here will embrace as we discover more about the futility of war in this ANZAC Centenary year. Heather was not only generous in her encouragement but she contributed financially to the Muriel Matters Society and to our social justice projects like the support for women in prison, via our support, in turn, for the Seeds of Affinity group, the importance of education for all, abolition of sweatshops, prevention of domestic violence and all forms of violence, and the promotion of the concept of world peace among many others.

On behalf of the electors of Florey and the members of the Muriel Matters Society, I extend my condolences and sympathy to Jane and Anne Marie and their family on the loss of their mother and to Heather's wide circle of friends and admirers. We have lost a wonderful spirit and need to step up our efforts in her memory.

The SPEAKER (14:28): I remember the Mitcham by-election of 1982 vividly. The member since 1955, Robin Rhodes Millhouse, had just been appointed by the Tonkin government to the Supreme Court, creating a by-election which the Liberal Party was expected to win, and its candidate was Robert Worth, the husband of Trish Worth. He had contested the seat previously, but 1982 was not to be his year. Although there was almost a 20 per cent swing against the Australian Democrats with the retirement of Robin Millhouse, nevertheless, Heather Southcott held on by 90 votes—7,090 votes to 7,000. Robin Millhouse had been the attorney-general. He had become the leader of the Liberal Movement in 1974. I well remember the 1975 Liberal Movement slogan—'Millhouse for Premier'—and he—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I have no idea why the member for Wright laughs—provided a lot of copy for *The Advertiser*. I well remember being a cadet at *The Advertiser* in about March or April 1982 and *The Advertiser* management taking Robin Millhouse out to lunch to thank him for his services to the media over so many years, and to congratulate him on his appointment. In fact, the leader may be interested to know that Robin Millhouse contrived to be named in most question times, and upon succeeding—

Mr Marshall: Did he have something better to do?

The SPEAKER: Indeed, he did. Upon succeeding in being named he would pack is attaché case, walk to the bar, and say, 'Well, I'm off to my electorate office for the rest of the day.' In that by-election John Hill was the Labor candidate, and he was good enough to score just fractionally less of the primary vote than Heather Southcott, which then allowed Heather Southcott to take nearly 100 per cent of his preferences and win the seat—

Mr Marshall: What a surprise.

The SPEAKER: Well, no; preference flows are not that true these days. I remember Heather Southcott as a member of this house when I was working down here. She was only here for a short time. Robert Worth having failed a second time, Stephen Baker became the Liberal candidate for Mitcham and won the seat with a 10 per cent swing to the Liberal Party at the general election, a general election which the Liberal Party lost. Heather Southcott, as has been recorded here, went on to be a very, very active citizen in so many areas. Vale, Heather Southcott.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 14:33 to 14:43.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—

Supplementary Report—Agency audit report: December 2014

Supplementary Report—Matters of specific audit comment: December 2014

[Ordered to be published]

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

Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal—Annual Report 2013-14

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

Health Advisory Council—Mid-West Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2013-14

The Health Services Charitable Gifts Board—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for The Arts (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Disability Information and Resource Centre Inc—Annual Report 2013-14

National Aboriginal Cultural Institute—Annual Report 2013-14

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

Australian Children's Education and Care Quality Authority—Annual Report 2013-14

Education and Care Services Ombudsman, National Education and Care Services

Freedom of Information and Privacy Commissioners—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Treasury and Finance, Department of—Erratum Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme—Annual Report 2013-14

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

Consumer and Business Services—Annual Report 2013-14

Independent Gambling Authority—Annual Report 2013-14

Government Response—Social Development Committee—Inquiry into the Sale and Consumption of Alcohol

By the Minister for Emergency Services (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

South Australian Fire and Emergency Services—Annual Report 2013-14

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

ForestrySA—Annual Report 2013-14

*Ministerial Statement***MENTAL HEALTH BEDS**

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:44): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Mr Speaker, I have made plain my view that it is entirely unacceptable that mental health patients experience days parked in our hospital emergency departments. I do not believe that an emergency department is an appropriate setting for the ongoing care of people experiencing an acute episode, and there are genuine concerns that this could further stigmatise patients.

An ever-increasing demand for mental health services has placed pressure on our emergency departments and acute units, mental health patients, their families and, of course, our hard-working staff. I promised to toil until this matter could be resolved, and I am pleased to say that we have made good on our promise of increasing mental health bed capacity across the three major metropolitan hospitals. We have opened new mental health beds at the Lyell McEwin, Flinders Medical Centre and at Glenside Health Services, and more beds will open in Mount Gambier next year.

Today I am announcing more work to keep these gains in place by setting new targets for emergency department waiting times for mental health patients, placing pressure on the system to keep responding. Under these unashamedly ambitious targets, mental health patients should not routinely wait more than 24 hours for admission to an acute hospital bed from 1 January 2016. As part of a longer term plan, by July 2018 I have set new benchmarks where I expect 90 per cent of mental health patients to be admitted within eight hours and 75 per cent within four hours. Providing mental health consumers with a bed in an appropriate ward within these time frames means that they will be able to receive their care and start their recovery sooner.

Targets are important so that we can work with our senior mental health clinicians to change our mental health system and deliver better quality care for our patients. As result, other patients will be seen and treated more quickly because there will be greater access to emergency departments. However, targets are just numbers unless we remember that these targets are about people, our patients. Just today in *InDaily* we saw another real example of the limitations of our current system. Jeanette Walsh bravely spoke about her experience of her daughter's presentation of the QEH, and I agree with her sentiments in that story; 'You shouldn't have to be there for days on end...it doesn't help anyone at all.' That is not good enough, and I expect things to improve.

In addition, I am establishing a new government structure for mental health services to enable consistent oversight of all mental health services in our local health networks. Under these important changes, the governance and administration of mental health will be made consistent with other clinical areas across our health services where clinicians lead and will be properly empowered and accountable

The new Portfolio Mental Health Executive will meet regularly to review performance indicators and to establish pathways to improve the quality of mental health services. This new executive brings a whole-of-health system approach and sharpens focus on the performance of our mental health services. I am also establishing a new advisory group involving key mental health clinicians from across the state to provide appropriate advice on mental health issues. The focus for this advisory group will be on reducing patient waiting times in hospital emergency departments. The group will work on ways to improve access to acute mental health beds and resolve some of the blockages within our system. A clinical audit will also be conducted to assess patient flow across our stepped model of care to ensure that patients are receiving the most appropriate care in the most appropriate place, first time every time.

I have always said that the issue of ensuring lower waiting times for mental health patients in emergency departments is a complex one. Providing safe and effective care in an appropriate environment remains a priority, and we are making inroads. Mental health is complex and no single

solution addresses all the issues, but this place can be assured that my determination to find more solutions will not waver.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to the parliament Richard and Evelynne Rominjer. Mr Rominjer is a former secretary of the California Department of Food and Agriculture and the former deputy secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture during the Clinton presidency.

Ministerial Statement

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:50): I table a ministerial statement made by the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation.

EXPORT INDUSTRY

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:50): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: It is with great pleasure, as the Acting Minister for Investment and Trade, that I rise today to update the house on the performance of South Australian exporters. Exports are the backbone of South Australia's economy. Whether it is our farmers, winemakers, miners or manufacturers, they are playing an important role in supporting jobs and investment by identifying and capturing new markets.

I am happy to inform members that the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures published today show South Australia's exports reached a record \$12.3 billion in the 12 months to October. Analysis of the ABS data also shows that the pace of export growth achieved by South Australian exporters during this period outperformed every state as well as the nation. South Australian exporters can be very proud of their efforts.

In a very challenging market, our state's exports grew 10.2 per cent in the 12 months to October. This is faster than the national growth rate of 6 per cent, faster than the resource-rich states of Western Australia and Queensland. The ABS data show exports grew in Western Australia and Victoria but fell in New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania. I think those results clearly put South Australian exporters' achievements in perspective.

South Australia can continue to be a place that makes things, that produces premium food and wine for global supermarket shelves and unlocks its mineral potential to support the growing economies of China, India and South-East Asia. Premium food remains a mainstay of our trade within the region. Our meat exports grew 46.2 per cent to surpass \$1 billion in the 12 months to October. Fish and crustaceans, very popular in Asian markets, grew 6.6 per cent.

Mineral resources and energy companies are also contributing, with a 3.8 per cent increase in exports of metal ores and scraps, a 46 per cent increase in coal and gas exports and a 40.7 per cent rise in petroleum and petroleum products exported to the world. Copper exports grew to almost \$1.4 billion

Further analysis of the ABS data shows exports to China grew 29 per cent in the 12 months to October, to \$3.2 billion—more than a quarter of our total outbound trade in that period. Our exports to India grew 15 per cent, to \$732.6 million. The Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) received \$1.97 billion worth of exports from South Australia, an increase of 6.1 per cent

The opportunity exists to further expand South Australia's economy by promoting our world-class goods and services to overseas markets. Even as I speak, the Minister for Investment and Trade is flying to China to continue our efforts to strengthen our already close relationship with our sister state in Shandong Province. Our China and India strategies are working to improve access for

our exporters to those markets and work continues to finalise a similar strategy for the huge market offered by South-East Asia that will no doubt help to generate exports to the countries of that region.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:54): I bring up the 2014 report of the committee.

Report received.

Question Time

STATE BUDGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer accept that, while his budget clearly identifies federal cuts of \$101 million, there is also an unidentified increase of \$97 million in federal funding coming to South Australia, thus resulting in a net cut for this current financial year of just \$4 million?

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:55): I've never once said a thing about your family business. I think my family business should be off limits too.

Anyway, I think it is important to note that the Leader of the Opposition, I believe, is not being honest with the people of South Australia in his assessment. Let me explain it in a coherent manner so everyone knows exactly what the Leader of the Opposition is attempting to sell to the people of this state. He claims that a \$30 million grant to non-government schools by the commonwealth is money that we can spend on health. He claims we can spend a \$66 million grant from the commonwealth for new infrastructure programs—for example, \$55 million to be spent on a north-south corridor, on the Darlington upgrade, and \$6 million for the South Eastern Freeway and the Mount Barker interchange.

What he does not mention is that the tied grants to health, education and pensioner concessions that were cut are not money that I can transfer from these dedicated grants. To give a practical example so the Leader of the Opposition can understand, and for the benefit of the house, let's say, for example—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I've got a better one. I have an example for the Leader of the Opposition. Let's say, for example, a third party gives the Leader of the Opposition \$1,000 every year to pay his electricity bills but, in lieu of that \$1,000, he withdraws \$1,000 and gives him a voucher for Wokinabox for a year. He can't use that Wokinabox voucher to pay for his electricity bills because it means he's got a loss of \$1,000 in revenue but he can account for that voucher. What he is asking us to do is say the tied grants to non-government schools and infrastructure can actually be used on health and education. What he is really saying to us is that we should have cut our hospitals and our schools and our pensioners by \$101 million—and we didn't.

On budget day, we made it very clear, and even in our published graphs in our South Australian response it does show commonwealth funding increasing for health but not what they had committed to at the previous MYEFO and the previous budget and in the COAG agreements that were signed by the Premier and the Prime Minister. That equates to a cut in funding and that is something that the opposition leader refuses to explain.

He is the only Liberal leader in the country who is not standing up to the Prime Minister on these cuts. He is the only Liberal leader in the country who is supporting the cuts that the Prime Minister has made to health and education. He is the only Liberal leader in the country—

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, point of order.

Mr GARDNER: The minister has now left the reservation and is debating the matter.

The SPEAKER: No, in fact, I think the Treasurer is still being relevant to the question of what is the true size of commonwealth cuts to the State of South Australia. However, I just wish to caution the Treasurer that he did take umbrage at the member for Chaffey's interjection about his family business.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Not Chaffey? Finniss.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Schubert—and then proceeded to refer to the Leader of the Opposition's business. But do go on.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. Yes, there is a log in my eye; I accept that, sir. If I am looking at the cuts the commonwealth have made over the four-year period, including the \$101 million in cuts that they have made this year, we are talking about \$655 million worth of cuts to health over four years. That is something the Leader of the Opposition supports. There has been \$123 million worth of cuts to our pensioners. That is \$190 to every pensioner in South Australia in council rate concessions that have been taken away by the commonwealth, and the Leader of the Opposition will not raise his voice in anger against the Prime Minister. Forty-seven million dollars in skills funding has been cut and \$73 million in Gonski and other education funding cut by the commonwealth, and the Leader of the Opposition will not oppose the cuts.

STATE BUDGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): Supplementary: what is the value of discretionary funds that come from the commonwealth to the South Australian budget each year?

The SPEAKER: I am glad that supplementary was extempore.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:00): We publish budgets yearly and the commonwealth publishes its budgets yearly.

Mr Marshall: Do you know the answer?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hang on a second. They publish their figures yearly as well. We publish the previous year, our budgets and our spending in health and education and, of course, the agreements signed by the commonwealth where they would ramp up their funding to meet activity funding. We were given five weeks' notice of \$898 million worth of cuts to health and education.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think the stress is showing, sir. It's okay. It will be over soon. Don't worry.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will return to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry, sir; I apologise. We were given five weeks to come up with a response to these cuts. I have to say that in our first treasurers' meeting with Treasurer Hockey and all the treasurers from the commonwealth and all the state jurisdictions in Canberra—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hang on a second. The Treasurer made it very clear to us that he would consult widely with the states because he used to work for a state government he claimed and knew how difficult it was for states to budget in terms of the way the commonwealth has signed their grants. He also said in those remarks that special purpose payments and national partnerships, by and large, would be honoured. You have to say the government allocates its unallocated discretionary spending from the commonwealth fairly early on, usually budgets in advance.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hang on a second. So when the commonwealth cut special purpose payments that match activity funding for infrastructure that we have built and cannot move and—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hang on a second. Hospitals are key to that and the reason that those hospitals and activity funding are so important is that every South Australian who attends a hospital does not walk into that hospital with a budget allocation over their head. In fact, it is up to the clinicians and the medical tests that are performed and the triage that occurs in those hospitals and they decide what the allocation of funding is on that individual, not someone in this room—and that is the way it should be. The reason we signed those agreements with the commonwealth for activity funding is that activity funding grows on average per annum by about 8 per cent.

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just hang on a second. Eight per cent, Mr Speaker. So that means the take of health every year grows more and more, and as our population ages and as medical advances improve and cost more money, what you see—

Mr Treloar interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders, not usually an offender, is called to order, and so is the member for Morialta.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Very clever. That's very good. Mr Speaker, I am doing my best to restrain myself from the Leader of the Opposition. I will maintain this even keel that you have asked me to have on our last day. But it is important to remember that what the Leader of the Opposition will not tell the people of South Australia is that activity funding is the key to making sure that the commonwealth gets to stay in our hospitals.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: we have had 3½ minutes and so far the Treasurer—

The SPEAKER: Now the point of order is what?

Ms CHAPMAN: Relevance; the Treasurer—

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The idea that we are keeping massive amounts of funds in reserve on the basis that the commonwealth may somehow one day remove and tear up an agreement that they signed with the commonwealth to meet activity funding for the next decade, ending forever this farce that we have with the states and commonwealth, who are always arguing about health funding—something, sir, that prime minister Howard and prime minister Rudd both said needed to end, and indeed, sir—

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer's time has expired. Leader.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): Does the Treasurer accept that GST money from the commonwealth is untied, that it currently sits just short of \$5 billion, and that there was a \$338 million increase in that GST funding from the commonwealth this year and that he can use that money at his own discretion?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:05): Sir, if you want to suspend reality and past budgets, then yes. If you want to take out every single other budget decision ever made over the past four years, he would be right. But, of course, the government was not invented this year and has no history; the government is an

ongoing concern. We have budgets every single year and we allocate spending on the basis of our best estimates of what GST will be.

The discretionary increase that the Leader of the Opposition is talking about from the latest figures is \$8 million—\$8 million, I am advised. So, if he thinks that \$8 million is enough to cover a \$101 million cut to our hospitals, to our schools, to our pensioners and to Gonski funding, he is sadly mistaken. I can tell you, and the health minister can tell you, and every member of this house can tell you that an ageing population presenting to our hospitals is growing at a rate of nearly 8 per cent per annum, as is the cost of delivering that service.

I can assure you, Mr Speaker, there is not a citizen in this state who expects us to deliver second-best health care or 1997 practice. The Leader of the Opposition is deliberately misleading the public—deliberately misleading the public, Mr Speaker—on this—

Ms REDMOND: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I do not believe that the Treasurer can accuse anyone of misleading in the house without a substantive motion to that effect, sir.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will withdraw, sir, for the ease of the house.

The SPEAKER: That would be good.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I withdraw, sir. I will put oil on troubled waters because I know it is a very anxious day for the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It could be your last day in the chair!

The SPEAKER: The—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'm so sorry, sir, I will go back to the question.

The SPEAKER: No, I am hoping it won't be my last day in the chair.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, sir; long may you last, and long may you prosper in your chair, with the wisdom of King Solomon. Can I just say I think the Leader of the Opposition is getting a bit white knuckled as we get closer and closer to Saturday.

The SPEAKER: Will the Treasurer return to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Healthcare costs are growing every single year, and the tied grants that the commonwealth have cut that have been linked to health and education, I could not transfer that money that was assigned for non-government schools. So, what the Leader of the Opposition is actually telling me—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —is that the grant that I received—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, he is getting a little bit hysterical.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It will be over soon, don't worry. It will be over soon.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, I will gladly read it out. It is a Council for the Australian Federation communiqué dated 18 May 2014, Sydney:

The unilateral termination of intergovernmental funding agreements, signed in good faith, is unacceptable.

The cuts to funding for States and Territories, and the manner in which they were imposed, will cause immediate and significant impacts on the hospital system—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hang on a second—

and permanent structural deterioration in the recurrent funding positions of State and Territory Governments.

With this in mind, [the Council for the Australian Federation]:

1. Expresses grave concern that, contrary to the Prime Minister's remarks today, there are immediate impacts on frontline services and the cost of living for Australians. For example, from 1 July 2014, there will be a reduction in funding for 1200 hospital beds across Australia and the withdrawal of over \$300 million per year from concessions for pensioners and seniors...

Liberal premiers, Mr Speaker!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Liberal premiers, Mr Speaker! A definition of a Liberal premier is a Liberal leader of the opposition that won an election. That is the definition, Mr Speaker, of a Liberal premier. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition can stand up for South Australians, stand up for our hospitals, stand up for our schools and stop standing up for Tony Abbott.

The SPEAKER: I think the Treasurer is debating the answer. The member for MacKillop.

SA WATER

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:10): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the government have any intention to alter the financial arrangements between the government and SA Water?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:10): I don't really understand what information the member for MacKillop is attempting to seek, so perhaps he could provide the house with an explanation to his question.

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: We will come back to the member for MacKillop. Member for Napier.

GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES

Mr GEE (Napier) (15:10): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about what he considers to be the government's most significant achievements since the March state election?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:10): I think I might be able to do that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right.

The SPEAKER: A point of order.

Mr GARDNER: Standing order 97 declines the availability of argument, and that question presupposes that there have in fact been any achievements.

The SPEAKER: If anything in the Premier's answer isn't significant, I will crack down on him. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. This year has been a year of significant renewal. We started with renewal in the cabinet—five new ministers—and by establishing a stable new alliance with the member for Frome and the member for Waite. We appointed new chief executives to key government departments, including the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, Renewal SA, the Department of State Development, Defence SA and the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources.

One of the first acts was to finalise the deal to underwrite the \$500 million expansion of the Nyrstar plant at Port Pirie, securing the future of this great town and indeed the region. We have delivered the most comprehensive reforms to WorkCover seen in 25 years, transforming it into a return-to-work scheme that will better support injured workers and save business \$180 million per annum.

We conducted a review of about 180 government boards and committees which will be abolished. We have established a new role for a Coordinator-General to provide the front door for those who seek to invest in this state, to assist to clear hurdles and get quicker answers. We established a simpler regulation unit to identify barriers to doing business. We announced a \$50 million financial guarantee program to support growing businesses to create jobs and, following a brutal federal budget, we handed down a state budget that protected those who are doing it hardest in our community.

Since the last budget, we have released 10 new economic priorities for South Australia to create jobs, creating a framework for future growth in our economy. We have conducted three successful country cabinets and, as I said, the country cabinet is here to stay. In one of the proudest moments this year, I appointed, on recommendation to Her Majesty The Queen, the new Governor of South Australia, Mr Hieu Van Le, and of course his deputy, Lieutenant Governor Professor Brenda Wilson.

We have established a massive consultation process in transforming a number of our important systems: the state's health system, root and branch reforms of the state's justice system, the planning system and the emergency services system. We secured automatic compensation for CFS volunteers who contract cancer through the course of their work—the most comprehensive scheme in this nation.

We increased the renewable energy target by 50 per cent to 2025. Importantly, we have taken the fight up to Canberra to protect South Australian defence jobs and also to resist the \$5.5 billion cuts to health and education, but that is not all that has been done during the course of the year. Significant milestones have also been reached: the opening of the two-way expressway, securing agreement with the federal government to deliver major upgrades to the north-south corridor, the Darlington project and the Torrens to Torrens project, and, of course, we saw the first season of the redeveloped Adelaide Oval—the much-maligned Adelaide Oval—with a million footy fans streaming through the city during our winter.

I went to the last state election promising to keep building South Australia, to stand up to the Abbott government and to govern for all South Australians, and we have done each of those things.

SA WATER

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:15): My question is again to the Treasurer. How does the Treasurer reconcile the current financial arrangement where SA Water is obliged to transfer 95 per cent of retained earnings to the government Consolidated Account with his position yesterday where he claimed that water pricing based upon replacement asset valuations was to meet future needs for asset replacement?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:16): This might be a bombshell to the member for MacKillop, but we own SA Water, and the public gets the benefit of its profits. I know it is a shocking revelation for the opposition that we dare to socialise the profits of SA Water and put them back into concessions and postage stamp water pricing and of course give a benefit to the people of this state for owning their water assets.

We have all seen the impacts of privatising electricity. When the opposition promised us that, by privatising our electricity, we would have cheaper power, they were wrong. We will not forgo ownership of our water assets in the driest state in the driest country in the world. We believe it is important we maintain ownership of those assets. We believe we should be the masters of our own destiny when it comes to water, not at the hands of foreign ownership. We believe our water assets belong to South Australians and they should get the benefit of those water assets.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

SA WATER

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:17): My supplementary is to the Treasurer. Since 2006, when the current financial arrangements were instituted between the government and SA Water, has there been any financial transfer from the Consolidated Account of the government to SA Water, other than the \$2.7 billion of debt transferred?

The SPEAKER: I am not sure that that question arose out of the minister's answer, but I will ask 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) (15:17): I will get a detailed answer for the member.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is like the Romans: 'What have the Romans ever done for us?' That's right. The opposition are claiming that there has been no transfer. Every time a road project is built in this state by the government, whether it is a partnership with the commonwealth or the state, I will get a detailed answer to show him exactly what it is we contribute.

I also point out this to the member for MacKillop. Given that SA Water is a monopoly provider of water and is owned by the people of South Australia and those profits are socialised, it is important that we set that pricing in accordance with COAG rules. I heard no such complaint from the member for MacKillop when he was deputy leader of the opposition and when he held multiple portfolios representing economic briefs in this parliament about not adhering to principles established by the then Howard government—not once.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know you're having a bad year. It's okay; it will be over soon.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned for responding to interjections.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am sorry for defending myself, sir. I apologise.

The SPEAKER: Your apology is accepted. Don't do it in future.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. I will get a detailed answer for the member but I note on the record here that he interjected, 'There was none', so we will see if he is right.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Is it Families SA's practice to avoid removing an at-risk child from their guardian due to speculation on how the Youth Court will respond to the order?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:19): It's Families SA practice, where it is possible, to maintain a family unit, and that priority is enshrined in our legislation, as far as I am aware.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order and so is the member for Colton.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Parents have the overriding responsibility for children. When serious concerns are raised and Families SA believe that a child is in danger, they can have what is called an 'assessment investigation order', which is provided by the Youth Court. That can be for varying periods of time in which they undertake an assessment of the family, whether they can look at unifying that family, providing extra supports and returning the child to the family, or whether they get a long-term order.

But, of course, the way that Families SA have been going about their work essentially results in more and more children coming into care, and we've talked about the problems in relation to that. So, we're going through a process now of Families SA changing the way they work and having much more intensive work with families, with children in their homes, hopefully with the ultimate aim of sustaining those families.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:21): Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: If it arises out of the minister's answer.

Ms SANDERSON: How many cases in the past have Families SA had rejected by the Youth Court that they have taken to remove the child?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:21): I obviously don't have that answer, and I'm happy to take it on notice. But I do know that there are situations where Families SA staff members have been put under considerable pressure by the Youth Court, that they haven't been happy with the extent of the investigation and the justification for applications.

So they are very circumspect and, as I understand, are very cautious about making sure that they are justified when they make applications to the court. I know the member for Adelaide would know there are many instances that her and I have talked about where children have either been taken into care or not returned to their families, or their foster carers who have had them removed, and the reasons why that is. So, it's one of those situations where you can't give a blanket answer.

Social workers go into homes every day dealing with incredibly complex situations. They are not as simple as one line in *The Advertiser*, they are not always as simple as families present in our electorate offices. The fact remains these social workers every day save children's lives, but they are damned if they do and damned if they don't. There's a select committee underway at the moment, people complaining that children have been taken away from them, and then we have situations where people are complaining that they haven't taken children from them.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:23): Quick supplementary: the minister said that she would come back with an answer. Is it possible to just get the answer for the number that have been rejected in the last five years, just to give a time frame?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:23): I'm not sure whether it's even possible to get that information, but if I can I'm happy to correspond with the member for Adelaide.

MANUFACTURING SECTOR

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:23): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation. Minister, can you provide a status update on manufacturing in South Australia, along with government assistance provided to manufacturers?

The SPEAKER: Yes, and the Speaker would like to know how a status update differs from an update.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:24): You would have to ask the questioner not the answerer.

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Thank you, sir. In the time that I have been the Minister for Manufacturing, I have visited many companies, getting up to 100 now, and sought to understand the issues that they face as well as the ways in which government can support them. I'm pleased to report that 230 manufacturing companies in South Australia have to date been part of programs and received assistance through programs associated with Manufacturing Works, the government's 10-year strategy that started two years ago. We have just passed that second anniversary.

Last week, I went to visit two companies which I think illustrate the challenges and the opportunities within manufacturing. One was Walker Corporation, which makes the exhaust and muffler systems for Holden, which will—unless they are able to diversify quickly—close when Holden goes. The other company was Redarc, a tremendously exciting manufacturing company which has been expanding and has recently applied for another grant and is likely to expand still further. Its employment numbers have more than doubled in the last few years, and they expect to go another 50 per cent again. So, where Walker's is right at the edge of having to try to diversify in a very rapid way, Redarc has demonstrated the way in which a manufacturing company can be highly successful.

The government's role there is to provide a range of supports. We have grants and we offer platforms to support new markets, whether that is private investment or government investment. Probably the most important theme in supporting manufacturing is to provide capacity building for individual companies and workplaces.

This morning we launched Smart Workplaces online, which I would urge people with companies in their electorates to direct their attention to. It has a diagnostic tool on it to allow companies to learn from the best South Australian companies about how they can improve their workplaces and really integrate innovation into their daily working, the way in which they operate. That form of capacity building is extremely important and allied with the grants and so on that we are able to provide.

The website was developed through the use of three pilot companies: Ellex, Bickford's and also Seeley International. Fred Seeley spoke this morning at the event that launched it and was very dynamic, as he always is, in encouraging companies to integrate innovation into everything they do. I say all of this in the context of the importance of governments backing companies, providing the kind of capacity building and support that is possible and, indeed, honouring contracts they have with them.

I was appalled to see the report from the Senate yesterday that suggests that the last federal government entered into a contract with Holden to provide armoured vehicles for the federal government fleet. Holden had tendered and won that contract, and this new government appears to have cancelled that summarily and not only taken the—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: Erskine May defines that ministers are not responsible for matters related to other governments' responsibilities.

The SPEAKER: If the manufacturing is in South Australia, the minister certainly is. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The new government not only cancelled that but entered into an arrangement with BMW, who hadn't even tendered. So I, of course, and this government will support any inquiry by the federal Auditor-General into that. In summary, governments have a role to play in providing support, increasing capacity and working with the manufacturing sector in order to make sure that South Australia remains a state where people make things.

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. The member for Mitchell.

TRAMLINES

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:28): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Is the minister aware of or can he detail any problems with the tramline cable from Victoria Square to the Railway Station?

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) (15:28): I don't believe that has been brought to my attention, but I am happy to look into it and bring an answer back to the house.

TRAMLINES

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:28): A final supplementary, sir: has the minister been briefed or received any advice—

The SPEAKER: Member for Mitchell, if it arises out of the minister's answer you surely can't be reading it?

Mr WINGARD: No, I am not; I'm asking a question, sir.

The SPEAKER: It's a supplementary?

Mr WINGARD: Yes, do you want me to look at you through the whole question, sir?

The SPEAKER: Yes, that would be good.

Mr WINGARD: No problem at all.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir. It is established in Erskine May that the Speaker has leeway to allow reading, where necessary. But if it didn't, Erskine May also demands that members not read any materials while in the chamber other than that relevant to the debate at hand, and I would ask members opposite to cease doing so as well if they are going to be so priggish on this matter.

The SPEAKER: I raised it, not members on the government side. I ruled yesterday, at one stage, that members could read out their supplementary questions even though those supplementary questions are supposed to arise spontaneously from the minister's answer. I was corrected by the member for Kaurua, rightly, that Erskine May rules out the reading of supplementary questions. Presumably that is because if the member is reading off the typescript it is not really a supplementary. So I deferred to Erskine May, and the member for Mitchell has kindly agreed to gaze at me while asking his question.

Mr WINGARD: Thank you, sir; it is a pleasure to gaze at you as well. My supplementary question to the minister is: has the minister received any advice about pending legal action against the company (Coleman Rail) that did the extension of the tramline from Victoria Square to the train station?

The SPEAKER: Splendid. The minister.

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) (15:30): Thank you, Mr Speaker. It did feel a bit weird there for a minute. In response to the question from the member for Mitchell, I do not recall anything about being briefed on that, let alone about any legal action. However, I am happy to take that matter away, seek advice and bring an answer back to the house in due course.

TRAMLINES

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:31): A supplementary question: I will have to get your clarification, Mr Speaker, about whether I can ask another minister a supplementary question on the same topic, because I would like to ask the Treasurer if he has received any briefing about pending legal action against the company that did the tramline extension.

The SPEAKER: No; unfortunately, the supplementary has to be to the minister to whom you asked—

Mr WINGARD: Can I ask another question then, sir?

The SPEAKER: Ask another question.

Mr WINGARD: Can the Treasurer advise if he has received any briefing and/or any documentation regarding the company that built the tramline extension and damage to the cable that may have occurred between Victoria Square and the train station?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:32): I defer to the Minister for Transport on this issue. I do not recall receiving any advice. I know that I am a longstanding justice of the peace, and the government does often turn to me for legal matters, so I will check my briefs and find out exactly if there are any—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Isobel, I have missed you so much.

The SPEAKER: Especially since Mr Woodyatt is not available to you just at the moment.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I am always amazed at the invisible role you play in this house as the independent umpire. You are not one of those umpires who wear a fluorescent vest, running around the field constantly blowing his whistle, sir. You are anonymous, sitting in the

corner and just letting the game flow for the benefit of the viewers. You do not want to be part of the game, sir, you just want to make sure that the parliament functions at its very, very best. On that I congratulate you, sir. I am not aware of any advice, but I will go back and check and get an answer for the member.

TRAMLINES

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:33): Can I also check with the Treasurer regarding whether he is aware of any legal action pending against the company that put in the cable for the tramline?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:33): I am a peruser of court notices, looking for the names of members opposite in those court notices, but I have not seen anything of late. However, I will check.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:33): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Does the government accept the view that sacking people in the education department will provide better support for principals?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:34): I thank the member for Ashford for her question. There was a survey released this week discussing factors that impact on principals' workloads, and there is no doubt that principals in our schools do have a challenging job. We want to ensure that they have the supports they need to get on with their very important work. Public servants help provide front-line support to our schools. They can include psychologists and speech pathologists who help our schoolchildren with difficulties. They include financial support officers who help to relieve the burden on our principals and teachers. Just over a month ago, on the issue of improving teacher performance, *The Advertiser* reported comments that the way to improve it was, again, to sack more teachers.

This government does not accept the proposition that any and every issue can be resolved by simply sacking more and more people. This government believes in investing in our schools and investing in our children. I think I recall the Prime Minister saying that money matters when it comes to education. However, now, of course, the federal government is refusing to honour the full six years of our signed Gonski agreement, with South Australian schools standing to lose \$335 million in just two years. That would assist our principals enormously.

Using the electorate of Fisher as an example, it looks like facing an indicative loss of more than \$5 million in funding, resources and support. That is for the schools in Fisher alone. Reynella East College will suffer the largest loss of \$2.1 million in two years for one school, for students and teachers and the principal at Reynella East College. Schools in southern Adelaide stand to lose \$45 million, or the equivalent of more than 500 SSOs.

The SPEAKER: Minister, the question was about sacking.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Yes, that's right, sir.

The SPEAKER: This is about cuts in expenditure which would lead to redundancies, not sackings.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, sir, this is about support for principals. What I am saying is that, when our principals are facing cuts to the tune of \$335 million, when one school in Fisher looks like losing \$2.1 million, that does not support the principals in our schools. What we have is the federal Liberal government dishonouring the Gonski agreement. This Liberal government is not standing up for—

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: I second your objection; namely, the relevance now. The question was very clear about a response to the sacking of bureaucrats and principals' autonomy; nothing to do with the assertions about what is happening—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Read your question.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader will be seated. I would ask the minister to respond to the question which is: does the government accept the view that sacking people in the education department will provide better support to principals? That is presumably the discretion to sack.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, sir, it is not the discretion to sack.

The SPEAKER: No?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: There are two proposals that have been flagged in *The Advertiser* by the member for Unley: that when teachers are underperforming we need to sack them; when principals have workload issues we sack the people who are employed to help them.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister has just revealed that the question is founded on an article in *The Advertiser* and I believe it is out of order to ask questions—

The SPEAKER: No, it would only be out of order to ask if the report in the media were true. Minister.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir. If I were asked that question my answer would be no, it is not true; that is not how you support principals. What you do is to have people to support the principals and do the work in our schools, and for them to be able to do that you have to fund them properly, and we have an opposition here that will not support—

The SPEAKER: No, minister, we are not interested—

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —our schools having the money they were promised.

The SPEAKER: Would the minister be seated. The minister is not responsible for the state opposition.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir: page 289 of *Erskine May* describes that it is not just asking whether something is true but asking a minister to comment on a report in the press is out of order.

The SPEAKER: The question did not ask the minister to comment.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister is called to order, and the deputy leader is warned for the first time. Member for Hammond.

MURRAY MOUTH

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:40): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Is the government going to allow recreational boating access whilst the Murray Mouth is being dredged?

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) (15:40): That's a good question from the member for Hammond. I would anticipate that there would be some level of boating restrictions around the works that are being undertaken during dredging operations, but the extent of those restrictions, whether it is complete or whether it is needing to give a number of metres of distance between recreational vessels and the dredging operations, I would have to check and come back to the house.

MURRAY MOUTH

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:40): Supplementary, sir: will the minister at least guarantee to the house that he will put in a safe passage for recreational boating so that Goolwa does not have to suffer from a relatively huge disaster like it did in the last millennium drought?

The SPEAKER: That is unfortunate that the member should frame the question that way. Does the minister care to respond?

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) (15:41): Not particularly, Mr Speaker, but I guess I could. I think there are two things in that—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned for the first time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: There are two things in that, Mr Speaker. One is the assumption that the only way to access the Coorong from up the river is from the Goolwa Barrage going past the Murray Mouth and, of course, that is not necessarily the case. Secondly, as I have said in my previous answer, I would have to check what the restrictions will be, whether that impacts—

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey.

SPORTS VOUCHERS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:41): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Why are the people in the electorate of Fisher being told on a Labor pamphlet that families will receive \$50 for each primary school aged child to help with the cost of sporting club fees when only one in four children are actually budgeted to be funded for the program?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I don't think the minister is responsible for what is on a Labor Party pamphlet.

The SPEAKER: The minister indicates that he wishes to answer. Minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:42): Thanks very much. I would love to answer it because we have answered this five or six times. The member for Chaffey is a very slow learner. People in primary schools who are going to be eligible for these things would understand it.

The SPEAKER: I will anticipate the point of order. I invite the minister to withdraw that.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I withdraw the 'slow learner' line, Mr Speaker. We have told the member for Chaffey time after time. This was an election commitment by this Labor government. We went to the election saying that we will give every primary school child who wants a \$50 voucher to be used towards offsetting the cost of club membership fees, \$50, and we stand by that guarantee.

SPORTS VOUCHERS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:43): Supplementary: minister, why did you budget \$7.7 million for the program when, in actual fact, if every child received \$50 it is about a \$30 million budget bottom line?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:43): Because we have done the analysis and not every primary school child—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No, everyone is eligible for it.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

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

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: We have done the analysis and we know that not every child will participate in club sport so, therefore, not every child will apply for a \$50 voucher. That is what our analysis is. And if everyone does—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned. Is the minister finished?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, sir.

SAFEWORK SA REGIONAL OFFICES

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:44): My question is now to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Minister, can you update the house on the future of regional SafeWork SA offices, particularly in Berri and Port Lincoln?

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) (15:44): I don't have that information with me off the top of my head. I do recognise it is an important question because, obviously, regional areas have as much interest in having safe workplaces as metropolitan areas do. The fact is that we are undertaking a number of measures at the moment in conjunction with the rollout of the new return-to-work legislation which will see enhanced—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Are you done? Are you finished? Good, thank you. It will see enhanced opportunities for there to be delivery of these services around the state and, in fact, the member for Chaffey might be interested to know—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I think it's spontaneous, but it's uncontrollable.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is a heartbeat away from departing the chamber.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The member for Chaffey may be interested to know that during our recent country cabinet visit I spent a bit of time in Port Lincoln, which I realise is not in the honourable member's electorate. I was talking to a number of the people there who are doing programs to improve safety in the workplace and who are very keen to be involved in the progress that is going to be rolled out over the next few months leading up to the introduction of the new return-to-work scheme in January.

The point I am trying to make with those answers is, first of all, as to your specific question about SafeWork SA, I will get you an answer on that, but I would like to make the point to the member for Chaffey and others that the role of having a safe workplace is a broader role than just SafeWork SA. It includes risk management, education and other functions, some of which are being delivered by other agencies.

In particular there is a tooling up going on within the Return to Work SA side of things to be able to use the mobile case managers that they will have visiting workplaces, some 130 or so of these people, including in regional South Australia. The idea is that those regional case managers, when they actually pay a visit to a workplace in order to assist an employer and an employee who have had an injury in that workplace, would also be able to deliver safe work messages there and provide training or at least assist in connecting that employer with the appropriate training so that that employer and their staff can provide a better, safer workplace.

SAFework SA REGIONAL OFFICES

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:47): Supplementary: going through the process to make that decision, was there a regional impact assessment study undertaken to make an assessment or a decision on whether they will close or remain open?

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) (15:47): I thank the honourable member for his question. The question that the honourable member is asking I am taking to be a reference specifically to SafeWork as opposed to the whole safe workplace process that I was trying to speak about. Again, that is a very particular question. I will get an answer about that as well because, as I am trying to explain, I think it is important for members to know. The member for Chaffey has asked this question and he is obviously interested in it and it is an important question. SafeWork SA provides a—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The SafeWork SA people provide a number of services, including, for example, the investigation of accidents and that sort of thing. The point I am trying to make is, if we are concerned about safe workplaces, which I know the member for Chaffey and all of us in this room are, I believe, then it is not just the inspectorate, if you like, that is part of that package; it is also the risk management messages that are going out to the workplaces and going to the workers, the fairly simple stuff you might think. For example, if you are working on a construction site then have the hard shoes on, have the hat on and have the protective glasses on—pretty basic stuff like that, but very important because, if people do not do that, you wind up with completely unnecessary injuries in the workplace.

I am just trying to make the point that it is a bigger proposition than simply the inspectorate, but I will take on board the questions that have been asked by the honourable member about the inspectorate part of it and I will endeavour to get an answer for him as quickly as possible.

POLICE CARS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:49): My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister confirm that the new, quite attractive, high visibility police car designs or wraps are being manufactured in Melbourne?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:49): I would like to thank the honourable member. I will need to get that detail for you.

ROAD SAFETY FUND

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:49): My question is to the Minister for Road Safety. Minister, what is the status of the expenditure of the Motor Accident Commission's Road Safety Fund?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:49): I would like to thank the honourable member for his question and also his obvious interest in road safety. As members would be aware, last year the Motor Accident Commission provided the government with \$100 million to be used for road safety infrastructure initiatives on our roads.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, the members opposite mock me, but when we announce roads in their electorate they are quite happy to join me for announcements. Members—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Members should also be aware of some of the major successes that have arisen from the \$100 million MAC funding, including the Britannia roundabout—

An honourable member: Hear, hear!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Hear, hear—and upgrades made to major intersections in their electorates. We are now seeing many of the projects announced in the first round come to fruition. Over the past few weeks, I have announced a variety of projects from money remaining in the fund. Today, I am pleased to inform the house that we are investing \$2.8 million to upgrade 12 intersections across the metropolitan area. The intersections to be upgraded are:

- North East Road-Grand Junction Road
- Woodville Road-Torrens Road
- West Lakes Boulevard-Frederick Road
- West Lakes Boulevard-Tapleys Hill Road
- Marion Road-Mooringe Avenue
- Grange Road-Frederick Road
- Montague Road-Belalie Road
- Montague Road-Reservoir Road-Ladywood Road
- Grand Junction Road-Valley Road
- Trimmer Parade-Frederick Road
- Panalatinga Road-Pimpala Road
- Findon Road-Trimmer Parade-Fife Street

The works will include controlling right-turn movements with green arrows, which has the potential to significantly reduce right-turn crashes. About half of serious casualty crashes that occur within the Adelaide metropolitan area occur at intersections, unfortunately. Between 2009 and 2013, there have been 89 crashes at these intersections resulting from right-hand turns, causing 12 serious and 77 minor injuries.

Even relatively minor changes to intersections such as these can drastically improve safety. This is an excellent investment in safety on our roads. \$2.4 million will be invested from the MAC's Road Safety Fund towards these projects, with an additional \$400,000 coming from the state government. We expect these works to be completed in 2015, weather permitting.

A large part of the Road Safety Fund investment is going towards improving roads in rural areas. We have recently begun work on a 94-kilometre stretch of the Augusta Highway between Port Wakefield and Crystal Brook. This \$3.5 million project is slated to wind up in April next year. Additionally, we are working on sightline improvements and entry points and exit points around Mambray Creek (between Port Pirie and Port Augusta) and Snowtown, at a cost of \$3.25 million.

In the south of the state, we are spending almost \$6 million on improvements to Main South Road and Victor Harbor Road. We will soon be starting shoulder sealing and guardrail installation on 16 kilometres of Gorge Road and Battunga Road, investing \$1.8 million towards that project.

We have also recently completed South Australia's first motorcycle-specific safety audit, analysing 200 kilometres of road sections for crash data over five years. From this, 14 sections of road in and around the Adelaide Hills and country areas were selected for a \$1.4 million investment. These improvements, which are upgrades to guardrails, will reduce the severity of crashes and save lives for motorcyclists. Mr Speaker, we heard—

The SPEAKER: Your time has expired. Member for Flinders.

HOSPITAL STAFF

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:53): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister advise why practice nurses in a town in the electorate of Flinders are currently on six-month contracts?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:54): No, I can't, but I am happy to find out and report back to the member for Flinders.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:54): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Had the proposed tenants for stage 1 of the ACP development at Gillman already expressed an interest to government in purchasing government-owned industrial land?

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: He knows what I'm talking about; you don't need to—

Mr Pederick: He knows.

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) (15:54): I know that I am frequently a disappointment to the member for Bragg, but on this occasion I will have to add to that because I am not sure I do know what she is talking about, but if she wishes to be a bit—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Very good, member for Schubert!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: The force is strong with this one.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The force is strong with this one, exactly.

The SPEAKER: I can hear a familiar voice behind the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, I think there's a hint, Mr Speaker, that if we are not careful the member for Schubert might be able to stand on his head and lift rocks at the same time. Getting back to the question, could you please explain that again? I am not sure I understand what you are talking about.

Ms CHAPMAN: Had the proposed tenants—

An honourable member: Time is up.

The SPEAKER: No, I'm curious. Deputy leader.

Ms CHAPMAN: Aren't we all? In respect of stage 1 of the ACP development at Gillman, had the proposed tenants under that arrangement in fact already expressed an interest to government in purchasing the government-owned industrial land?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I can suggest to the member, given the time, that I am happy to try to have a talk to her about it, but I don't understand what is meant by 'already'. I understand what the word means but, in the context of the question, I don't understand what it means, and 'the tenants', I'm not quite sure who the tenants are in the context of that.

Grievance Debate

STATE BUDGET

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:56): In our continuing series of grievances in this place about the waste and mismanagement of this Labor government, I thought I would take a bit of a trip down memory lane to some of the greatest hits this government has perpetrated on the people of South Australia. Indeed, I will be up-front: if the Treasurer is looking for some budget savings, I have \$1.968 billion worth of examples of waste and mismanagement in blowouts that this government has perpetrated on the people of South Australia over the last 12 years.

Can we start off at the top with the great Adelaide Oval and its \$66 million worth of blowouts. We could go on to any number of road projects—you can take your pick—but the Southern Expressway blew out by \$55 million, the Northern Expressway blew out by \$264 million,

the Port River bridges blew out by \$34 million, the Anzac Highway blew out by \$55 million and the Port-Grange Road blew out by \$123 million. Generally, when it comes to road infrastructure, you cannot trust this government to actually deliver something that it promises. When it gives you a figure up-front, basically you should squint a little bit then double it and maybe we will be getting somewhere close to the truth.

We can go on and talk about the blowouts in IT services. I know it is such an issue that even the Auditor-General took the time to write a supplementary report just to make sure that everybody knew what was going on when it comes to the \$54 million blowout in EPAS, the absolute debacle that is RISTEC, with about \$31 million or \$32 million worth of blowouts we have had there, and the \$5.2 million blowout in CASIS. When it comes to IT projects, you cannot trust this government to actually deliver what it promises.

Can I say that, as members of the opposition, we are sometimes strident in our wish to hold this government to account, so strident that some people may say that all we do is carp and whinge, but I have an example where the opposition had a great policy that we took to the 2010 election, and that was the upgrade of the Royal Adelaide Hospital on the current site at a total cost of \$750 million. We will have a beautiful new hospital, a beautiful big monolith. No doubt, there will be many ribbons cut—not for the fact, mind you, that it has an increase in beds—but we will cut those ribbons at an extra cost to the taxpayer of \$1.35 billion. That is an ego boost worth \$1.35 billion that this government perpetrates on the people of South Australia.

Over the course of my time in this place over the past eight months, it has amazed me to look at the litany of failures this government has perpetrated on the people of South Australia and the cost that has had to the budget. When the Treasurer comes in here and wants to talk with bleeding heart about getting this \$90 million a year he needs by getting rid of the remissions on the ESL levy, he really needs to go back and have a look at some of his own government's processes, and the waste that has existed within his government over such a long period of time, to understand how it is we got here. As part of the Labor government, he could have fixed these problems before we got here.

After 13 years, it is very difficult for them to stand here and blame anyone else because the proof is in the pudding. It has been a long and consistent failure, and there is such a long list of examples as we look back over the life of this government that we can point to that show why the budget is in such a mess, why they have had to increase taxes and go down the path of folly of trying to charge people a car park tax and decrease the ESL remissions, amongst a variety of other increases in taxes and charges. Then there is the \$100 million of overpayments that the people of South Australia have to spend on their water bills for a bunch of overinflated assets that this government has charged in a cynical move to prop up its otherwise disgusting budget.

It has been the most surprising thing that I have come into this place, which I would have thought was the pinnacle of management in South Australia, the pinnacle of fiscal responsibility—responsibility that this government has over \$16 billion a year of revenue—and I have been able to see that they have been able to waste so much of it, and it is all money that the hardworking taxpayers of South Australia have given them.

SPORT PARTICIPATION

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (16:01): I rise today to highlight the importance of sport and, in particular, junior sport to our communities and to society generally. Without doubt, sport teaches us many and varied lessons for life, especially in team sports. We may learn about the principles of discipline, decision-making and dedication, fitness, friendship and focus, reliability, resourcefulness and responsibility, camaraderie, cooperation and compromise.

Through participation in club and school sport from an early age, we can develop skills in leadership and hone many other talents that will stand us in good stead for the future. Sport also plays a big role in ensuring that our young people in particular are able to participate in positive, productive pastimes while forming friendships at the same time.

As our general population ages, and the impost on our health budget continues to grow as we live longer, sport plays a vital part in keeping our communities healthy. Prevention is always better than cure and, in an age in which Australians are becoming less active, we need to all be aware of

ways we can combat increasingly sedentary lifestyles. Our sporting clubs help to buck the trend on inactivity as they bring together people of all backgrounds and ages, abilities and fitness levels.

A love of sport also unites many Australians and many people around the world and provides a broader sense of community, something we have seldom seen so strongly as in the wake of the tragic death of cricketer Phillip Hughes. The outpouring of grief and the flow of tributes around the country and from across the world has been deeply moving and almost unprecedented. There has been an overwhelming oneness of spirit when it comes to recognising and remembering the life of this talented young man.

It brought together people from all walks of life, young and old, at the Adelaide Oval yesterday, where Phillip Hughes played with the Redbacks and the Adelaide Strikers. It brought them together to be part of the celebration of his life via a big screen as he was farewelled in his home town of Macksville. Junior cricketers around Australia retired last weekend with their score on 63, the same tally Phillip Hughes was on when he was accidentally struck by a ball which ultimately took his life. The usual mandatory junior cricket retirement tally was increased from the standard 50 runs in tribute.

There is also a story going around of one junior cricketer making 37 before walking off the pitch to retire. When asked why he did so, the young boy reportedly said, 'I finished his hundred for him.' Despite the sadness the sporting world has faced in past days—and we also think of the loved ones of the Israeli cricket umpire killed when he was hit by a ball just two days after Phil Hughes—the game will go on and the great benefits of sport will continue.

I am proud to be part of a government that understands and acknowledges the importance of sport in so many ways, including the Premier's Be Active challenge for our schoolchildren. The challenge is to do at least 60 minutes of physical activity on at least five days of the week for at least four weeks. I am really pleased that one of the schools in my electorate of Torrens, Hillcrest Primary School, will receive an award at the challenge's official ceremony tomorrow as a high achieving school. Congratulations to everyone involved at Hillcrest Primary School and at the other schools who have taken part in this initiative.

Sport not only provides benefits for highly talented or elite athletes in the making, but there are also development opportunities for people willing to be involved with coaching, umpiring or other volunteer roles. Today is an opportune time to mention the immense contribution of our volunteers to sporting clubs and, indeed, to the arts, community services, education, emergency services, recreation, health, tourism and the environment, among other areas. The reason is that tomorrow is International Volunteer Day, which was established by the United Nations General Assembly in 1985. The day gives volunteer groups and individuals the opportunity to raise awareness of their contributions to the economic and social development of their society.

It can be of great value in giving people skills for the workplace, it can be a stepping stone to a career change, or it give help with the all-important transition to retirement. While most volunteers receive no public recognition or awards, the time and talents they volunteer are essential to our society's basic fabric.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ECONOMY

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:06): I rise to speak on the state of our economy today and the burdensome regulations and start-up fees required of businesses in South Australia and to talk about a particular example called START-UP New York, a model that promotes start-up businesses overseas, which I recently came across. South Australia has the highest start-up fees you will find, Deputy Speaker, the highest payroll tax, the worst business confidence in Australia.

Small business is the highest employer in South Australia. It is part of an economy which is built on the success and failure of small business. The decline of our state's economy is symptomatic because of the struggle that these small businesses face. There is no doubt that this government has abrogated its responsibility, in my opinion, for growing our small business sector and our start-up sector by imposing onerous obligations, regulations and taxes (like payroll tax) on them.

In my discussions with business people in my electorate, I find that, instead of registering new businesses in South Australia, some of them are even thinking of registering them interstate.

Recently, I discovered one who registered in Victoria, bypassing the ridiculous hoops that a start-up business would have to go through here. Although these businesses initially conduct their business and employ people in South Australia, the problem has been that the poor business conditions that I have mentioned in South Australia effectively force these businesses to relocate to Victoria and other states where they are already registered, where business conditions are far less burdensome and where they actually encourage growth.

In order for our economy to get back on track and where it needs to be, the Leader of the Opposition outlined a number of policies prior to the last election to release businesses from the shackles of overregulation and fees. I would like to point out an example where the start-up community and start-up businesses have been given a fair go and flourished. It is in New York in the United States, where a model that has recently been implemented is working. It is called START-UP New York.

START-UP New York offers business start-ups a tax-free zone for new businesses in the established zones in New York. In some cases there are zero start-up fees for a business where it is conducted in a tax-free zone. The credit generated would eliminate any tax liability for a period of time. This encourages secure employment opportunities and gives greater impetus for retaining and employing staff as there is a greater credit within the model of that particular business. The result over there has been staggering. It has been a game changer for small businesses across New York, with businesses looking to start up and it has created hundreds of millions of dollars within the business sector already. There are lessons to be learnt from this example.

The New York example is about vibrancy, growth, jobs, organic growth and incentivising businesses—and this is how you do it. I encourage the government to have a look at this example. It is one of many examples which are being implemented right around the world and which this government could take heed from, and which the Labor Party could certainly learn a lot from. It is important that, with the decline of business confidence, deregulation in business start-ups and reduced taxation are looked at. There is a number of aggressive strategies the government could implement. Some of these aggressive strategies are needed to stop the mass exodus of small businesses from South Australia, which is as a result of government regulations.

Something like this is certainly needed at the moment for businesses to flourish in South Australia. If the state government ever wants to revive this economy—and it says it does—and be in a position over time to recover what is becoming our dwindling revenue, then helping the backbone of our economy—the small businesses of this great state—would be a good place to start.

I encourage the government to make bold decisions which allow businesses to thrive and to employ people. Look at the example I have provided. Help make our city more vibrant. I encourage them to talk to our federal colleagues because this is not something we can do alone—we will need help from our federal colleagues—and I would ask them to work together with them, to explore ways to inspire and incentivise businesses to actually want to come to Adelaide, to start in Adelaide, to grow in Adelaide and to create prosperity for South Australians in Adelaide. I encourage the South Australian government to look at the New York example and learn from it.

CHRISTMAS ADVERTISING STANDARDS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16:11): As of today there are 21 sleeps, 20 shopping days, and zero parliamentary sitting days until Christmas. I know that hundreds of thousands of South Australian children are very excited. They have lined the streets for the Christmas Pageant to see Father Christmas and they have been to visit him in the Magic Cave. But as well as visiting him, many children will write a letter to Santa, and I remember doing this when I was a kid.

For some years, Australia Post has run a wonderful service where children can write letters to Santa, and through their rapid airmail links to the North Pole postage service, all children receive a direct reply from Mr Claus himself. This is the work of just one organisation, and I know there are many others across the country getting into the Christmas spirit. On the face of it, we should be encouraged by another company which launched a new website this year. To quote its media release:

This festive season Mattel is helping to strengthen the Christmas spirit by encouraging children to create their Santa wish list online, through their new website Letter to Santa...Letter to Santa is here to keep this magic

thriving through the interactive website that allows children to select their favourite toys to be compiled into a letter to Santa.

Children can log on to this website yourlettertosanta.com.au, enter their name, age and sex—you can even enter an age as small as one month old on this website—then you are taken to a page to put together your wish list for Santa.

Kids are encouraged to select their favourite toy and place it on a conveyor belt to go into the 'processing tube'. They can then pick up to 15 toys; and shock horror, the brands of Barbie, Thomas the Tank Engine, Fisher Price and Hot Wheels—all marketed by the Mattel Corporation—are the ones available for selection by kids. No non-Mattel products are available. Once you have selected your 15 toys, you are then allowed the opportunity to order your toys through an email to your parent, and the kids can select their order of preference and which of the toys is their favourite. Once the letter is sent, the child receives a message direct from Santa saying:

Ho ho ho, gosh Rudolph, my mailbox gets full so quickly. So many children's letters to take back to the North Pole. I hope we have enough space in the sleigh. Oh, what's this? I see you've written me a letter. Did you choose the toys you want the most? Oh, I think you've been a good little boy. There may be something special for you under the tree this year, right Rudolph? Let's get back to work at the North Pole, Christmas is almost here!

At the same time the child's parent is sent an email stating:

Don't be late—see what your child would most love for Christmas now! [View letter now.](#)

Not only can the parents then see the list of Mattel products which have been selected by the child, but links are provided for parents to buy them direct from retailers. All this happens on a website with only a tiny Mattel logo in the corner and no ability to select toys other than Mattel products.

This website has been heavily promoted in recent weeks by the multinational toy maker in television advertising during children's viewing hours. When you are talking about four-year-old or five-year-old children there is a corporate responsibility to take every precaution to not take advantage of those children. In this website young children are informed that only Mattel products are available from Santa's sleigh this Christmas, when we all know that the limits to Christmas presents are as broad as your imagination. I think this website is like taking a child to the Magic Cave at David Jones but then telling them that they have to select a toy out of the David Jones catalogue and there is no other option.

In my view this is clearly misleading and deceptive conduct by Mattel against these children, to suggest that Santa stocks only Mattel products. It also makes things even tougher for parents; obviously it is a tough time of year for some families, and it does nothing to teach children the true meaning of Christmas. I think it is even more galling that Mattel promotes itself as one of the most ethical companies in the world, and their own global code of conduct states, 'We know that how we achieve success is just as important as the success itself,' and, 'We may not always be able to choose the challenges we face...but we do have a choice in how we make these decisions.'

Today I have written to the ACCC asking them to investigate this misleading and deceptive website for possible breaches of the Australian Consumer Law. However, I would encourage Mattel to stop being a Christmas grinch and to voluntarily show some good Christmas spirit and either remove this sneaky website or make it completely open for children to write letters to Santa without pushing Mattel products down their throats.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Whoa, let's hear it for Ken. Member for Morialta.

DEMENTIA

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:16): I was not sure whether that was a reflection on me, Deputy Speaker. This afternoon I am pleased to speak about the Morialta Dementia Friendly Communities Forum, which I was very proud to host in partnership with the Campbelltown City Council's Home and Community Care Program and Alzheimer's Australia SA on 25 November. A total of 148 members of our community came along to talk about how we can make our communities more dementia friendly.

In particular, I would like to acknowledge Melissa Fielke, the Home and Community Care (HACC) team leader from Campbelltown City Council, Deb Treherne, also from HACC, who is the

social options coordinator at Campbelltown City Council, Phil Saunders, the policy officer at Alzheimer's Australia SA, and Ian Gladstone, a consumer diagnosed with younger onset dementia. These people were of invaluable assistance in organising and presenting at the forum, and I commend them to other members of parliament who may be considering taking up the opportunity Alzheimer's Australia has presented to conduct similar forums. I would also like to acknowledge the shadow minister for health and ageing, the Hon. Stephen Wade MLC, who was in attendance at the forum and who greatly appreciated the opportunity to hear those presentations.

People living with dementia need to feel as if they still belong to their community, their social networks, their clubs, and, importantly, to feel that they have a role to play and a sense of purpose. A dementia-friendly community is one where the wider community is dementia aware. Education is important, and educating people in the community to better understand how they may help people they confront who may have dementia. A dementia-friendly community is one where we have reduced stigma and myths about dementia.

One of the comments, for example, that was made at the forum was about one of the myths regarding dementia. People do not understand that it is, in fact, fatal, and the comment was made, 'I don't think people would make so many jokes about me forgetting things if they knew that I was going to die from this condition.' It is the sort of thing that most people do not have a full understanding of, but by talking about it, by learning about it, and by actively seeking information about it we can all make that contribution to making our community more dementia friendly.

A dementia-friendly community is a place where what a person can do is the focus and not what they cannot do, where a person is not hidden away or ignored because people are ignorant or uncomfortable speaking to them, or dealing with them or helping them. One member of the community came along and asked a very simple question. He has been a carer for his wife, who has had dementia for a number of years now, and he was very emotional when he asked the experts on the panel, 'How do I respond when people ask me how my wife is? What am I supposed to say? They want to hear me say that she is okay or that she is getting better, but she is not getting better. Every day she gets worse. It is a degenerative condition and every day she gets worse.'

This fellow contributes an enormous amount to the community. He is a volunteer, he is a member of Rotary and a number of groups where I have come into contact with him before, and he just wanted some advice on how to do that. He had never really had the opportunity to do so in a forum like this before. This is not something that we like talking about; it is not something that people are comfortable talking about.

I encourage all members, for a start, if you know somebody whose partner or loved one has dementia, it is probably not the nice thing that it sounds like to ask, 'How are they doing?' every time you see them. You can ask how the carer is doing; that would be a good start, for anybody can help.

A dementia-friendly community is also a community where the physical environment enables people to get out and about safely and where support services are helpful and enabling. There are more than 332,000 Australians living with dementia, and we identified that apparently there are about 800 in Morialta. That will continue to grow—one person every six minutes and 170 people per week in South Australia with dementia alone.

At that 2½-hour forum, in addition to hearing the presentations and the expert information about dementia and the consumer perspective, which was incredibly well received, one key focus was that every person there—the 148 people who came along—was given the opportunity to just think of two ideas of their own about how to make our community in Morialta more dementia friendly. It was a wonderful exercise.

I have about a page and a half of notes these people came up with but with only 15 seconds left I am afraid I am not going to have time to read them into the *Hansard*, but I will be including them in my next newsletter so that everyone in the community can continue to contribute and make our community more dementia friendly, which will do an immeasurable amount of good for the thousands of South Australians who suffer from this condition.

Time expired.

PLAYFORD ALIVE LOCAL HEROES AWARDS

Mr GEE (Napier) (16:21): I rise today to speak about Playford Alive and the Local Heroes Awards which I attended last week. The Playford Alive project covers the areas of Davoren Park, Munno Para and Smithfield Plains in my electorate, and Andrews Farm and Penfield in the member for Taylor's electorate.

The project is delivering new and redeveloped homes to the local community, plus many jobs. Over the last year, a mix of fast-food outlets, a service station, childcare centre and gym have arrived in Munno Para. Next year we will see a new Woolworths supermarket and specialty shops, a church, new offices, restaurants, the Stretton Centre and the Playford Town Park. Playford Alive has always been much more than bricks and mortar. It is about the long-term economic and social sustainability of the Playford Alive area and the reinvigoration of the Peachey Belt community.

The Playford Alive Local Heroes Awards last week celebrated a small amount of the great work that local people and organisations contribute to our community through never-ending hard work and the selfless donation of their time to help others.

The night saw 17 awards presented across three categories: three Mayor's Youth awards, three Governor's awards and 10 Playford Alive awards, plus the minister's scholarship. The organisations to win awards included the Playford Aquatic Club and Habitat for Humanity. The Playford Aquatic Club won for the third consecutive year for their contribution to the Playford Alive community. Habitat for Humanity is an organisation that I have previously spoken about in this place. It does excellent work assisting people in my electorate to gain jobs and their own homes.

I will speak in detail about four individuals who won awards. Tim Wegner won the Best Learning to Employment Outcome Award. Tim was nominated by Mark Oliphant College. Tim left school at 16 to complete some short courses before re-engaging with school. Tim battled a range of personal issues but stayed focused on his goal of full-time employment. Tim completed a number of technical courses and is now completing a three-year fabrication apprenticeship.

Amy Everitt won the Best Work Experience Placement Award. She was nominated by Para West Adult Campus. Amy suffers from severe anxiety which interfered with her mainstream schooling. The Community Learning Centre at Para West enabled Amy to realise her goal of achieving her SACE career in child care. Working towards this, she completed the compulsory stage 1 subjects, her stage 2 research project and a certificate III in childcare. Amy organised work experience with four different employers who all said they would have employed her if she had full qualifications.

Dennis Jarmyn won the Playford Alive Achievement Award for Service to the Community. Dennis is a legend in the Playford area. He has headed the Playford Community Fund for more than 10 years. The fund provides food, furniture and financial support to disadvantaged families and victims of domestic violence across the Playford area. The commitment Dennis gives to the community and the passion he has for the north is unwavering.

Jacob Desmond won the Mayor's Youth Award, Positive Playford. Jacob is a star of the future. A swimmer with the Playford Aquatic Club, the 14 year old took out gold in the 100 metre backstroke and bronze in the 200 metre backstroke at the Australian Age Championships in Sydney earlier this year. Jacob is an affable young lad who is striving for the Australian team and, ultimately, the 2018 Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast.

Other award winners include the Elizabeth Riders Committee. This committee helps young people develop their skills on scooters, skateboards and bikes. David and Narelle Warner, Laura Brenton, Amber MacDonald, Liam Rodger, Joseph Petrizza, Ian Storay, T & J Constructions Pty Ltd, Tickets2Trade Civil Live Works Program and Christine Jacques-Dooland also were presented with awards on the night.

I will lastly speak about Laurie Partridge, who took out the Inspire Playford Award and the minister's scholarship, which will see her receive \$3,000 towards her future studies. Laurie is a young Aboriginal woman with two young children. She was nominated by Anglicare and is completing her SACE at Para West Adult Campus. She has undertaken certificates in hospitality and security operations to gain casual employment. Laurie has encouraged her two younger brothers to follow

her path back into education and is a participant in the HIPPY program to ensure a bright future for her children.

Bills

**ANANGU PITJANTJATJARA YANKUNYTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS (MISCELLANEOUS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 December 2014.)

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:27): I rise today to support the bill. It is fair to say that this current government has neglected the APY lands for more than 12 years, unfortunately. It has done nothing to solve the endemic problems and corruption in the APY lands and the problems with the APY Executive, and obviously there are problems there. I note that the APY has been through a period of dramatic instability over the past few years. Since 2010 alone, I am told, there have been seven different general managers up there. I understand the ICAC has requested access to the APY lands without the permission of the APY Executive in order to investigate claims of corruption, and that is an area that we need to look into.

To talk a little bit about the APY background and statistics, there are certainly a lot of statistics in the APY lands that the government cannot be proud of. In fact, they should be ashamed of them. Whilst regular statistics may not have been collated every day, in 2004 it was reported that 8.4 per cent of the population was addicted to petrol sniffing. Although I accept this figure has declined steadily from what it once was, it is absolutely shocking to read. For the year until late September 2014 in the Far North LSA, a very sparsely populated area of about 2,500 people, of which the APY lands make up a significant part, the police had recorded offences for the following: acts intended to cause injury, 811; sexual assault and related offences, 44; robbery and related offences, 13; serious criminal trespass, 486; theft and related offences, 770; and property damage and environmental issues, 1,035.

The Children in State Care Commission of Inquiry and Children on APY Lands Commission of Inquiry, delivered in 2008 by former Supreme Court judge Ted Mullighan, over six years ago, stated:

In short these are the problems of poor living conditions in the APY lands communities characterised by unemployment, substance abuse particularly petrol sniffing, inadequate housing capacity, low attendance at school, boredom and inadequate youth initiatives, high violence and crime, rubbish and lack of care for the communities and most notably great fears for personal safety and evidence of much protective wiring, bars and security.

That report actually stated in conclusion that any change to governance of communities on the lands be implemented promptly so as to reduce the extent of dysfunction and possible corruption in the communities.

This was a report done in 2008 and what has this government done since 2008? They have not done enough, it is fair to say. It is an utter disgrace that this report was delivered in 2008 and that the government was well aware of the problems that existed in the APY lands and the problems with its governance, but what have they done? They have done nothing about it. It is absolute hypocrisy. It is an absolute disgrace.

It is incredibly important that the ICAC not be impeded when they conduct an investigation into possible corruption in the APY lands. For all I know, it may have been alleged by certain groups that that may well be the case. It is incumbent upon this parliament and the ICAC to stamp out corruption wherever we find it but, for the case in point, they are there to stamp out corruption if it exists in the APY lands. It is extremely important that we bring these people to justice up there because the statistics speak for themselves.

I have drawn on crime statistics in the Far North LSA, and when you look at 2014 alone (and we are not even at the end of the year) in terms of the current rolling year they show: acts intended to cause injury, 828; sexual assault and related offences, 46; and property damage, over 1,000. It is just absolutely outrageous. I will certainly support this bill and I commend it to the house.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (16:31): I stand today to talk on a very difficult subject, that being Aboriginal affairs, and in particular the administration of the APY lands in the far north-west of our state. This is a complex issue to discuss, and in many ways I feel unqualified to be in the position of making decisions regarding Aboriginal determination. I have not been to the APY lands, although I do hope to go in the very near future, as I believe it is vital that members of the state's parliament and, as such, decision-makers for this state, should be as familiar and aware of what happens there as possible.

I am obviously not someone of Aboriginal descent or who necessarily has strong ties to Aboriginal people, but I am an elected member of this state's parliament and it would be a great disservice to the community who put me here if I were to ignore the situation in the APY lands and not stand up to make a statement on this matter. In fact, part of the problem with Aboriginal affairs in this state is that too many of our state leaders, and also the community at large, have their head in the sand and have had so for too long with regard to these issues.

Perhaps this situation has come about because our state's leaders possess the same level of nervousness that I have, feeling unqualified and poorly placed to interfere to make decisions to help to remedy long-term difficulties that have gripped the APY lands. Perhaps some of our leaders have become mesmerised by the do-gooding mirage of political correctness, kowtowing to that so-called political correctness while unspeakable crimes are committed behind closed doors. Perhaps the APY lands are just too far away, conveniently so, lulling us into self-deluded blindness about what is happening there and leaving us to concentrate on mythical middle Australia and what lovely things we can ply them with.

Every year, thousands of Australians, many of them our young people, travel overseas to volunteer in Third World nations, doing their bit to support the development of these countries. When I was 22, I travelled over to Uganda on one of these trips. At the time, I remember reflecting on the situation back home in South Australia and mentioning to the people I was travelling with that, from what I could gather, there was an equally diabolical situation of poverty, deprivation and even lawlessness within our state's borders.

I shared this with the group of Australians I was with and they were stunned. I am actually not sure that they believed me. I would go further and suggest that what has been going on in the APY lands for many years is worse than the painful deprivation that I witnessed in Africa. Somehow, it is made worse by the fact that it happens within a developed Western nation, and I think that is unforgivable.

Legislation of this nature is not ideal. It has been fast-tracked through parliament with the support of government and the opposition. As such, it has not undergone the rigorous analysis that it might otherwise benefit from. We saw the minor parties in the upper house vote against the bill partly on the ground that it had not undergone the appropriate analysis of the parliament, but one wonders if they have not become mired in the foolish notion of political correctness instead of actually working to achieve outcomes for Aboriginal South Australians.

There are lots of questions regarding how we got to this position and why South Australia has 3,000 people living on the APY lands in often abhorrent conditions. I do not want to dwell on those reasons today, apart from briefly to question the role of the minister and the bureaucracy. The minister is someone who has had a quite lot of struggles in my short time in this place. One could dismiss this as a run of bad luck, or perhaps it is incapacity or even a poor public administration sitting behind the minister. I would hazard a guess that it is a combination of all three.

I will not use my position in this place to bash public servants, but I will be a straight shooter when it comes to dysfunction, which I have personal experience of. As many people here know, I had an extensive career in the Public Service prior to my election, particularly within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, within which the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division was until quite recently.

I note that it has been moved to the Department of State Development. I also notice that the D has been dropped from the acronym, so now it reads AAR as opposed to AARD. I fear has something of a depressing onomatopoeic resonance because I know that during my time working the cabinet office if my colleagues or I ever had anything to do with this particular division we would

utter a sound that was similar to that acronym, AAR—a sound of pain and depression at the thought of having to be involved in this very difficult part of government. That is not a reflection on the public servants who work there; rather, it is a reflection on the inherent difficulties which confront this part of policymaking and the responsibility that this division within our state's Public Service has to carry.

My great worry is that the Aboriginal affairs component of the public sector has been deskilled and defunded in recent years and has in many ways lost its reason for being. I feel that at times it was not trusted to deliver what it should be delivering. Responsibility for Aboriginal affairs and delivering for Aboriginal South Australians was scattered to various departments across government, where central coordination was much more difficult to undertake.

It is not all bad in the APY lands. While I have said that I have not been there and hope to travel there soon, I understand this is a beautiful, unique part of South Australia, and I do look forward to going there. I have a friend who recently got a job working on the lands. I sent him a text message a short while ago, and he replied saying that he is having a really great time there, learning lots and building connections with the Aboriginal people. Tonight, they are holding a Christmas party in the community he lives in to connect with as many people as possible. He is really having a great time up there. He believes the APY lands have a huge amount to offer our state and he looks forward to having me there as his guest in the near future.

I have read the *Hansard* record of my colleagues' contributions in another place and listened with interest to the contributions of the leader, the deputy leader and the members for Morphett, Goyder, MacKillop, Flinders, Heysen and, today, the member for Hartley.

As the member for Goyder mentioned yesterday, I too ensured that I was in the chamber for the contribution made by the member for Morphett, who I regard as one of the few non-Aboriginal people I have come across who has a genuine connection and affinity with our state's Aboriginal people and who has worked tirelessly to improve the lives of South Australia's Aboriginal people. I would commend the member for Morphett's speech to anyone who wants to capture an insight into the challenges facing the APY lands. He outlined the issues perfectly and explained with both compassion and passion that this is not racist legislation, it is not discriminative legislation, it is not about land rights; rather, it is a sad but necessary action in an attempt to create a good governance structure for the APY lands—a governance structure which the people of the APY lands deserve.

The bill before us today has two components. The first component allows the ICAC commissioner to enter the APY lands without going through the usual permit seeking processes. This is a common-sense reform which will ensure that the commissioner has the agility to move in and out of the APY lands and undertake the investigations he believes are necessary. We are under the understanding that grave concerns exist around financial management on the APY lands, and the commissioner must have the ability to get in there and undertake appropriate investigations.

The other component of this bill is the addition of a clause which allows the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs the power to dismiss or suspend the APY Executive without stating why he has chosen to do so. The minister has said on a number of occasions that he will seek in the first instance not to act on this new power if the legislation is passed, but instead he will seek in the first instance to work alongside the existing APY Executive to try to improve the governance situation on the lands. I suspect, however, for better or worse, the minister will be activating this power in the coming months and seeking to remove the APY Executive.

I am pleased that the government has agreed to two important amendments which the opposition has proposed in another place. Firstly, we have sought to ensure that any administrator appointed in the future by the minister reports to the parliament, adding another level of important accountability to the situation. Secondly, we have inserted a sunset clause into the bill to ensure that the minister's new extraordinary power can be removed in the future. This is very necessary, especially given the unusual speed with which this bill has been rushed through the parliamentary process.

Despite our concerns, the opposition will support this government's legislation because we feel that, on balance, we need to present a bipartisan position in the face of the huge challenges facing our APY lands. Quite simply, something has to be done to give the approximately

3,000 residents who live in the lands a fighting chance to live healthy lifestyles with the opportunities that they deserve—the opportunities that most other South Australians take for granted.

We can no longer pretend that the APY lands are not there. The government, our parliament and our state need to wake up to what is in the north-west corner of our state, and we need to take action. Politics and concerns about the government's record in this area aside, as members of the South Australian parliament the least we can do is give our first peoples the best chance of getting ahead. There is no doubt in my mind that there is deep and unwieldy brokenness within the APY Executive, and the people who call the lands their home deserve better. That is why I will support this bill.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the minister speaks, she closes the debate, but before I call her I would like to acknowledge in the public gallery today the presence of a group of Anangu traditional owners who have travelled down to be with us today for the debate, and to also acknowledge Commissioner Khatija Thomas, Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement. Minister.

Bills

**ANANGU PITJANTJATJARA YANKUNYTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS (MISCELLANEOUS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (16:43): I thank members for their input to the discussion on this bill, some of which was extremely thoughtful and well considered. I note that there is general agreement in this place that there has been some instability involving the APY Executive Board for a considerable time. The APY Land Rights Act currently provides only limited powers to the minister to intervene in the governance and management of the APY.

These are all conditional on the minister first issuing a formal direction to the board, which the minister may do only in specified circumstances to take action to address a failure of the executive board of a prescribed kind, and the executive board then failing to comply with that direction. Only then can the minister suspend the board and appoint an administrator. The alternative is that which is before the chamber today, and that is to amend the act to add a discretionary ministerial power to suspend the executive board and then appoint an administrator.

I note that it is with heavy heart that the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has sought to introduce a further mechanism to intervene in the decision-making on the APY lands. This government stands by its belief that Aboriginal people must be empowered to make decisions that affect their lives. This is fundamental to the concept of self-determination, which must be built on a foundation of strong relationships, mutual respect and an open dialogue with Aboriginal peoples.

One aspect that often gets overlooked when self-determination is discussed is that of governance capacity and the importance of robust institutions. A strong administration is necessary if the APY is to operate as an institution that is effective and accountable to the communities it represents. The APY board, like many boards, has a great reliance on its administration. There are two positions that support the board with its statutory responsibilities, being the general manager and the director.

These roles provide an important gatekeeping function by determining what is passed on to the executive and providing independent assurance of financial and other matters. The board trusts and relies on these two roles. Indeed, all Anangu rely on these two positions to operate with independence and integrity, free from undue influences. This bill will add a discretionary power to the existing checks and balances available to safeguard the integrity of APY governance and its accountability to communities.

I note that the minister in the other place has commented more broadly on the way in which the system of governance operates on the lands. Anangu have a collective freehold interest in their land. The management of their land is overseen by a board which acts as a custodian for their interests, yet there are varying interests which remain unrepresented. This structure creates a void in which custodians can focus on their own interests and neglect those of the broader Anangu community.

This is particularly evident in relation to women's interests. The minister has said that he intends to introduce a broader package of reforms, in large part informed by the review conducted late last year and early this year into the governance of the lands. While much of the changes are yet to be settled, this government is determined that women will have a stronger say in the affairs of the lands. With that, I commend the bill to this house.

Bill read a second time.

Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. S.E. Close.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Ms CHAPMAN: When this matter was dealt with in the other place, the minister indicated that he had not visited the lands for over 12 months. My questions are: when did you last visit the lands; and, if you are aware, has any other minister of the government visited the lands in the last 12 months?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am advised that ministers have visited this year including, we think, the Minister for Health and the Minister for Police. I can obtain more detail for you, but we do not have that here.

Ms CHAPMAN: When the Minister for Police attended—and I am assuming it is the current minister for police—how long ago was that?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Because we do not have the details I will have to take that on notice.

Ms CHAPMAN: If you do not know when the Minister for Police visited the lands, and you have the senior adviser here from the department, could you inquire as to when the Minister for Police last visited?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Certainly, that is what I meant to say in 'taking it on notice'. We have had this discussion. She does not have the details here, and therefore I am taking it on notice.

Ms CHAPMAN: Irrespective of the date that he visited the lands in the last 12 months, what was the nature of the visit to the extent of inspection or consultation with police services on the lands?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Again, she does not have that detail. She is not privy to the details of the visits, and therefore I will have to take that on notice.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is the minister aware of any ministers' visits in the last 12 months? Perhaps I should confine it to since the election, because obviously you were not in cabinet prior to the election, so I will assume that you do not have knowledge prior to that. Have any of the issues of alleged dysfunction on the lands been raised at cabinet level about the basis upon which this request is now coming before us to pass this bill?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The member will be aware that I am unable to discuss anything relating to this bill that has been raised within cabinet. Chair, I seek your guidance on whether the ought to be discussing specific clauses.

The CHAIR: We are on clause 1.

Ms CHAPMAN: You see, minister, this has been canvassed in another place. There are a number of questions that remain unanswered about the specifics of what is allegedly dysfunctional in respect of the current governance on the lands. The minister—and you have repeated it—essentially says that there have been seven different general managers since 2010, and then there

is unspecified dysfunction. Further questioning in the other place does not provide us with any identified dysfunction other than that—what I can glean from it—there is apparently some financial dysfunction. Can you firstly tell us the nature of the actual dysfunction?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I better understand the context of the question, so I appreciate that. I understand that the minister has outlined the governance and probity problems involving the APY Executive Board, which have been ongoing for a considerable period. These are issues pertaining to expenditure, procurement, recruitment and salary allowance irregularities. They also relate to executive board payments and payments to spouses for travelling expenses.

The member for Morphett outlined in this place yesterday many recent events involving information from former general managers and staff of the APY. What is clear is that there is a series of allegations over a number of years from a number of people that suggest a pattern of decisions or actions by the executive board that affect the way the APY staff are able to operate, resulting in conflicts with staff, difficulties in operations and service delivery, and instability in the organisation as a whole. The minister has said that he cannot wait another three months for a bill to pass state parliament enabling him to change how the APY lands are administered.

Ms CHAPMAN: Certainly we have had the advantage of information that the member for Morphett shared with the house as to areas of concern that he understands former general managers and employees on the lands have raised, where they are the victims in the sense of intimidatory conduct and the like—to that extent. We are grateful for that, but we do not have anything from the government. So, if these things have occurred in respect of expenditure, procurement, recruitment and salary allowances, and expenses of the board, when were they first known to the government and what action has been taken?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I can only respond on the basis of the briefing I have been given which suggests that the minister has previously outlined these governance and probity problems. In terms of the timing, I will have to take that on notice.

Ms CHAPMAN: Under the act, section 11 provides for the minister to be able to give directions, and there were some directions detailed in the other place in letters of correspondence and responses. Some of the directions outlined by the minister largely related to financial matters and the matters referred to there, that is, a willingness to undertake and agree to do those things (or not do those things), and that is outlined in the correspondence that was read out in committee in the other place. If there has been a breach of any of those directions, are you aware whether there has been any action taken by the government to treat those matters as a breach of direction?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I think there are probably two aspects to the question and one relates to whether the existing powers are sufficient and then some question about actions that have previously been taken that may have proved inadequate. To address the question of the extent of existing powers, I am advised that the current powers of the minister to intervene are limited and take the form of power to direct specific action and only then in limited circumstances.

The current powers may be exercised only where certain failures of a specified kind have occurred on the part of the executive board or individual board members. The complexities of time involved in that process can be detrimental to the interests of the Anangu who depend on and deserve a stable and functioning government to represent their interests, and this is, I am advised, the position of the minister.

In terms, specifically, of trying to address the existing financial management issues, in 2012-13, the government arranged for KPMG to review the financial management systems. In 2013-14, we provided a once-off budget increase to assist in improving financial governance systems. In 2013, the government funded a full-time financial controller, and funding for this position has continued. In 2013-14, the government strengthened the APY funding agreement to require monthly budget variance reports.

I am advised that in late November 2014, the APY financial controller took the extraordinary step of contacting the minister directly and providing the minister with correspondence outlining his concerns about a range of concerns pertaining to the members of the board and administration staff.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, this is a letter from the financial controller. Is he or she still the financial controller in that role?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am advised they do hold the position but are currently on leave.

Ms CHAPMAN: Has the letter that went in November to the minister from the financial controller been tabled or made available at all for any of the parliament to consider this matter?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am advised that it has not been tabled.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is there any reason why that has not been presented, listing, presumably, the concerns in respect of the financial management?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I have no advice on the considerations that the minister gave, so I am unable to answer that question.

Ms CHAPMAN: I assume that, given the statement you have just read out, it formed the basis upon which the minister came rushing into the parliament to say, 'Look, I need broader powers.' That is a concern to me to this extent: there are very clear provisions in the act which set out, particularly on financial matters, about what is to occur. I am just going to ask a number of questions, and I appreciate you may not know, but they are matters which I think should be before this parliament in relation to what has occurred. The minister has, under section 17, the right and power to direct that members attend meetings. Has he done that in the last four years?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am advised that he has not.

Ms CHAPMAN: Section 12E makes provision for the entitlement for APY—that is the general populace as such, the corporation of which the entity is defined—to recover compensation from the executive board. Has there been any application for and/or payment of compensation made by the APY against the executive board in the last four years?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We do not have the answer to that question here.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it the case that the advisers that you do have here at this stage are not aware of any applications?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The person who is advising me is not aware of such an application, but I am happy to take it on notice for you.

Ms CHAPMAN: Under section 12F there is a code of conduct that the executive board is obliged to prepare. Has a code of conduct been prepared, and is there a current operating code of conduct?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am sorry, member for Bragg; would you mind repeating the question?

Ms CHAPMAN: Under section 12F of the act there is a provision, an obligation for the executive board to prepare, maintain and review a code of conduct. That is required to go through a certain process, including that it has to provide for a requirement that persons referred to—which is those members of the board and the directors of administration and the like—must not engage in bullying of, harassment of or threatening behaviour towards any Anangu or persons employed on the APY lands. My question is: is there a current code of conduct that is operational on the lands?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am advised that there is, yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: Under 12G there are obligations to develop and submit for ministerial approval, in respect of inspection and copies being available, a set of guidelines which have to be followed by the executive board and general manager. To your knowledge, is there a current operative set of guidelines that has followed that process?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: My adviser believes that to be the case, yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: Under 12H of the APY act there are prudential requirements in respect of certain activities. That is, the executive board must obtain and consider a report that addresses the prudential issues in respect of, largely, financial matters, but that they are also required to follow in the event that they want to approve a project that is likely to exceed 20 per cent of the approved

budget for the year. To your knowledge, has there been any prudential oversight of any projects of that nature in the last four years? If so, have they followed the required requirements?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We do not have that information here. We will have to take that on notice.

Ms CHAPMAN: Under division 4A of the act—and I suppose this is where it gets to the pointy end of the personnel who operate as employed officers on the lands and who are answerable to the board—there is a requirement that there be a director of administration and a general manager. We have heard a lot about the seven general managers who have come and gone. Is there a general manager currently on the lands at all?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Yes, there is an acting general manager who has been appointed by the board.

Ms CHAPMAN: So how long has the acting general manager been in place?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I understand since the board made the decision to terminate the previous general manager.

Ms CHAPMAN: How long is that? Six months, two years?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Since 15 October.

Ms CHAPMAN: So we have somebody since 15 October, a couple of months ago, who has been the acting person. We have had a letter sent in last month to the minister from the financial controller, who is still employed—apparently on leave at the moment but still employed—identifying some obviously significant financial deficiencies that are being alleged. The act also provides that there be a director of administration under 13B. Is there a current director of administration on the lands who is still operating?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Yes, there is.

Ms CHAPMAN: The director of administration is the same person, is it, as the acting general manager or financial controller?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: No, that person is not acting in that role.

Ms CHAPMAN: In addition to the board, at the moment we have a financial controller, an acting general manager and a director of administration, all of whom have lines of responsibility to the board but all of whom are paid and continuing in their work; is that the situation?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Yes, it is, assuming that the leave is paid leave for the financial controller, which I do not know.

Ms CHAPMAN: Apart from the financial controller, who sent a list of concerns to the minister last month—and you will check whether we can have a look at that—has any other correspondence or submissions been presented by the director or administrator or the acting general manager, and I appreciate they have only been there for a couple of months, confirming or corroborating the concerns raised by the financial controller?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I will have to take that on notice. I do not know the answer to that.

Ms CHAPMAN: Under the APY act, minister, under sections 13N and 13O there are principal processes that are to occur in the event that the minister is to intervene. At present, under section 13N the minister may direct the executive board to do a number of things if he is satisfied that:

- (a) the Executive Board has refused or failed to exercise, perform or discharge a power, function or duty under the Act or the constitution; and
- (b) the refusal or failure has resulted in, or will result in, a detriment to the Anangu generally, or a substantial section of Anangu.

Basically, any obligation that the executive board has got to do of any nature, financial or otherwise, and its refusal or failure has some detrimental effect—so it is pretty general—then the minister can direct the executive board to do things.

We have heard already, in the other place specifically, correspondence previously going from the minister to the board saying, 'I would like you to do or not do certain things,' and they have written back and indicated whether they will or will not do those things. As I say, it is very broad. I should also point out that, of course, under section 13O if the executive board refuses or fails to comply with any of those directions the minister has the power to ultimately suspend the executive board for such period as is gazetted essentially, and I am paraphrasing it but I think we do not need to go through all the detail of it.

What I do not understand, at this point, is that correspondence has gone previously when there have been concerns raised and they have, presumably, been sufficiently answered to have not acted. But, as late as last month, correspondence has gone from the financial controller. We do not know whether it was supported or otherwise by other senior people on the lands. It has been suggested that there has been some impropriety in some way.

I am only assuming at this point that the financial controller has raised financial matters because he or she has a specific task. If those concerns were in relation to prior conduct or a future threat to the finances in some way or access to moneys that are in line with the matters you pointed out—employment, salaries, allowances, procurement or expenditure—then the minister is in a position to set out what the executive board is to do or not do, as the minister has done in the past.

My question is: having got this information from the financial controller, was any request issued by the minister in the form of a direction to the executive board since that material was received from the financial controller?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am advised that, no, he has not issued a direction since he received that correspondence.

Ms CHAPMAN: Can we understand why that is the case? Why has there not been any instruction issued to the executive board when this material was presented from the financial controller?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: It is impossible for me to answer why a minister who is not here to answer for himself has made a decision, but it would seem to me to be logical to understand that his judgement is that this bill is required and that is why he has brought it forward. A number of the speeches on the other side were supportive and understanding of the necessity for this additional clause, for the additional power, so I regard that as a matter of judgement that has been made by people who have a better understanding of what has been occurring, or could occur.

Ms CHAPMAN: That may be so, and I have no doubt that our leader does not in any way want to have a situation where, if a minister says there is a circumstance of significant detriment to Anangu people, he in any way impedes the government from being able to operate to protect against that. That does not mean as a parliament we are not entitled to have some information from the minister about not just the nature of the concern.

I think you would agree, minister, that, if the problem is that there is some imminent risk to the financial security of the funds on the APY lands—and a lot of money goes in and out of these accounts and there has been a lot of discussion in the other place about very significant moneys coming in from cattle and, presumably, the management of feral camels and all sorts of other income opportunities they have there, so millions of dollars go through in the management of the lands—clearly, though, under the act, if it is just a financial matter, of course the most immediate direction from the minister would be that there is not to be approval for any funding without his approval or without having the financial controller or such other audit process that he thinks fit.

We already know, as is clearly in the act, there is an obligation under the codes of conduct for there to be no bullying or intimidation in respect of any person either on the lands or employed on the lands. It is very broad. I think the member for Morphett has been the most frank about concerns that he thinks are out there, namely, intimidation of those who may well be obliged or who have felt obliged in certain circumstances to have to comply with the demands of the APY board. That is the impression I am getting.

We have heard all this before. We have heard it all before from Ted Mullighan when representatives of his inquiry went to the APY lands and issues of intimidation were raised about why

it was that such a prolific amount of child abuse was happening on the lands and the women were saying, 'We can't report this.' The mothers, grandmothers and sisters and people who were worried about the children felt intimidated into silence. So we know it can happen, but it is just that we are being asked here to be blind to that detail which would clearly be sufficient, in my mind at least, to support some further intervention.

I am still at a loss as to why under the act there is not that provision because there are two very clear things. Firstly, there is a myriad of people who are managing the finances up there, or should be, and who have capacity to be able to resist unreasonable demands by a member or the whole of the board; and, secondly, we have very clear code of conduct obligations which you have told us are in place and which prohibit bullying or intimidatory conduct. So I am still completely in the dark as to what on earth is going on on the lands or have the confidence that the current minister is actually going to do anything about it because he has failed to even try, it seems to me, under the current law to effect that.

It may be that, ultimately, in passing this bill in the circumstance where the parliament is about to rise, we need to call on the Premier to appoint a new minister to make sure that this actually happens and to feel confident that there is actually going to be somebody there in charge who knows what they are doing and is prepared to do something about it—

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: —because that is the concern I have. If we pass this legislation today and rush it through the parliament because everyone is going away for the next three months and we are not going to be here to deal with it, then surely it is reasonable that we say to the Premier to put someone in charge who knows what they are doing or is prepared to have the courage to actually implement the terms of the act, especially as we are going to give them carte blanche under this provision.

The CHAIR: Is there a question because we do have other business we need to move to?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, my next question—

The CHAIR: No, that is the end of that. That was a statement, is there a question?

Ms CHAPMAN: The question is: who is the minister currently proposing to appoint as the administrator?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I think it is important to note that what this bill does is give the power to the minister to appoint an administrator. As the honourable member would know very well, an important element of natural justice is that ministers of the Crown should not prejudge what decision they may or may not make and should first provide others who may be affected with an opportunity to be heard about the proposed decision. I understand that the minister has said that he does not want to prejudge the situation and that he needs to make a considered determination about it.

The minister has said that he hopes that he will be able to work with the APY and the Anangu to actually get better governance administration of the lands. What the bill seeks to address is the design and architecture of a very important check and balance and that is the way in which the administrator can be appointed, so it is premature to be asking who might be appointed. The minister requires the capacity to do this as opposed to being about to make a decision.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

STOLEN GENERATIONS (COMPENSATION) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council with a message drawing the attention of the House of Assembly to clause 10 printed in erased type, which clause being a money clause cannot originate in the Legislative Council but which is deemed necessary to the bill. Read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT) BILL*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council does not insist on its amendments Nos 8, 10, 11 and 12, to which the House of Assembly has disagreed, and does not insist on its amendments Nos 5, 6, 9, 13, 14, 16 and 17, but has made amendments in lieu thereof and relevant to these amendments to which the House of Assembly has disagreed, as indicated in the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

Legislative Council's alternative amendment to its Amendments Nos. 5 and 6

Clause 98, page 36, lines 16 and 17—

Delete '(and no right of action will arise against a Minister or the State on account of that termination)' and substitute:

(but any such termination will not affect any right of action that a person may have against a Minister or the State on account of that termination)

Legislative Council's alternative amendment to its Amendment No. 9

Clause 119, page 40, after line 4—Insert:

(5a) Section 81—after subsection (2) insert:

(2a) For the purposes of conducting a review under this section, the Tribunal must not be constituted by a medical practitioner sitting alone.

Clause 122, page 41, after line 32—Insert:

(da) the constitution of the Tribunal must be consistent with the following requirements for an internal review in the following cases:

(i) in the case of an internal review that relates to an order of the Tribunal under section 16 or 29—the Tribunal must not be constituted by a medical practitioner sitting alone;

(ii) in the case of an internal review that relates to a review under section 81—the Tribunal must be constituted by 3 members;

Legislative Council's alternative amendment to its Amendments Nos. 13 and 14

Clause 181, page 57, lines 17 and 18—

Delete '(and no right of action will arise against a Minister or the State on account of that termination)' and substitute:

(but any such termination will not affect any right of action that a person may have against a Minister or the State on account of that termination)

Legislative Council's alternative amendment to its Amendments Nos. 16 and 17

Clause 203, page 65, lines 37 and 38—

Delete '(and no right of action will arise against a Minister or the State on account of that termination)' and substitute:

(but any such termination will not affect any right of action that a person may have against a Minister or the State on account of that termination)

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 5, 6, 9, 13, 14, 16 and 17 be no longer insisted upon and the amendments made in lieu thereof be agreed to.

I will be brief about this matter. I would like to just say that it is the government's intention to accept the amendments that have been brought to this place from the Legislative Council. Although not absolutely perfect from everyone's point of view, they are nevertheless capable of being lived with. I would like to thank those people who have been involved. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the great work done by SACAT president Justice Greg Parker, Judge Susan Cole and registrar Clare Byrt. The support of the administrative law community in South Australia has been very much appreciated for this very important initiative.

I would also like to place on the record my appreciation to my personal staff who have worked very hard on this matter, particularly Will Evans and Kim Eldridge, who have done a great job, and also the people in Legislative Services—there are many of them; I will not name them all—who have done a great job. I think this might be a first, but can I acknowledge the constructive role played by the member for Bragg in having overcome some difficulties, and the Leader of the Opposition for being very cooperative and assisting matters to move in a positive direction. As I said, I do appreciate their assistance.

Ms CHAPMAN: I thank the great crucible of compromise, the Legislative Council, for their contribution, and what appears to be at least some acquiescence of that by the Attorney. There have been some matters of principle to be resolved. I will just conclude by saying that I have already thanked a number of people who have dealt with the establishment of this court. I wish it well, and I hope that the new court will provide an affordable and accessible alternative, and that Judge Parker and others who have been recognised do well in providing that access to justice for South Australians. It is an important initiative. It has taken a bit of a gestation period. As to the question of cessation of terms, a compromise has been reached and I am appreciative of it. We will let others deal with the legacies of those disputes.

Motion carried.

ANANGU PITJANTJATJARA YANKUNYTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 1.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am almost finished on this. I am sure that the leader has some very important questions on this question of what happens next, if the bill is passed. I think what you have said is that the minister has not decided yet who is going to be appointed. There will be a process and consultation about who should be appointed before that decision is made. Is it the intention of the minister that the opposition will be consulted in respect of the appointment of a new administrator?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am unable to bind my colleague minister. I think it is a reasonable request to make, and I will convey that to him, but I want to just be very clear that the minister has not said that he will move immediately to appoint an administrator. It is very important that he be allowed to have due consideration, having the power to do so.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it intended then that there is going to be some advertising for a position, if he does decide on the information that is so pressing that we have to pass this legislation? I am getting an inconsistent message, minister. We are being asked to rush this through the parliament so that it gives him a chance in the next three months to take steps, including the appointment of an administrator, and now you are saying to us that he has not really decided that he is necessarily going to do that. What is the situation here? What is he actually going to be doing?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I think it is important to note that having the power to do something changes the dynamic regardless, but he has indicated that he will take this under consideration as soon as he has the power and work through a process in an appropriate way. Whether the opposition is part of that consultation, I cannot bind him, as I say, but I am prepared to convey that I think that is a reasonable proposition.

Mr MARSHALL: Just on this same topic, has the government had discussions with any person or persons regarding taking up this role?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Not to the knowledge of the people advising me here.

Mr MARSHALL: There has been some confusion in the other place as to whether or not the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement has been consulted. Could you clarify whether the commissioner has been consulted regarding this amendment bill?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The advisers here are unaware if that consultation has occurred. I think the minister may have said that it had not in the other place, but I have not read *Hansard* sufficiently clearly to be confident of that. Our knowledge is limited, and we would have to take that under advice.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the minister provide any explanation as to why the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement would not be consulted? Is there any situation in which it would be appropriate not to consult with the commissioner expressly commissioned to engage on Aboriginal affairs in South Australia?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: That is a position that you have put. Because I do not have the advice on whether or not that has occurred, it is difficult for me to answer that question.

Mr MARSHALL: I would suggest we need to clarify this because there have been serious allegations made in the other place today as to whether or not the minister has consulted with the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement. I am happy for you to send one of your advisers to ask the minister so that we can get this clarified, because we will not be passing this until we get an answer.

The CHAIR: Are you indicating that you are not sending a messenger?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: No; I have advisers here and they are unable to advise me, so I do not have an answer. I can take it on notice for you, and I think we should just proceed with the committee stage.

Mr MARSHALL: I am happy to continue with other questions, but I advise that we will not be passing this unless we get an answer to this important question. We would like to know whether or not there was engagement. We do not want these wishy-washy answers that continue to be presented to us with the government's hopeless mismanagement of this bill before the house. They need to treat the house with respect.

We have given our best undertaking to work with the government but, to date, we have had no straight answer. There have been very serious allegations today in the other place regarding this matter and we would like it determined. I suggest that we get an answer as soon as possible. I will proceed with another question on the same clause. Can the minister advise whether the meeting held between minister Hunter and members of the APY Executive on 21 November was the last meeting that was held with the APY?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Yes.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the minister confirm that at this meeting he informed the APY Executive that he would choose the next APY general manager and that he wanted the APY Executive to agree with him?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I would have to take that on notice. I am not the minister, clearly, so I would have to take it on notice to ask him to provide you with information about that.

Mr MARSHALL: Can you advise, minister, who accompanied the minister at this meeting?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I understand these questions were asked in the other place and therefore the answers ought to be a matter of record or being obtained for you. I am unable to answer for myself.

The CHAIR: Shall I put clause 1, which is just the title?

Mr MARSHALL: No.

The CHAIR: You do not even want the title?

Ms CHAPMAN: It is just that there are only three or four clauses on this issue, and then there are the ICAC issues.

The CHAIR: Leader.

Mr MARSHALL: Is the minister seriously suggesting to this committee that she is not going to tell us who accompanied the minister to the meeting with the APY Executive on 21 November?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Given that that question has been asked in the other place of the person who attended, then I think that should be sufficient.

Mr MARSHALL: Sorry, but we do not all sit around reading *Hansard* from the other place on a continuous basis. We are asked to consider this matter here today as presented and we are doing that. We would like to know who attended that meeting with the minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I have taken that on notice.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On that same clause, on page 7 in his draft report to Mr George Kenmore, the conciliator reported that, when Mr McCarthy raised issues about financial management and compliance with the act, he had not seen a report that was done by a Mr O'Shea into compliance with the act. I said yesterday in the house that I actually have a copy of that report and in that report there are 110 line items. Some 52 line items—47 per cent—were in compliance, 46 per cent were noncompliant and 12 per cent were opportunities for improvement, so for over 50 per cent of the particular items that were examined by this auditor, the APY were actually in breach of the act. Has the minister seen this report and, if not, why not?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Can I just clarify whether you mean me as minister or the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs?

Dr McFETRIDGE: Can you say that again?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: You just asked if the minister had seen something and I was checking whether you meant me or the minister in the other place.

Dr McFETRIDGE: The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, obviously.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: My adviser is unable to say whether the minister has seen either report. We are a little unclear about whether you are asking about the Niemann or the O'Shea, but she is unclear whether the minister has seen either. I am unable to speak to that.

Mr MARSHALL: Chair, I have checked *Hansard* from the debate, which was held in the other place on Tuesday evening. The question was asked, but it is not clear who attended that meeting, so we do not have any clarity. I ask the minister again: who attended that meeting and was Nerida Saunders at that meeting?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I have taken that on notice.

Ms CHAPMAN: In respect of the meeting on 24 November 2014, which the minister attended with the APY Executive, is it correct that the minister said that he was going to draft legislation to change the APY structure and that he would introduce it next year?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I can ask the minister what he said at that executive meeting, but I do not have that knowledge.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

Ms CHAPMAN: Under the act, permits are required for anyone who wishes to go on the lands. It is all consistent with the original legislation obviously to give some autonomy and the right to enter. Given that there are not fences all the way around this—it is not like a small property—it needs to be respected so that people do not enter without permission. That is done by a permit system. Certain persons are exempt; one example is members of parliament, with an accompanying person), and police are on that list. This amendment proposes that it also applies to the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, an examiner, or an investigator performing a function of ICAC.

We have heard already from the minister that there are matters that may be referred to ICAC arising in some way out of events on the lands; I do not need to go into the detail. The ICAC commissioner has indicated that, if he is to attend, this clause is necessary for the purposes of undertaking his inspection, interviews, confiscation of documents, whatever.

Under this schedule, we already have police officers who are exempt; in fact, we have already heard the Premier tell us proudly that under his watch there are permanent police officers on the lands. Have any of the issues, which are yet undefined but which are the basis of this legislation that has come to us for urgent review so that the minister can intervene, been reported to the police either visiting on the lands or on the lands?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The advice is that the information from police is that they make no comment about information that they have or have not received from their investigations.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am not asking, minister, whether the police make any comment. I am asking whether the minister, or any representative of the minister, to his knowledge has reported these matters to the police, not whether the police have done anything about it or what actions have been taken, just whether there have been any reports of alleged misbehaviour in some way.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: My advice is, no, there has not.

Ms CHAPMAN: In relation to the question of what can currently be referred to the ICAC, which is everything from misconduct across to corruption, in respect of any matters that are in that category where there is a suspected criminal offence have any matters been referred to the Director of Public Prosecutions?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Sorry, I was listening to two things at once. What was the last bit of your question about who has gone?

Ms CHAPMAN: In respect of any matters from misconduct across to corruption, obviously where there is a suspected criminal offence, have any of those matters which are in the category of circumstances or events that we do not know about, which are undisclosed but somewhere there weighing on the minister's mind, have any of those matters been referred to the Director of Public Prosecutions?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: No, they have not.

Ms CHAPMAN: To your knowledge, have any of these events or circumstances been referred to the Office for Public Integrity?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: As you are aware, I am unable to comment about anything relating to references to the Office for Public Integrity.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it your understanding, minister, that although this clause is desirous to enable the commissioner himself to attend—someone who is not a police officer—for him to be able to attend this clause would have to go through, but at present police officers are already able to access the lands without a permit?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: That is correct.

Ms CHAPMAN: If any of the officers who currently work for ICAC are commissioned and operating police officers, they could already attend the lands; is that correct?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I presume, without being in detailed possession of knowledge of the act, that that must be true. The advice I have just been given, which may or may not add anything to what the honourable member already knows, in reference to the meeting with the APY representatives on 21 November—and I am reading from *Hansard* in the other place—the meeting included the majority of APY Executive members, including Mr Singer, Mr Adamson, Mr George, Mr Baker, Mr Pompey, Mr Tjami, Mr Graham Harbord and Ms Lesley Johns, and it was in his office. I suspect that did not go to the question you asked.

Mr MARSHALL: My question is: will you be providing that information today? Given the fact that the government whip has actually just spoken to somebody who is alleged to be have been at the meeting, and you are sitting next to someone who is alleged to have been at the meeting, are you genuinely saying to this committee, are you genuinely treating this committee with such disrespect, that you will not answer a simple question that is put to you?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am not in possession of any information that I am not conveying. The advice, in seeking an answer to your question, is that I have been directed to that in *Hansard*. Otherwise, as I said, I have taken it on notice.

Mr MARSHALL: What about the question of whether the minister had actually consulted with the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, as a commitment that that would be sorted out?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Similarly, I was directed to a piece—and I have just lost that place now. As I understand it, the minister was asked that last night and said 'No, I have not,' as an answer. I understood it was the case that he had said that on *Hansard* yesterday.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (17:46): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that seconded?

An honourable member: Yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: For the question say aye, against say no. The ayes have it.
Mr Clerk.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I put it and no-one said anything. Now I am asking Mr Clerk to read it a third time.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you speak at this point it is only about changes to the bill, and there have been no changes in committee.

Mr Marshall: There were amendments, actually.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I did put the question.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did put the question. There is no dissent to that.

Ms CHAPMAN: Deputy Speaker, you may have put the question but it has not been read a third time at this point. The Clerk is about to do that—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No; the minister has moved that it be read a third time and I have put the question.

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, and we are about to speak on that question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And I just said that it has been put. In any case, if you had a question it would only be about changes in committee and there were none, so I am not sure how much you want to say.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No; I have accepted that. I am trying to be as helpful as I can by reminding you that you can only comment on changes within committee and that there were none, so there would be very little you could say at this point.

Ms CHAPMAN: There were a number of amendments that were made in the bill that came to us—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is my advice. Irrespective of the fact that I have already put it and, in trying to be accommodating to you, because there were no changes within committee and you must confine your remarks, at this point, to changes in committee, there would be very little you could say at this point.

Mr MARSHALL: With respect, what was the Attorney-General doing with his third reading speech just 10 minutes ago regarding the SACAT amendment bill?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: At that point we had not put it. We have put this.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am advised that that was a different perspective. Irrespective of all that, the question was put and that is an end to it, as far as I know.

Ms Chapman: That's quite disgraceful.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not see you standing. It all happened, and that is the end.

Ms CHAPMAN: With respect, Deputy Speaker, my understanding is that you put that the bill be read a third time and the leader rose to speak on that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. I think *Hansard* will show that I said, 'Those in favour say aye, against no; the ayes have it,' as it was my understanding that we were going through.

Mr Marshall: Maybe we should check with *Hansard*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That may be the case, but we will continue in the meantime. Mr Clerk.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION (PRESCRIBED DRUG OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Clause 20—Delete the clause

No. 2. Clause 21, page 9, lines 29 to 31—Delete clause 21 and substitute:

21—Amendment of section 209—Credits to the Victims of Crime Fund

(1) Section 209(1)—after 'Subject to' insert:

subsection (1a) and

(2) Section 209—after subsection (1) insert:

(1a) The Attorney-General must ensure that in each financial year an amount equal to 50% of the proceeds of confiscated assets of prescribed drug offenders for the preceding financial year is, instead of being paid into the Victims of Crime Fund under subsection (1), applied as additional government funding for drug rehabilitation programs (and such money may be applied without further appropriation than this subsection).

No. 3. Clause 22—Delete the clause

No. 4. New clause, page 11, after line 4—Insert:

24—Review of Act

(1) The Attorney-General must, within 3 years after the commencement of this Act, undertake a review of the amendments to the Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005 enacted by this Act.

(2) The Attorney-General must cause a report on the outcome of the review to be tabled in both Houses of Parliament within 12 sitting days after its completion.

**PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (ELECTORAL LAWS AND PRACTICES COMMITTEE)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Long title—Delete ' and to make a related amendment to the Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1990'

No. 2. Clause 2, page 2, line 6—Delete line 6 and substitute:

- (1) This Act will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation (which may not be a day that falls before the prescribed report has been presented to each House of Parliament).
- (2) Section 7(5) of the Acts Interpretation Act 1915 does not apply to this Act or a provision of this Act.
- (3) In this section—

prescribed report means the report prepared by a commission of inquiry established by the Parliament to inquire into and report on electoral reform that would ensure that the political party (or coalition) that receives the majority of the State-wide vote at a general election of members of the House of Assembly is elected in sufficient numbers to enable that party (or coalition) to form a government.

No. 3. New clauses, page 3, after line 1—Insert:

3A—Amendment of section 15E—Membership of Committee

Section 15E—after subsection (2) insert:

- (2a) A Minister of the Crown is not eligible for appointment to the Committee.

3B—Amendment of section 15H—Membership of Committee

Section 15H—after subsection (1) insert:

- (1a) A Minister of the Crown is not eligible for appointment to the Committee.

No. 4. Clause 4, page 3, after line 34 [clause 4, inserted section 15Q]—Insert:

- (2a) The members of the Committee are not entitled to remuneration for their work as members of the Committee.

No. 5. Clause 4, page 4, lines 17 to 19 [clause 4, inserted section 15R(a)(iii)]—

Delete 'the Minister responsible for the administration of the Electoral Act 1985' and substitute:
resolution of either House of Parliament

No. 6. Clause 4, page 4, lines 21 and 22 [clause 4, inserted section 15R(b)]—

Delete 'or by resolution of either House of Parliament'

No. 7. New clause, page 4, after line 22—Insert:

4A—Transitional provision

A member of either or both of the following Committees under the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 who is a Minister of the Crown ceases to hold office as a member of the Committee or Committees on the commencement of this section:

- (a) the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation;
- (b) the Statutory Officers Committee.

No. 8. Schedule 1, page 4, lines 23 to 29—Delete the Schedule

Adjournment Debate

VALEDICTORIES

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (17:51): On behalf of

the government can I thank all of those who have worked so hard behind the scenes to make the parliament function. First, can I thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and of course the Speaker for presiding over the house. I thank the Acting Clerk and the Acting Deputy Clerk, Paul Collett, and of course the table staff who keep everything working here.

I also thank the catering staff and other staff at Parliament House for everything they do every year to keep this such a well-functioning and splendid place to work. I would like to also thank and pass on my best Christmas wishes to the Leader of the Opposition and to the opposition members of the house on behalf of the government.

I would like to particularly point out and thank our whip and deputy whip for the incredibly hard work that they both do on behalf of the government to make sure that we rarely lose a vote in the house. That is, of course, so very important. Of course, I thank the staff in the whip's office, Carol and Wendy, for the great work that they do on behalf of the government. I also thank my parliamentary adviser, Corey Harris—the ever-efficient Corey.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: He is always cheerful, yes, indeed. I thank him for the great work that he does. I wish all members a very safe and merry Christmas and I look forward to being back here in February 2015. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (17:53): I would also like to make some final valedictory remarks for this year, and wish all members of this house all the very best for a happy Christmas and a successful new year.

I would like to thank the staff who work in Parliament House. They are very hardworking people. In particular, I would like to acknowledge David Woolman, the building services manager, and Liz Lynch, his lovely assistant, who look after the building services extremely well. It is a privilege to work in this house but it is only a privilege because it is kept in such good order. We have been particularly pleased to be able to have Old Parliament House back this year, and what a splendid job they have done.

Thanks from this side of the house to the catering staff led by Creon Grantham and James Nicholas and to their entire team for the outstanding level of service provided to members but, most importantly, to the guests and dignitaries who visit this house. I think that is something we can feel very proud of. Thanks also to the finance staff.

To Philip Spencer, the Leader of Hansard, and his entire team who work extraordinarily hard. I do not know how they do their job. Listening to some of the speeches, I do not know why they do their job, either: but, there you go. They must enjoy it. They must have lots of chats back in their room after they leave here, thinking, 'Did you hear that load of—'. Anyway, I will not go there, but I do sincerely thank the team from Hansard for the excellent work they do.

To the entire House of Assembly staff, led by, of course, on this side of the house, the Acting Clerk Rick Crump, who does an outstanding job, and we are very grateful to him and to his entire team, including Paul Collett, who is his great assistant.

I would like to specifically acknowledge this year someone in the other place. We do not normally do that but I think this year is an extraordinary year where we acknowledge 50 years of service from Jan Davis. What an outstanding service. I said yesterday when we met in the Balcony Room that it was not just the quantity of her service but the quality of her service as well over those 50 years. She started here when Tom Playford was the premier of South Australia, some time before I was born.

The library is ably led, of course, by Dr John Weste, and we congratulate him on his elevation to Director of Library Services in this place; and, of course, PNSG who keep everything else operating.

This year we have seen some departures from this house and, in particular, I would like to acknowledge the service of Iain Evans to this place—21 years of continuous service. It is an outstanding record. He should be commended for the wonderful work he has done. Of course, this

year we also acknowledged the sad passing of the late Dr Bob Such, who contributed in this house for 25 years. He will be sorely missed.

This year has been an interesting year. There have been some highs and some lows, I must say, for people on this side of the house. We were very pleased to participate as effectively as we possibly could in the passage of the return to work legislation. This is important, long overdue work for South Australia. We were particularly pleased to participate in the debates regarding the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal—again, long overdue reform for this state—and we are grateful that the government has accepted some of our important amendments to that overarching umbrella legislation.

One of the disappointments this year, of course, was the government failing to really work with the opposition effectively to establish a commissioner for children and young people. That is a real disappointment. That is a real wasted opportunity. We need to do so much more in the area of child protection and it is incumbent upon every single person in this house not to play politics with child protection. We should have had that through. The government committed to getting it through before the end of last year, before the end of November 2013, and, of course, here we are in December 2014 and we have prorogued. It is extremely disappointing. The minister in that area should hang her head in shame.

It was also shameful last night in the other place. The opposition moved the Stolen Generations (Compensation) Bill. This is long overdue legislation in South Australia. It was first talked about by the Hon. Tammy Franks in the other place. At the time the Legislative Council moved consideration of this off to the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, they undertook a body of work and I think came up with a very good analysis of the Tasmanian model. The government chose not to take it up. We on this side of the house decided that it was extraordinarily important to bring that legislation to the house.

I must say it was a very sad moment for this parliament when we really were treated with complete and utter disrespect, and I think Aboriginal people in South Australia were treated with complete and utter disrespect, with regard to that legislation. The government did not consult and did not participate in the committee stage and, in fact, the minister was not even present in the chamber for the consideration.

The low point for this entire year, surely, comes with the passage of this bill today, the APY amendment bill. I think the government's handling of this is nothing short of disgraceful. Today we asked reasonable questions and we could not even get an answer as to whether or not the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement in South Australia had even been consulted.

I note that the minister has been castigated by his colleagues in the other place and today a no-confidence motion was passed in this minister. That is the second no-confidence motion passed in this minister this year. I understand that before this there had only been three successful no-confidence motions in a 20-year period in the other place. We have had two of them this year against the same minister, and I just put it to this parliament that we need ministers who are hardworking and who have the best interests of their portfolio in mind. If they are not prepared to do the work then they should get out of the way and let somebody who has the right motivation take over important portfolios.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. J.J. Snelling.

Mr MARSHALL: To my side of the house, I thank my team for their continued support of me as their leader. I thank my hardworking deputy, Vickie Chapman, and I thank John Gardner, the member for Morialta who is the whip. The whip is an extraordinarily important person and he does an extraordinarily good job.

I am not going to single out other people. I will say thank you very much to the shadow cabinet for their hard work. We meet weekly and there is a lot of important work to do, but I think the great joy for me this year is the new members who have joined our team. The member for Schubert—who thought somebody could take over from the previous member for Schubert—has hit the ground running. The member for Hartley is doing an outstanding job. I thank the member for Mount Gambier

for his hard work, especially when dealing with difficult issues regarding unconventional gas in his area.

I also thank the member for Mitchell and acknowledge his great start to the year as he is already into the shadow cabinet and, of course, the member for Bright who is the deputy whip. I think he has the great honour of being one of the first new MPs, on this side of the house anyway, to go directly onto the Economic and Finance Committee, one of the most prestigious standing committees of this parliament.

They have all made a great start and it gives us great hope for the future of this parliament. I think it is an important job to come into parliament and to work diligently to advance the cause of South Australia and with these five new people who have come in on this side I know that each and every one of them has the right motivation, and that augurs well for this place.

The only thing I wish to do now is to thank the Speaker, of course, for his fair rulings throughout the entire year, and you, Deputy Speaker, for your work as the committee chair, and to wish all members on both sides a very merry Christmas and a happy new year.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (18:03): Hear, hear! It is my privilege, as I am in the chair at the moment, to thank all members for their remarks this afternoon and their goodwill in my time in the chair since my appointment as Deputy Speaker.

In concurrence with the leader I would like to thank all our parliamentary colleagues for all their good and diligent work throughout the year in progressing the work of the state and the government, and to also acknowledge all our colleagues who work within the building and thank them for all they do to support us in our work. I am sure all of us will return to our electorates and enjoy all the school graduation ceremonies, music evenings and carols nights in the final week of school. We all want to be able to return safely to this place in February after our holiday and continue again the work of the state.

At 18:04 the house adjourned until Tuesday 10 February 2015 at 11:00.

*Estimates Replies***EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY**

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (23 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:

1. 22,389 Seniors Card holders received an emergency services levy (ESL) rebate in the 2013-14 financial year.