

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5 May 2015

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

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (11:01): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to give notices of motion forthwith.

The SPEAKER: There not being an absolute majority present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of clarification.

The SPEAKER: It is a point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes. I refer to the report of the Coroner of 9 April 2015 and inquire of you, sir, whether you have received, pursuant to his recommendations, a report from the Attorney-General as the minister for children's reform, and child protection reform in particular, outlining the evidence of a Mr Harrison and the Coroner's remarks in respect of section 22—

The SPEAKER: I am just not clear. My recollection from being the Attorney is that the Attorney or a relevant minister has a certain number of weeks to respond to a Coroner's report.

Ms CHAPMAN: And they did so, sir, a very few days afterwards, but—

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order, then?

Ms CHAPMAN: My inquiry is as to whether you have received the report—

An honourable member: What's the point of order?

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of clarification.

The Hon. J.R. Rau: This is not a point of order; it is a point of theatre.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am just simply asking the question, John, as to whether—

The SPEAKER: I will inquire whether, so far as the parliament is concerned, what is required to be done for the purposes of the parliament has occurred, but the deputy leader has not risen on a point of order. The deputy leader is making an impromptu speech.

Ms CHAPMAN: But can I—

The SPEAKER: No, I will not hear the deputy leader further. I have red marked and inwardly digested the point she is making.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: It is not a point of order. It is disorderly for her to make it this way; nevertheless, I have it.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you, sir. I look forward to your response.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer.

Ministerial Statement

SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSIONER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (11:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As the house is aware, the Governor in Executive Council appointed Mr John Chapman as Small Business Commissioner on 25 September 2014. Since Mr Chapman's appointment, he has reviewed the operations of the office and identified a number of discrepancies in the statistical information contained in the 2011-12 and the 2012-13 annual reports. These reports were previously tabled on 5 March 2013 and 12 November 2013 respectively.

As a result, Mr Chapman commissioned Ernst & Young to undertake an independent verification of the statistical data in the 2011-12 and 2012-13 annual reports, along with the 2013-14 data from the Office of the Small Business Commissioner. The Ernst & Young report has found that certain statistical data contained in the 2011-12 and 2012-13 annual reports is inaccurate, along with certain statistical data collated in 2013-14.

Specifically, I am advised that this data contained an overstatement of both the number of inquiries made to the Office of the Small Business Commissioner and reported success rates. The Ernst & Young report also found that data in the current system did not correlate with information which was produced and tabled in the 2011-12 and 2012-13 annual reports.

As a result of these independent findings, I note my predecessor and I have made statements to the house and provided information to the Legislative Council based on advice provided by the Office of the Small Business Commissioner which has now been found to be inaccurate. I refer the house to the tabled Ernst & Young report for the verifiable data. The 2011-12 and 2012-13 annual reports will be amended to advise readers to make reference to the Ernst & Young report, which will be located with these annual reports on the commissioner's website.

Mr Chapman has briefed the Auditor-General on the matter. In addition, Mr Chapman has subsequently put a number of new procedures in place relating to data collection. These include a process whereby the commissioner must formally sign off each case determination based on a recommendation by the case officer. I table the Ernst & Young report, and I table the 2013-14 annual report of the Small Business Commissioner.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2015

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 March 2015.)

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:10): It is a pleasure to be back in this place after four weeks away—back to the grind, as they say. However, it does give the opportunity for all of us as members to spend time in our respective electorates and touch base with our constituents again. I continue the debate on the Supply Bill for 2015, on the understanding that the passage of this bill will give the government the required funds to manage and run this state in the interim period between 30 June and the passing of the budget bill.

In previous years I have used my contribution to the supply bill to outline some of the funding priorities as I see them in the electorate of Flinders and of course to highlight, as we always do, the government's deficiencies when it comes to managing the state's finances. Yet again, the funding priorities for me remain largely unchanged and largely unaddressed, which I will come to later in my speech, and of course the fiscal performance of this government is as lamentable as ever. Debt and

deficit are the bywords of government in this state—indeed governments around the world, sadly, it would seem, but particularly in this state where we see, once again, continuing deficit and debt.

We are forecast to have a \$1.2 billion deficit this coming year. The debt is approaching the levels that we saw during the State Bank disaster and the State Bank collapse that in fact brought down a government in a spectacular way. We are getting to those levels of debt once again. As has been mentioned many times in this place before, the debt this state is carrying is costing us \$2 million a day in interest. What an extraordinary amount of money—\$2 million a day in debt servicing.

Imagine what could be done if that money was spent on schools, hospitals, roads and other public infrastructure. Public infrastructure remains a priority. I have said to both the Minister for Transport and the Treasurer on different occasions that infrastructure spend in regional areas and in the seat of Flinders is largely about roads. It is about other things, but it is largely about roads, and that is the area that has been most neglected.

From time to time we have quoted in this place the road funding backlog that has been identified by the RAA. Previous figures that were thrown around were about a \$400 million backlog in road funding, but that has escalated incredibly. In just the last couple of weeks the RAA has come out and identified what they are saying is a \$1 billion backlog in road funding. That is an extraordinary figure. I know the government take them to task on that figure, but the RAA ultimately are responsible in representing the road users in this state, and they are saying that the deficit is around \$1 billion.

This backlog is reflected in the roads we see around the state, not just in the city but of course in country areas, and probably more particularly in country areas. All regional members have roads we have identified. I have identified the Tod Highway in my electorate. In fact, this week I will be tabling yet another petition to the parliament, signed by the constituents in Flinders, urging the government to spend some money—some money at least—on upgrading the Tod Highway. There are other roads, of course. For example, at our branch AGMs that we have been having over the past few weeks we have identified the Kingoonya to Wirrulla road as well.

There are port proposals. Some of them relate to the mining industry, which we know is going through difficult times at the moment. On page 4 of today's *The Advertiser* some of the options to drive growth were identified, which have been floated and put to the government in various guises over the years, and an Eyre Peninsula bulk commodities port is one of those. Of course, it is dependent upon mining development. With the price of iron ore collapsing to a point where it has not been for many years and indeed has come off significantly in the past 18 months, it is making even current activities less viable and any new prospects probably less and less likely to go ahead. The projects that have been floated in the past include Port Spencer, just north of Tumby Bay; Cape Hardy, which is just south of Port Neill; and even Port Bonython, which I know was a government favourite for a time. Ultimately, you need a customer, and it is difficult to find customers at the moment.

In regard to the mining sector, I heard news late last week of significant job losses in the South Middleback, namely, Iron Duke and its neighbouring mines. Sadly—although not unexpected—those losses are devastating for the people who work at the mine site and their families. Of course, many have young families and mortgages and commitments, as all families do. About a third of the workforce at Iron Duke reside in Cowell, which is in the electorate of Flinders. Last week, I spoke with a representative of the Cowell Area School who suggested that up to 50 per cent of the students at the Cowell Area School—a relatively small school—could be affected by these job losses at Iron Duke. These impacts are being felt far and wide. It is right across the sector, right across the state and, in fact, right across the country. Of course, that downturn in the mining sector is a big cause of the federal government's current budgetary constraints.

We are also still working on a port upgrade at Thevenard at a local level. We had all the key stakeholders around the table at Ceduna during the period while we were away from parliament and our local RDA convened that meeting and is driving what we hope, ultimately, will lead to some government input—both federal and state—into the infrastructure at the port of Thevenard, which is a busy port. In fact, it is the second-busiest port in the state and has existing customers. I talked about ports needing to find customers and, indeed, Thevenard has customers in place already; we

have gypsum, salt, grain and mineral sands all going out of there at an average rate of about two and a half ships per week. So, that is desperately in need of an upgrade.

I referred to page 4 of today's paper, and it is interesting to note that one of the other options listed to drive growth was the spent nuclear fuel storage. I for one am pleased that this royal commission is underway. I think we have an incredible opportunity in this state, in this jurisdiction, to fill a space where nobody else is, and that is the secret. It can be a very important economic driver to operate in a space where nobody else is at. There is no point in trying to compete on the world stage with what others can do equally as well, sometimes better, and often at lower costs. So, I do look forward to this royal commission and the findings that it may provide for us as a state and the opportunities that, hopefully, it can provide us in the future.

I also noticed that today's paper referred to a population shift in this state which has moved south from a little way north of the city of Adelaide to just north of the city of Adelaide. In essence, the southern suburbs and even the southern parts, and regional cities like Victor Harbor and the South-East are our growth centres, and towards the north populations are declining. Natural population trends and shifts have occurred over time and, sadly, our regional areas are losing population. That is not to say we are not as productive or as effective as we have ever been, but the reality is that, in an industry such as farming and agriculture, technology has allowed us to be more productive, more efficient, to grow more grain than we ever have and yet require fewer people to do that.

One of the things that really hampers business in this state is the cost of doing business, and we have talked about it many times in this place. Our competitiveness simply is not there. Unfortunately, the best and brightest of our school leavers, our young people, are leaving the state for better opportunities, and you cannot blame them. If they are looking for a career and opportunities to challenge them, to best use their skills, their education, then, sadly, they are starting to look elsewhere, because, simply, the opportunities and jobs are not here. The government promised 100,000 new jobs by 2016. Of course, that is just a year away and, to be frank, we do not have a hope in hell of achieving that sort of promise—séance economics, I suggest.

Regulation and red tape is something that also hampers business. We talk about it a lot. Governments always talk about reducing the cost of doing business, the amount of regulation and the amount of red tape, and yet nothing is ever achieved. We have committees to investigate the cost of red tape and regulation and to establish ways of reducing it, but simply nothing occurs. I think the size of government, the impact of government, the fact that the tentacles of government are everywhere these days, has a big part to do with that regulation and red tape. Many sectors are simply hamstrung and unable to operate efficiently under so much regulation and red tape. Fishing and aquaculture, which is a big part of the regional economy in my electorate, feels that more than most.

I often have aquaculture representatives and those involved in the wild catch fishing sector come to me and talk to me about the cost of compliance and how it is crippling their businesses—absolutely crippling—and they wonder what they get for it. What does a fisherman or an oyster grower get for the money he pays the government? Certainly, there is monitoring and administration, but, goodness me, the numbers and figures that some of these people are talking about are quite extraordinary. This is something that we will need to address seriously as a state, otherwise we will constrict one of the few opportunities we have to grow businesses in this state.

I am a great advocate and supporter of aquaculture, and I believe that in a world where the population is growing significantly—and it is likely to be about nine billion people by 2050—we are in the box seat to provide foodstuffs, quality foodstuffs, to a lot of people in the world, particularly in that South-East Asian and east Asian market, and we are already making good forays into that market with our grain and our seafood. That regulation, red tape and the cost imposed by government on business certainly hamstringing those sectors.

I understand the government is undergoing an investigation into the cost and impact of marine parks in certain areas of the state. Ceduna is one of those areas. I would be interested to see the findings from that inquiry. I hope that our fishers and others affected, even the recreational fishermen, take the time to make a submission. Unless the government hear from them, they simply will not know what the impact is. I certainly hear, anecdotally on my travels around the electorate,

about the severe impact it is having on fishermen. Abalone and crayfish are a good example, because that is the rocky bottom that the government identified, with very little science, I might add, to lock away into sanctuary zones.

After much consultation, the government decided to do what they were going to do anyway. It is interesting; they have made a shift from announce and defend, which was the old Mike Rann mantra, to consult and decide, or something. I would suggest that that is not quite accurate either: it is better described as decide and then consult. I know that many of those who are involved in the consultation period feel that they were not listened to and that their voice was not effective, sadly.

In terms of the cost of doing business, water bills are a regular complaint from my constituents and all rely on water, and it is such a precious resource in South Australia. Admittedly, we have had good rains over the past few years. Our basins are at a level that we have not seen for some time. They have not fully recovered, but they have certainly had an improvement. I have no doubt that the cost of the desal plant that was built at Port Stanvac is impacting significantly on the price that people around the state are paying for their water, and for what good I am not quite sure. I understand that it is there for water security. However, the desal plant is twice as big as we believe it needed to be, and ultimately that means more than twice the cost, and the water users of South Australia are paying for that. Water is such a great enabler. It may not be the most valuable commodity but it is certainly the most precious.

I might just mention that our local NRM board has released its water allocation plan for consultation. This water allocation plan has been in development since 2006, so it has taken nine years to get to this point. It has been a long time coming, there is no doubt about that. During that time we have had a period of dry years and a period of wet years, and natural resources have been tested and have had the opportunity to recover. From what I have seen from this particular plan, this particular paper, I have to congratulate all those involved for the amount of work, the amount of research, the amount of science and the amount of consultation and community input that has been taken into account to produce this.

One of the aggrieved landowners who sits atop the Poldas Basin—a basin that is much talked about and well known on the Eyre Peninsula—took me aside after one of the community meetings and said, 'Well, Peter, I think we may have finally turned the corner.' For me, that is a good result. I think some of the recommendations that came out of the Natural Resources Committee inquiry into Eyre Peninsula water, although not immediately recognised as being worthwhile by the minister, have certainly been incorporated into this Water Allocation Plan. No doubt we will have more opportunity to talk about that when it is tabled in the parliament. It is a little way off yet, there is more consultation to carry out, but we will get there.

A bright spot, I think, with regard to the western part of the state, and hopefully for the state as a whole, is the exploration for oil and gas that is occurring in the Great Australian Bight. Much acreage has been let to BP, Chevron, Statoil, Murphy oil—I think Bight Petroleum also has a tenement but theirs is closer inland just west of Kangaroo Island. But certainly out in the Bight we have some big players in a highly prospective area.

I think it is exciting, although it is not without its risks, both financial and physical. The exploration area is a long way out. It is over 200 kilometres south-west of Ceduna, on the edge of the continental shelf. It is really at the very edge of where technology is at the moment. However, it is exciting and it is highly prospective, as I said. BP looks like being first, the first cab off the rank, and its commitment to drill four wells beginning 2016 is still on target. We will watch this with great interest. Towns like Ceduna have already seen the benefit of that company being there and preparing for what looks to be some years of exploration activity. Should they find something, it will still be at least 10 years to production, I suspect, particularly if it is oil. If it is gas it is likely to be sooner but, as I said, we will watch with great interest.

In the minute that remains I will just comment that over the past four weeks excellent rains have been received across much of the agricultural areas of the state—not all, but a lot. And certainly on the Eyre Peninsula, almost all areas have received what we would class as the break of the season. We would never say no to more rain at this time of the year, but it certainly looks as though the season is off to a good start with the rain at Easter followed by another rain on ANZAC Day.

ANZAC Day was a bit wet and windy but nobody minded because that really gave the farmers the opportunity to begin their seeding program, with much canola going in around the place. I suspect that now we are into May, the wheat crop will not be far behind. So, it is a good start. Once again, as we have done many times in this place before, we highlight what a critical sector the agricultural sector is to the financial and budgetary wellbeing of this state. It is such a significant exporter and through those exports brings new money into the state. It is not just money going round and round between service providers, it is actually new money, with exports going overseas and new money earned and spent within the state of South Australia.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:30): I rise to make a contribution on the Supply Bill. I have a number of topics that I want to cover today, all of them economic in nature. First, I want to paint a picture, according to the latest data, of where we are in South Australia from an economic standpoint. The Deloitte Access Economics March report makes for fairly grim reading. It states that there has been no jobs growth over the past year, while unemployment in South Australia is the highest in the nation and that is restraining the potential for growth, especially with consumer spending, car sales and home construction showing not much of a rise over the past year. This is very much in stark contrast to the recovery we have seen in New South Wales.

Our population growth is another source of weakness, remaining well below national rates. The gloomy mood is being reflected in below average levels of small business confidence, and that is a key indicator that I will touch on later. We have also had the unprecedented result in the last year of more businesses closing than were started up—more businesses closed than were started up. This is a unique event across the country, indeed it would be a unique event across history. The idea that more businesses shut their doors than started up really says something about the strength of the South Australian economy and the ability of this government's policy program to encourage people to start their own businesses and help kickstart the South Australian economy.

Our share of the national economy has continued to fall, from 7.4 per cent in 1987 to 6.2 per cent now. There was a time, in the days of the great Sir Thomas Playford, when South Australia was the third largest state in Australia. Since that time, we have seen the inexorable and continual decline of South Australia's standing in the national economy. It is an absolute disgrace and shame on all of us over a long period of time in South Australia and it is something that we need to look to rectify. When I look at the natural advantages that we have here there is no reason why we should be in this situation.

If I turn to the current state of the budget and the Mid-Year Budget Review some very interesting reading ensues, for those who enjoy reading through some good taxation papers. Tax revenues have been revised down further, and I gave a gripe on that last year, saying how that was something that should have been expected. In fact, it has been predicted by many other people within the South Australian economic community and came to pass at the release of the Mid-Year Budget Review.

The forward estimates revised down taxation revenues by \$470.7 million, reductions in property related taxes reflecting more modest growth assumptions for property transfers and payroll tax revenues reduced as a result of lower than expected collections in 2013-14 and lower than expected wages growth across all years. I think that is a rebuke and a stark moment of honesty from the government, when it admits the fact that its budget estimates were over inflated, that its assumptions were over inflated and too optimistic, and reality has come back. What that has meant is, if I look through the net operating balance, looking forward over the forward estimates, there is some good news. From the budget, 2014-15 was looking like a deficit of \$479 million, that is now down to 185 and continues throughout the forward estimates.

The major factor in relation to the reduction of the deficit this year is the fact that we are flogging off the MAC. Normally, when you sell off assets you use that to retire debt. If I look at what the last Liberal government did in the wake of the State Bank collapse and the ensuing debt that ballooned out, by selling off assets we were able to retire debt. Unfortunately, the sale of the Motor Accident Commission in this case is not even going to make a dent in the deficit. We are still going to have a deficit in South Australia, as opposed to being able to retire debt.

On that front, I know that the Treasurer loves to talk about net government debt but, unfortunately, the Auditor-General views all government assets and all government spending as

debt, and things like the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, unfortunately for the government, do not necessarily get to be completely off their balance sheet.

When we look at the total non-financial public sector debt, we are predicted to blow out in 2017 to \$13.155 billion. That figure is something that should haunt this Labor government. It is something that we will continue to remind this Labor government about because it is a disgusting figure and the most stark reminder of the mismanagement and excessive spending of this government.

This figure and this message is not new. On this side of the house, we have been talking about debt and deficit for a long time, but can I say that just because this issue does not get continually run in the press does not mean that it has gone away. I think it is incumbent on us as a loyal opposition to try to make sure that we continue to remind the people of South Australia of what this debt means.

What I will do now is attempt to put that in a format that generation X will understand. Those of us gen Xs here in the parliament will be very fond of and have a great understanding of the longest-running TV series in world history, that is, *The Simpsons*. When I look at the state of the budget and some of the decisions that the government has made over the past 12 months, it reminds me of an episode of *The Simpsons* where—

Mr Picton: What about *Peppa Pig*?

Mr KNOLL: We have had *Peppa Pig*. I am trying to instruct the parliament on other various TV shows. There is an episode of *The Simpsons* where Homer runs for sanitation commissioner, and I think the parallels here are undeniable. I would go so far as to say that this state Labor government is the Homer Simpson of Australian politics.

In this episode, there is a local department store called Costington's which announces the formation of a new August holiday intended to boost sales, and they call it 'Love Day'. The Simpsons celebrate it, and there is a vast amount of packaging produced which causes the garbage to build up. When Homer eventually takes it out, he is infuriated with the garbage men as they drive away without collecting the trash. Angered by their ignorance, Homer insults them by calling them 'trash-eating stinkbags', but this only angers them into a fight with Homer and, as a result, the family's garbage service is cut off, leading to the Simpsons' garbage piling up on their front lawn. Homer and Bart think that it is easy to throw the rubbish out the window and, as the mess continues to grow, Marge tells Homer to apologise for the remark, but he insists on doing things his way.

Homer awakens one morning to find the pile of trash gone from the front of the house, and he proudly boasts that he has beaten city hall, only to learn that Marge wrote a letter of apology to the Springfield sanitation commissioner, forging Homer's name. Homer goes to see the famous sanitation commissioner, Ray Patterson, demanding the apology letter be returned. Even though Ray Patterson tries to be civil with Homer, he insists on getting into a fight and, eventually, Homer decides that he will run for sanitation commissioner, remaking it into his image.

Mr Picton: You are just reading this from Wikipedia.

Mr KNOLL: No, it's not from Wikipedia: it's *Simpsons* Wikipedia. Homer begins to promote his campaign, and the campaign starts off badly. There is a U2 concert which Homer interrupts—

Mr Picton: PopMart Tour concert.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNOLL: —but it picks up when Homer, after prompting from Moe—

Mr Picton: Thinks of a slogan for his campaign.

Mr KNOLL: Thinks of a slogan.

Mr Picton: 'Can't someone else do it?'

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kaurna, if I could ask you to stop interjecting.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kaurana!

Mr Picton: The shoe is on the other foot.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kaurana, I have asked you to stop interjecting!

Mr KNOLL: This isn't question time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Don't respond to interjections.

Mr KNOLL: Sorry, Deputy Speaker. The response is 'Can't somebody else do it?'. Now, there is a refrain that I have heard before, and it does remind me of this state government. 'Can't somebody else do it?' implies that it is somebody else's fault and that somebody else is to blame. We can point the finger over there and make all this somebody else's problem. I definitely think there are parallels there when we look at this state government sheeting home blame for everything—all and sundry—that they can think of to the federal government. It is a topic I have spoken about numerous times in this place, but I think that 'Can't somebody else do it?' seems like a very apt slogan for this state government. Homer spreads the message to the town and promises expensive services, such as a round-the-clock garbage service and having sanitation workers do all the cleaning.

Members interjecting:

Mr KNOLL: Can I say at this point, Deputy Speaker, that there is nothing unusual about people reading public remarks into the *Hansard*.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Normally, you say that you are quoting. You don't plagiarise.

Mr KNOLL: I am not plagiarising at all.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: You haven't said you are quoting somebody else. You are reading text, as if they are your own words.

Mr KNOLL: Well, substantially I am getting the information from a public source, and that is fine, but it is not like it is inaccurate. Either way, he goes on to do various things with his campaign and he is elected on the back of his expensive promises to sanitation commissioner—a great day in the Simpsons' household. Unfortunately, after he is elected, he enacts his promises, and it turns out that he spends his entire year's budget of \$4.6 million in one month. I will admit that it is not a complete analogy because the state Labor government has not spent its entire budget in one month, but last year we saw them blow out their budget by \$331 million, and they are approaching \$4 billion worth of unbudgeted expenditure, and I think there are genuine parallels there.

To solve the crisis that ensues, because there is no more money for Homer to play with, he has to find alternative ways of raising money, so he takes other cities' excess garbage and stores it in an abandoned mine shaft on the outskirts of Springfield. I want to be delicate at this point because I am quite supportive of the royal commission into the nuclear fuel cycle but I would also say that it seems quite odd to me that, after decades of strident opposition to increasing involvement in the nuclear fuel cycle, we get to a stage where the Premier and his cabinet decide to reverse their strident opposition and open up to this beautiful thing called the nuclear fuel cycle by having a royal commission. Again, I think there are parallels and I think the parallel is around the desperation.

This government loves the big wins. I remember that the former treasurer, member for Playford, stood here and said that South Australia would be a very different place in a few years' time. They hung their hopes on Olympic Dam and that did not come through. They always seem to focus on the big wins, and it is when those things do not come off that the South Australian economy is all the worse for it. As much as I am very open to look at what the royal commission is going to do, it seems to me to be a desperate attempt to try to rectify what has otherwise been profligate spending over a long period of time.

I also think that Labor struggles to be fiscally disciplined. Their parliamentary ranks are filled with political staffers and union organisers and, whilst I do not doubt their sincerity in any sense, they have always worked with other people's money, whether it be union dues or taxpayer funds. The disconnect between having to earn the money and being able to spend the money creates issues, and I very much think that that is what we are seeing played out here.

To give an example, in the Treasurer's maiden speech, in the shadow of the 1997 election campaign, this was made clear—and, again, I do not doubt the sincerity of the then member for Peake when he made these comments but I do doubt his ability to deliver, and this will be made very clear. It comes back to the fact that this government cannot manage its budget in a sufficiently disciplined manner to be able to deliver on all the beautiful things that it wants to achieve. I quote here from the member for Peake's maiden speech:

Our Party has shown a commitment to meet these challenges in new and exciting ways, to challenge the doctrines of the past and to move forward together. We fought to preserve our State's treasures and assets. We fought school closures—school closures in areas where our children deserve the right to the best education we can provide.

This is cold comfort to those regional communities and others who have lost their schools to super schools—

We fought hospital cut backs—

I love this comment—

We fought hospital cut backs—cut backs that were aimed at not improving the standard of health care but were simply cruel cost cutting.

This is rank hypocrisy, in my view, when we look at what is happening to the Repat, the Hampstead Centre, The QEH, Modbury Hospital and Noarlunga. It is an absolute disgrace. This one perhaps, though, is my favourite:

We fought police station closures because all South Australians, no matter where they live, deserve the right to enjoy the same lifestyle and security some take for granted.

This is obviously true, except if you live around these following areas: Tea Tree Gully, Pooraka, North Adelaide, Newton, Malvern, Hallett Cove, Firlie or Blakeview. Tell me, where is the then member for Peake standing up for everybody and making sure that everybody deserves to enjoy the same lifestyle and security that some take for granted? I think it comes back to the fact that, as much as those comments were made in all sincerity, a lack of fiscal discipline means that those promises cannot be honoured. I think the Treasurer should be ashamed of himself. He has walked away from what he originally came here to do. Why? Because he cannot control the purse strings.

I would like to turn my mind now to the public sector and its growth, and I am reminded of a quote from the great Sir Thomas Playford on the growth of public sector numbers. I would like to read from a biography written about him. It says:

Until near the end of his Premiership, Playford set his face against the creation of a formal 'Premier's Department'. He maintained it was unnecessary. If he needed information about aspects of education, agriculture, highways, etc., all he or his Secretary needed to do was to telephone the Department concerned. And the Treasury itself...was in the same building. Today's Premiers and Prime Ministers have developed large secretariats to collate information, prepare reports, develop policies and challenge material flowing in from departmental sources.

The article goes on to say:

Years later, when Don Dunstan was at the helm, he expanded the Premier's Department to such an extent that it began to attract public criticism. Playford, then in his mid-70s, was visiting the city one day when he ran into his former Secretary, Miss Dunn. 'How are you, Miss Dunn?' he asked genially and still very formally, which had always been his way with women on his staff.

'I'm extremely well, thank you, Sir Thomas...better than I've been for years,' responded Miss Dunn.

'I'm so glad to hear that, so glad,' replied Playford. 'You know, I don't sleep as well these days as I used to think when I was younger and I was lying awake in bed the other night thinking that when I was Premier I must have treated my staff very badly...and particularly you, Miss Dunn.' His former Secretary was both astonished and indignant.

'Why on earth would you think that?', she asked. 'You know that's not true!'

'Well,' Playford responded, his mouth crinkling in a dry, well-controlled smile, 'You know how it was in the old days around at the Treasury. There were you, and me, and George Pearce and one-armed Wally Muggleton on the door; and I picked up the *Advertiser* recently and saw they now need 214 people to do your job...They both much enjoyed the joke.

I understand that times have changed and I understand that the state of South Australia has grown but I do not think the people of South Australia would appreciate the joke in the wry humour of Playford and Dunn, because we are the ones paying for it. These excerpts I have just quoted are

dated, and I will grant you that, but we have the recent example of the release of the minister's directory. We now have 260 to 270 ministerial staff to cope with the bloated bureaucracy. Indeed, it is over the last 18 months we have seen the government continue to water down their Public Service reform numbers.

On a lighter note, we do need to look to the future of our state. Whilst we did not get the mining boom, we were hurt by an ensuing high dollar that hurt our agricultural exports and natural advantages. But, as China moves now to more domestic consumption-based growth and we have seen a fall in the Australian dollar, we should begin to benefit in our natural strengths of agriculture, food and wine, tourism and education. Can I say that locally in the Barossa we have had some positive news. For the 2014 financial year versus last year, we saw an increase in international visitation from 8,000 to 13,000. We saw overall an 85,000 person increase in visitors, and that led to \$21 million in extra tourism revenue. This would certainly be off the back of the lower dollar and also off the back of the Barossa Be Consumed campaign. I would like to congratulate everybody involved in that.

Whilst the macro figures are not great, there are some positive signs but, as aspiring members of a potential future government on this side of the house, what could and should we be doing to help kick start our economy? I have said previously in this speech that there has been much focus by the government on the big wins. I am thinking now about OZ Minerals and Hewlett Packard.

The government very much focuses on the big wins. Whilst this is important, and I do not deny that, this, for me, misses the bigger opportunity. South Australia is a small business state. Figures from the Small Business Commissioner that I received only last week said that 97 per cent of businesses in South Australia are considered small and that 65 per cent of small businesses do not employ anybody. These are the backbone of our economy. This is where the vast majority of our employment lies. It is here that we are going to see a recovery of the South Australian economy.

In order to help small business we can do a number of things with direct support through our RDAs in the regions or other services in the city. From a whole state perspective, we have to go back and look at the fundamental cost of doing business because here is where I genuinely believe we are going to see a recovery of the South Australian economy. In order to look at those fundamental costs, we need to go back and have a genuine look at taxation—not this tax discussion paper, which merely seeks to mask what is otherwise an intent to put a land tax on the family home. We have to have a genuine look at compliance costs in occupational health and safety, WorkCover, mandatory reporting and other red tape.

We need to look at utility costs and not boast about the fact that we have the highest water prices in the nation or the highest electricity prices in the nation; in fact, we need to do more about that. We need to look at infrastructure provision that helps us to become more efficient, something the member for Flinders spoke about earlier. We need to look at things like high-speed internet provision. It is only through looking after our small businesses that our economy will recover because it is the small business community that will reinvest to help improve the future of South Australia.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:50): I also rise today to contribute to the Supply Bill. May I say that I found the month or so away from this place a fantastic opportunity to really wear out some shoe leather and embed myself in the electorate and, most importantly, listen to the electorate and hear the concerns of the constituents in my area—what they are seeking and what their needs and concerns are. It was a wonderful opportunity, and it also allowed me to see and hear firsthand how discontented people are with the current government in South Australia. The state can certainly do much better—and it needs to do much better. Those needs are certainly not being met by this government at the moment.

It is only when the tide goes out that you discover who has been swimming naked; I think it was Warren Buffett who said that. As the member for Schubert alluded to, when the opportunity was here for this state to do something about mining and blossom, as the state of Western Australia has done, what did this state government do? This state government wasted that opportunity. Of course, we know that a strong economy can provide prosperity for the rest of the state, and without a strong economy you certainly cannot do that.

I want to draw the house's attention to two reports: the CommSec State of the States report and the Deloitte Access Economics report, where there are stark and extreme concerns with the state of our economy at the moment. When you look at dwelling commencements, for example, compared with the last decade average we are down 1.3 per cent. This is a massive issue because so much of the housing market flows through to other parts of the economy.

In terms of unemployment, compared with the decade average we are up 21.8 per cent. It was shocking when I was out doorknocking parts of the electorate, especially amongst the youth, to see people who want to find jobs—they really do—but who do not have the opportunities here that they should. It is terrible. Of course, when they are not at work, their morale is lower and they are costing the taxpayer more. It does so much for the state if these people can have jobs.

Economic growth has been up only 8.6 per cent compared with the last decade and it has fallen behind many of the other states, especially those on the east coast. Equipment investment has been up by only 6.6 per cent. Housing finance, though, is the big one: compared with a decade average, it is down by 13.7 per cent. These housing finance numbers are of massive concern. As I said, when people build new homes, it obviously flow through to so many components of the economy. When these numbers are down by so much the concerns are great.

Obviously, some big negatives cloud the current outlook, and we all know about the demise and departure of car manufacturing under this government's watch and the uncertainty that exists in other parts of the state. The timing is unfortunate. I would not play the Leonard Cohen album just yet, but we have some real concerns in this state. There has not been any job growth over the past year, and this is on the back of then premier Rann's announcement to create 100,000 new jobs by 2016.

There has been no job growth over the past year and unemployment in South Australia, as we have heard, is the highest in the nation, and obviously that is restraining the potential for growth in consumer spending. I believe that in many cases a consumer spending occurrence will have to be a massive factor in getting this state out of the rut. Car sales are not even showing much of a rise in this past year. There is also population growth, basic supply and demand. Population growth is another source of weakness. We need more people coming here to South Australia; without it we just cannot recover from the rut we are in at the moment.

The gloomy mood is also being seen in below-average levels of small business confidence, as the member for Schubert alluded. More people are shutting down businesses than are starting them, and this is a massive issue. During the parliamentary break I took the time, as did some other members here, to have a look at what the start-up community is doing at the moment and one of the better things I have seen done overseas are economic zones and tax-free havens. I have spoken about them before, but I have no doubt that this state government should look at something like that. There are young people, entrepreneurial people, wanting to put it all on the line and willing to take a risk; they just need a helping hand from this government, and I encourage the government to look at something like that.

So we certainly have modest growth predictions here in South Australia, and we need to be doing more to facilitate that growth. This morning we have seen an annual report from the Small Business Commissioner, including some issues concerning transparency, trust and integrity. How can the people of South Australia have any trust in this government, in the integrity of its accounts and that sort of thing, when we see these sorts of errors? Thank God for the new Small Business Commissioner, who has identified these errors and done something about them. However, what else is wrong? How can we have trust and faith in any of the upcoming budget documents, for example, when you see errors like this that were only discovered by an independent umpire? It is absolutely outrageous. It is amateur stuff, and I am ashamed that these errors were found in significant government documents.

By far the biggest issue in my electorate and I would say across the state, in terms of an immediate economic point of view, are pensioner concessions. It is about time this state government stopped playing politics with some of the most vulnerable South Australians, namely our pensioners and those who receive concessions. We know that South Australia is the only state government of all the states in Australia that has threatened to cut pensioner concessions. It is absolutely

outrageous. These are people who have paid taxes their whole life, who have been the back bone of this state and this nation, and yet here is the state government using them as a political pawn to negotiate with the federal government. It is absolutely outrageous.

We want to make sure that 160,000 pensioners out there remain entitled to up to \$190 per annum in concessions, which is worth a total of \$32 million a year. We have heard a particular Labor MP claim that the \$190 of pensioner concessions will remain, despite the Labor government saying it may be abolished. Please, stop playing political games with this. It is not doing the government any good and it is creating angst in the community. In my electorate alone I have obtained 2,000 signatures; so please, stop playing politics with this. Fund the concessions. These are some of the most vulnerable people in our community and they need this \$190. I also believe that the shadow minister for local government will table a relevant petition today.

When you look at South Australia's job advertisements you can see that they continue to decline under Labor's watch. Obviously, this is a significant factor in the economy. You could say that job ads are forward-looking; they are like the stock market in that you can anticipate growth and you can anticipate activity based on who is looking to hire in the future. Just this week figures were released by the ANZ regarding the number of newspaper job advertisements in South Australia, and they showed that job opportunities are scarce in this state. South Australia recorded the largest fall in newspaper job advertisements of all the states and territories in Australia. They all have their own particular challenges, they all have the same federal government, but we see that South Australia recorded the largest fall in the last 12 months, with a 58.7 per cent decline.

It is definitely concerning that the jobs market in South Australia continues to shrink when there is so much opportunity, when we do have advantages here in South Australia. Not only that, we are also seeing an economic recovery in other parts of Australia. Why is South Australia doing so poorly? Why is it that even Tasmania has generated more newspaper job ads each and every month? With less than one-third of South Australia's population, even Tasmania averaged nearly 20 per cent more job opportunities, at around 190 job ads each week in April. It is absolutely outrageous.

I also have people who work at the current Royal Adelaide Hospital coming to me in droves. They are really concerned about what is going to happen with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. The new Royal Adelaide Hospital, of course, is going to have fewer beds than the current Royal Adelaide Hospital, and, when you look at some of the challenges that the Royal Adelaide Hospital is going to have—

Mr Picton: That's not true.

Ms Digance: It's rubbish!

Mr TARZIA: What's rubbish about that?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TARZIA: What's rubbish about that? Maybe you can ask the former chief of staff to the health minister—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is unparliamentary to interject and it is unparliamentary to respond to interjections. I ask all members to listen to the contribution in silence—all members.

Mr TARZIA: I ask your forgiveness, Deputy Speaker.

The Hon. P. Caica: Stop misleading.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: All members in silence!

The Hon. P. Caica: Sorry, ma'am.

Mr TARZIA: Deputy Speaker, there is no doubt that alarm bells are certainly ringing after announcements that the Weatherill government's e-health records system, EPAS, is not expected to be operational at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital until July 2017. If EPAS fails at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, I have no doubt (we need to be screaming about this now) that the impact on patient care in South Australia will be devastating, and this is a matter of public interest. It will be dangerous and, not only that, but project costs will blow out substantially, and it is really important—

Ms Redmond: They already have.

Mr TARZIA: Exactly; they have already blown out substantially. EPAS has been a basket case for Labor. They have totally mismanaged it; it is a rolling disaster. One critical deadline after another has been missed; it has been mismanaged. Project costs have more than doubled, and they will continue to rise on the taxpayer dollar. The people of South Australia have to pay for this mess that Labor have created. We have seen independent reports that have reinforced the scathing assessment of the operation of EPAS, not only at this hospital, but also across others as well.

I spoke earlier about trust and integrity, and the report on the errors of the findings that we found out about today in one of the Small Business Commissioner's reports. How long did it take? I understand it took about two years for a member from our side of the chamber to understand who the government are actually employing. It was almost a two-year battle under the FOI laws, and the government was forced to release copies of confidential ministerial directories, which list all staff in their offices as at December 2014 and March 2015.

If they had nothing to hide, why would they not just release the information that should be public to us? I think the public has a right to know who their taxes are actually paying for and what their taxes are actually being used to do. The government needs to come clean. The government needs to understand how certain ministers justify having 20 or 21 staff in their offices alone. Why have they tried to conceal this?

Ms Redmond: Are they not competent to do things themselves?

Mr TARZIA: Exactly right; they cannot do them themselves. They need to expand their own bureaucracy to cover for the mess and the unproductive nature of what they do. They need to come clean. They need to explain why they have tried to conceal the true number of staff in the budget papers. This is outrageous; why do it? Taxpayer dollars are being used to pay for this. It is about time that the government came clean, and that they are transparent and accountable, rather than playing political games.

I understand that they want to trivialise some matters by bringing Bert and Ernie from *Sesame Street* into the fray, but Gilles Street is not *Sesame Street*. They are here to do a job, and they are here to do a job for the people of South Australia. It is about time that they were upfront and transparent about the most basic information, and that they released that when we asked for it.

I have not even got to my own electorate of Hartley. Let me just point out three of the broken promises that this government has made on Premier Weatherill's watch. There was a *Today Tonight* story, Deputy Speaker—you may have seen it—during the parliamentary break which basically alluded to one of the broken promises at Glynde. The government, on the eve of the election, made a written promise, which they sent out via direct mail to the people of Glynde, to provide alternative land to move a substation from a residential site.

What have they done about it? Absolutely nothing, absolutely zilch! That is how arrogant is this government. They do not care about making promises and breaking them to save their own skin. It is absolutely disgusting. I call on the government to reiterate the promise that it made before the election, and provide alternative land so that a substation can be built somewhere other than in a residential area in Glynde.

The old McNally site up in Woodforde runs adjacent to my seat of Hartley. Magill is the area where my constituents are most affected. You basically have to threaten the government to get any answers from them. For so many months they have known that this development was likely to occur. They are selling off the farm because they cannot pay for their debt; they cannot pay for their deficit. So, what are they doing? Here we see another large blue chip property sold off the public books into private hands. That is all well and good—they will bank their cheques. I can see the former minister laughing as she goes back to her seat. They don't care. What about the people it affects? What about the people it affects in Magill who will have 300 extra dwellings?

Members interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: Careful! Karma, karma!

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: I beg your pardon?

Mr TARZIA: I said 'karma' because she was heckling, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just continue the debate.

Mr TARZIA: I will continue the debate, Deputy Speaker. What about the residents of Magill who will have 300 dwellings adjacent to their own site? Each one of these places will have probably two cars each. Where will these cars go? Yet, the government has not called for a traffic management plan, as we did before the election. I call on the government to consider these people in my electorate, because when 300 extra dwellings go up and more cars are on the roads, they will stream down my electorate. These are real people, they have real lives, they have jobs and kids to take to school in the morning, and it will affect them.

The Paradise Interchange is another broken promise by this current state Labor government. Before the last election both sides of politics took the steam out of the issue and committed to building a car park in the vicinity of the Paradise Interchange. What has happened since then? They have pulled their promise. They say that you need a car park tax to build more car parking facilities, which is absolutely outrageous. It is outrageous because then they have the audacity to want to spend \$160 million on a new O-Bahn facility, when they cannot find \$2 million to \$4 million to build a car park that is needed in Paradise. It is absolutely outrageous!

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: You could have done that—you could have helped with that.

Mr TARZIA: We will do it, member for Newland. When we are in government, we have already committed to do it. What member for Hartley in the past—walk out, okay, can't cope. What other member for Hartley has made that commitment three years out from opposition? The arrogance with which this government is treating the people of South Australia is shameful.

Look at the schools in my area, namely, East Marden Primary School. I know the former minister for education has a keen interest in East Marden Primary School. Have a look at that school; there is so much asbestos ridden throughout the building. The facilities there are terrible compared with some other state schools in this area. I will continue to lobby for schools like East Marden Primary School to make sure they get the best facilities they can to provide for the best education possible for our children.

A number of churches in my area would also love to have assistance from the state government purse to help fund their various projects and buildings. The Campbelltown SES in my own electorate cannot even afford to have alarm monitoring in its building at the moment because of the rising costs of living, the rising costs that such organisations have to endure. This government is not helping. We have also seen a water catchment plan in Felixstow. I would love to see the government chip in some dollars. Water is one of the best things we can invest in. For the sustainability of our future we need to be doing more.

I call on the state government to assist in the Felixstow water reserve project at Langman Grove. Earlier it was referred to that there is almost a \$1 billion backlog in road maintenance. You can see this sort of thing in my own electorate as well, and that is why we need to be doing more. I have applied for Black Spot funding in the past, but the state government also has a role to play, especially on state roads, to make sure that more roads have the funding that they should. Roads like Payneham Road, roads like Montacute Road, roads like Hectorville Road.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: Main Road, Blackwood—not in my electorate but also that road as well. Glynde Corner, for example, what a basket case that has been in recent times and that is why we all need to be doing more for projects. It all comes back to a strong economy. When you have a strong economy, when you can pay off your debt, when you can pay off your deficit, when the engine room of the South Australian economy has confidence—namely the small business sector—we have more money to do more things to make our area the best that it can be. So, it is with those closing remarks that I say that the state needs to be doing much better and I hope that I have drawn the house's attention, humbly, to some of the things that the government needs to be doing better.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Goodness me; the member for Davenport.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (12:10): Thank you, Deputy Speaker, I know I have not been that long in this house. I also rise to speak to the Supply Bill and, of course, the government has come to this house asking to appropriate \$3.29 billion from the Consolidated Account for the Public Service of the state for the financial year ending 2016. I know the Liberal Party will of course support this bill but I wish to make a few brief comments about the government's fiscal performance overall.

The Commonwealth Bank's State of the States report published in January this year ranked South Australia seventh on economic performance out of eight states and territories— that is right, seventh out of eight—and that includes the ACT and the Northern Territory in those eight jurisdictions. Dwelling starts, housing finance and construction work lagged almost behind every jurisdiction. The state economy grew at just 1.3 per cent in the year 2013-14, following a growth of only 0.9 per cent in 2012-13.

Our state's unemployment rate is just too high. The participation rate or those looking for work has fallen to 61.8 per cent, indicating that there are many jobseekers out there who are giving up on the hope of finding work, and we are especially seeing this in many of our regional and rural centres, those in traditional manufacturing areas and amongst younger South Australians. The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate remains around 6.9 per cent trending to 7 per cent, which is just unacceptable.

Of course, utilities have become some of the most costly in the world with water prices rising 227 per cent since 2002, power prices some 137 per cent, and gas prices 126 per cent under the same period. We know that households, industry and agriculture are all suffering from these higher costs in utilities, especially water costs where we know that consumers are being price gouged and stymied by this government.

Former Essential Services Commission of South Australia chief executive, Dr Paul Kerin, has come out on the record and said that the government has been price gouging SA Water users for years. To quote Dr Kerin:

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.

We wonder why our businesses are struggling in South Australia with such high inputs into their businesses.

We know that our state debt is approaching \$11 billion. Net debt to revenue is expected to peak at 54 per cent of revenue in 2015. Over the last financial year, the government borrowed an additional \$260 million to cover its debt—that is about \$712,000 a day spent on interest servicing our state debt. That, of course, is \$712,000 a day that this government is not able to invest in schools, hospitals, roads, police stations, which we are seeing closing all across metropolitan Adelaide, and family services. This is the real opportunity cost of our \$11 billion of state debt—it is the cost of not being able to invest in those key services of government, those services that have been so stretched and cut back over many years.

It is not just the mounting state debt level that should be a wake-up call to all of us; it is the ongoing state deficit that is of real concern. Our state deficit for 2013-14 was over \$1 billion. Our budget position in South Australia is in stark contrast to that of our Victorian neighbours. Today it is expected that the Victorian government will hand down a budget with an expected surplus of \$1.2 billion—a Victorian budget surplus being handed down on the back of four years of strong Liberal governance. After 13 years of continuous Labor government surely we should be in a better financial position than we are today. Alas we are not.

Talking about some of the other indicators: consumer and business confidence remains low in South Australia; population growth trails behind that of the Eastern States; and according to the Commonwealth Bank's State of the States report for April this year, just recently released, South Australia once again ranks seventh out of eight in most indicators including economic growth, retail trade and housing investment.

Small business is the backbone of our state economy. It is small businesses that are suffering at the hands of excessive red tape and regulation. We all talk about removing red tape and the

inefficiencies that go along with it, but rarely has the government acted on genuinely removing red tape to ease the cost of doing business in South Australia.

The high cost of energy and essential services is one of the many reasons that businesses are shutting up shop and moving their operations interstate. Our inefficient WorkCover scheme has been a major contributor to small business inefficiencies for many years. For the past 13 years this government has mismanaged WorkCover, hurting both employees and employers. I have to say that I do welcome the government's recent announcement to cut the WorkCover rate from 2.75 per cent to 1.95 per cent from 1 July this year. Of course this is a welcome announcement, but one that for many is too late.

State payroll tax is another inefficient state tax that penalises our business operators from employing South Australians in their businesses. If there is ever a tax that is a disincentive to job creation and economic growth, it is payroll tax. I will paraphrase the member for Bright, who was speaking the other day of his uncle's business back in Scotland, and the frustration that the member had in explaining to his uncle that this state and this country levy payroll tax. From what I understand, for some time there was a lack of understanding that a government would impose a tax on employment, yet we do here in South Australia and across the nation.

Business SA has called on the government to lift the payroll tax threshold from \$600,000 to \$1 million by 2017-18 through annual increases of \$100,000, and I for one certainly support Business SA in this case. I urge the government to review our state's payroll tax and thresholds as a means of stimulating our economy. We are at the stage where a serious and mature debate on the GST and our funding arrangement within and from the commonwealth is required. A future state reform process needs to look at the abolition of many of our inefficient state taxes.

Road infrastructure and the investment that goes with it is a key role of any state government. Within my electorate of Davenport, Main Road, Old Belair Road and the Blackwood roundabout have been pieces of road infrastructure long overdue for state government investment.

On 5 March this year, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) released its Edition 2 of the Road Management Plan (RMP) for Main Road, Belair Road and Shepherds Hill Road at Blackwood. No doubt the residents of Davenport would appreciate the one-page media release that accompanied this fantastic announcement. I highlight that the initial Road Management Plan was released some nine years ago in 2006. In that time no substantial funds have been allocated to this project and, since the release of the 2006 Road Management Plan, DPTI has only delivered the following in their plan: reducing speed limits to 50 km/h; new bicycle lanes and an upgrading of bicycle infrastructure; a new pedestrian crossing at Russell Street; an upgrade to mid-block treatments; and upgrades to the intersections along the corridors, which mainly was the repainting of the lines on the road.

Whilst the above is probably welcomed by some in Davenport, it does not constitute decent road investment in a key corridor (namely, the Blackwood roundabout) which has been identified by the RAA as one of the worst roundabouts in South Australia. Last month AAMI said that Main Road at Blackwood is one of the five most common roads to have an accident on within metropolitan Adelaide. Given these statistics and a nine-year Road Management Plan, I am not sure why the government is failing to invest infrastructure in the Mitcham Hills. I call on the state government to genuinely invest in road infrastructure and join the Liberals' \$20 million investment promise.

Today the state Liberal Party will table a petition signed by over 13,000 South Australians concerned about this government's proposed cut to pensioner concessions. Many of the petition's signatures have come from my electorate of Davenport, though not quite the same as those from my colleague the member for Hartley. Seemingly, this government has money to burn when it comes to government advertising, waste and mismanagement, but it cannot find within its means a guarantee to 160,000 South Australian pensioners, who are some of the most vulnerable in our community, that their \$190 pensioner council rate concession will not be abolished. South Australia is the highest-taxed jurisdiction in the nation and removing the pensioner concession on council rates would exacerbate the cost of living pressures on a group in our society that can least afford it.

The emergency services levy, along with the pensioner concessions, is another levy and a cost this side of the house has acknowledged and has looked to have removed. This side of the

house is really quite appalled by the government's record on the emergency services levy. But, of course, the government is removing the pensioner concession and increasing the ESL rates because it needs to because of its mismanagement, and it needs to find its way to service that debt I was referring to earlier.

The state Liberals have committed to reversing the government's \$90 million increase in the emergency services levy. The ESL is no more than a tax on the family home, and the state Liberals have a commitment to restore the remission on the ESL, which would deliver an annual cut of about \$168 to a homeowner with a property value of approximately \$450,000. This amounts to a \$672 tax cut over the life of the government.

Further, I call on the government to reverse its emergency services levy hike, made possible by the recent unexpected increase of \$146 million in GST allocation that South Australia will receive as a result of the recent COAG agreement. Immediate relief in ESL charges and pensioner concessions is within the reach of this government, due merely to the recent changes in our GST allocation. Given this, why is the government continuing to inflict financial pain on those families and the most vulnerable in our community?

As I said, job growth in this state continues to fall, and we are seeing high levels of unemployment in the traditional manufacturing sector and rural communities, as well as high youth unemployment. Recent news that JBS Australia, the largest meat processing company in Australia, has stood down hundreds of workers from its facilities in Victoria and South Australia is a huge blow to our regional communities. The high cost of undertaking business in South Australia is hurting our long-term jobs growth and economic viability.

Poor fiscal management of the state has real consequences. Young graduates continue to leave the state in search of work, taking with them energy and ideas that would otherwise be available to this state. In 2013-14, net interstate migration from South Australia was 2,968 persons. Real youth unemployment in my electorate is approximately 14 per cent, and youth unemployment is much higher in the northern and southern areas of metropolitan Adelaide. This government is failing our school leavers. Graduates are completing VET and TAFE qualifications and university degrees with the knowledge that their first post-graduate job may well not be in South Australia.

Payroll tax compliance on apprentice wages has proven to be a disincentive for the employment of apprentices, putting further strain on our vocational education training system. In addition to removal of payroll tax on apprentice wages, the government should also heed the call of Business SA and abolish the requirement for employers to register before they can employ an apprentice or trainee in South Australia.

Mums and dads, families, small business operators and young people all suffer when governments perform badly, especially when the government loses its focus on economic growth. It is easy for us to sit here, comfortable as we are, and pretend that we are doing all we can while a whole generation has to pin its hopes on the meagre opportunities that currently exist in South Australia.

The first purpose of government must always be to support business and its efforts to create jobs and wealth. The dignity of a job cannot be overstated. This government has manifestly failed to support jobs growth in South Australia. In view of the government's record, I must express my reservations before extending the government more funds as part of this bill. I urge the government to continue its focus on job creation in South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (12:24): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. It is my great pleasure to rise to speak—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are the lead speaker, I presume?

Mr MARSHALL: Yes; I indicate to the house that I will be the lead speaker and that I will be supporting this bill for the appropriation of \$3.291 billion from the Consolidated Account to support the government's activities until it brings down the budget. As a person who, prior to coming to

parliament, came from the business sector, I always find it quite interesting that a government asks for money—in this case, \$3.29 billion—without providing us with a budget.

Could you imagine this ever occurring in the private sector, Deputy Speaker? It would never ever happen, because what would happen in the private sector is people would say, 'This is how I would like to spend my money in the coming financial year, in accordance with the objects of the organisation,' and it would be approved in advance of that money being made available. That is not the case in South Australia. In fact, the parliament today is given the task of deciding whether or not it will extend this money to the government, and all we can base our decision upon is their past performance. Of course, this is not a particularly good record. In fact, this is a government which has proven itself to be completely incapable on the Treasury bench in South Australia.

Let's just take a look at recent performance. Last financial year, for example, was the year the government was going to return us to surplus. I think it is appropriate for us to revisit that promise that they made to the people of South Australia and see how they went against that promise to return us to surplus last financial year. When we look at the actual result, of course, we find out that it was a deficit. It was not a surplus: it was a deficit. In fact, it was the largest deficit in this state's history—\$1.2 billion. They were predicting a surplus; they got the largest deficit in the state's history.

For this current year the government also said, 'We have a projection for this year.' Originally, they were going to have a \$479 million deficit. That is what they told us at this time last year. They have updated that, and this is interesting, and I would not mind just spending a minute or two on this. They now tell us that we are only going to have a deficit this year of \$185 million, so you can see that that is a \$294 million improvement in the projection they gave us this time last year. At a cursory glance, you would say, 'That's pretty good going, they've reduced the deficit', but just scratch below the surface. Just scratch below the surface to find out how they have created this situation, and I will tell you.

The government has made it clear now that there is going to be an \$852.9 million transfer from the MAC this year, so of course, when you add the \$852 million back to the projected loss of \$185 million, you see that the underlying structural deficit by this government has not improved one single jot from the largest deficit in the state's history. They want to be out there telling the people of South Australia that they are going to have a wonderful improvement in their performance. What they are not making clear is the way that they have done this. It has not been through their own very prudential management of our state taxpayer dollars but through the flogging off of some of our assets, something they promised unequivocally that they would not do before the election, and now we have the Treasurer of this state saying that, of course, this is exactly and precisely what will happen in South Australia.

Next financial year, which, let's face it, is only seven or eight weeks away, we are going to return to a surplus in South Australia. How many times have I heard this, that we are going to return to a surplus? Be very careful, and here is the warning to the parliament and to the people of South Australia: look more closely when the budget comes down than the top line, because I make it clear to you that, if there are more sales of state government assets, we need to be aware of what they are going to be.

This is a government which has not performed particularly well against their own expenditure budget and, in fact, I am predicting that some time in the next six months we are going to become the \$4 billion state. That \$4 billion is the unbudgeted expenditure that this government has made since it came to power. We know from the Mid-Year Budget Review, which was handed down by the government in the dying days of 2014, just a couple of days before Christmas, that so far they are predicting the unbudgeted expenditure over the life of this government to be \$3.914 billion. That is absolutely shameful—\$3.914 billion. I am predicting that some time in the next six months we will breach the \$4 billion mark.

Imagine for one moment what we could do if this government just operated within its own budget each year. They set their own budget, and each and every year, they blow the budget. In fact, in December, they updated the parliament that they had already blown the budget this year by \$96 million. They brought that down two days before Christmas.

Imagine what we could do with that \$96 million, Deputy Speaker, in Florey. Imagine what we could do for our hospitals. Imagine what we could do to preserve our police stations in South Australia or upgrade education. We could even get around to fulfilling that often-promised new city campus here in South Australia, but we cannot do that because this government is reckless with our taxpayer dollars and they have blown the budget by a whopping \$4 billion.

Our state faces significant challenges, and it is interesting that the Premier now also acknowledges the significant challenges that face our state. They come in a number of areas, but I think the principal areas of challenge for our state are high unemployment, low growth, very low business confidence and young people giving up hope in South Australia. I would like to address those very briefly.

First of all, high unemployment is a travesty. Let us not forget that in the lead-up to the 2010 election, this government made a solemn promise to the people of South Australia that they would create 100,000 new jobs in South Australia in a six-year period. By my calculation, they have less than a year to deliver those 100,000 new jobs, so I think it is important for us to take this time as a parliament to consider how they have gone. They have set their own goals. This was not imposed upon them by the people of South Australia. It was not imposed upon them by the parliament. It was not imposed upon them by some greater authority. They came up with their own solemn promise to the people of South Australia, so how have they gone?

I just had a look at the most recent statistics in South Australia in terms of unemployment. We now have the highest unemployment rate in seasonal terms and trend terms in the entire nation. About the only thing we lead the nation in nowadays is unemployment.

Ms Redmond: Even worse than Tassie!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Heysen!

Mr MARSHALL: And it is quite incredible that, as the member for Heysen quite rightly points out, we have knocked Tasmania off the top of the perch. We now have the highest rate of unemployment in the nation and this is an absolute disgrace. The Labor Party has not delivered on its promise to create jobs and they should hang their heads in shame. What is the reason for this? I will tell you. This government, through its hopeless taxation and regulation regime in South Australia, has the handbrake on the South Australian economy.

Let us have a look at the growth figures in South Australia. In 2012-13, our growth in South Australia was 0.9 per cent. Last year, it was 0.13 per cent. What was it nationally? I will tell you what it was nationally: it was double. It was 2.5 per cent last year. In fact, the fast-growing states and territories are rocketing ahead. We have lost sight of the peloton. Let me tell you, the peloton has whooshed past us. The Northern Territory had 6.5 per cent growth last financial year: South Australia is sitting on 1.3. We have lost touch with the main peloton and now we have Tassie whooshing past us as well. We are right at the back of the pack and this is the problem.

Each and every year—and there will be one in a couple of weeks' time—the Treasurer comes in here and says, 'We've got a fantastic plan to grow the state.' He will come in here and tell us that we are going to have a growth rate of 2 or 3 per cent. Let me tell you that already the projection from this government for next financial year is 2.5 per cent. I just checked what Deloitte Access Economics has us down for in the next financial year and it is 1 per cent. How can Treasury and this government get it so wrong, or are they deliberately getting it wrong? It is séance economics from this Treasurer and this government, which just does not care.

But it is not just in terms of low growth that we are getting further and further behind. Of course business confidence is now really at an all-time low. When we look at the National Australia Bank's monthly business survey and the most recently published statistics for March, the business confidence index in South Australia is at minus 7.

The business conditions index is at a net balance of zero—the lowest in the nation. Businesses in South Australia have given up on this government creating the right conditions for them to grow their businesses and to employ South Australians. This is really then flowing straight through to the next generation's lack of confidence in this state and in this government. Last financial

year we had net interstate migration of 3,000 people. That takes to 38,000 in net terms the number of people who have moved away from this state since Labor formed government.

I know people leave this state and I know that they come back, but when you look at it in net terms, it is 38,000 people, and these are our best and brightest people; they are our young people. Imagine this state if we had those 38,000 people back in South Australia, contributing to our economy, spending money in our economy, paying taxes in our economy, maybe buying a house, maybe even starting a business and employing people. We would be transformed as a state, but instead we are just treading water because this government simply does not care.

I say to you, Deputy Speaker, that this budget that we are now approaching at a rapid rate of knots is very important. Sure, we do not have it in time for the Supply Bill today, but we know that it is coming. We know that Victoria today is going to bring down a budget surplus of \$1.2 billion. We brought down a deficit of \$1.2 billion last year; Victoria is going to be bringing down a surplus of \$1.2 billion. We are encouraging our government here in South Australia to make this budget all about the objectives that we have as a state, and the principal amongst those at the moment is job creation.

How are we going to do this? First and foremost, the government must look at the levers which are directly under their control. The first one to look at, of course, is the taxation regime in South Australia. We are the highest taxed state in Australia. We have the highest taxing, highest spending government in Australia. Last year's budget, when they brought it down, projected that state-based taxation revenue for this current financial year would go up 10 per cent—10 per cent.

We are already the highest taxed and their plan last year to stimulate economic activity was to stick the taxes up by a further 10 per cent. That is not going to cut it this year. We implore the government to think about tax cuts. We are not talking about putting a land tax on the average family home of \$1,200 per year or ripping away the ESL remissions from households, which is only going to further dampen economic activity in this state, but providing real incentive; not shifting the deck chairs, not taking it off here and putting it back on double the size in another area, but really providing tax relief so that we can grow and stimulate the economy.

We particularly ask the government to rule out the move that the Labor government has made in Victoria to substantially increase stamp duty for international buyers. In Victoria, they have imposed a 3 per cent surcharge on foreign investors in terms of their stamp duty, and importantly they have also increased the annual land tax paid by these people. We need every single dollar of investment coming into South Australia that we can get, and we hope that the government will rule this out. The Victorian Treasurer, Tim Pallas, has said with pride that they will put this additional tax on investors in Victoria. We say to those investors, 'Come to South Australia; for goodness sake, come to South Australia.' We are asking Tom Koutsantonis to make sure that he rules out putting this additional impost upon people wanting to invest in our economy in South Australia.

The other thing that a government can do, of course, is to try to stimulate economic activity through increased export activities. This has been a longstanding commitment of this government. This government has said that it would like to increase the value of exports. In fact, in its State Strategic Plan it set a target of \$25 billion. That would be achieved, according to its plan, by 2013.

Some of you might have noticed that 2013 has come and gone, and so we ask ourselves, 'How did the government go on this very important metric?' I will tell you—they failed miserably. In the first instance, they just changed the time frame from 2013 to 2014. Again, the most astute of you in the parliament today would recognise that 2014 has also come and gone. Did we achieve it? No, we did not. Was the government's response to put some more investment into this area? No. What did they do? They pushed the time frame out to 2020. They have now bought themselves another five years, but I can tell you that there is no chance that they are going to hit their mark. Why? Because they are not taking export seriously.

I would like to report to the parliament that the ABS international trade stats are out today. In fact, when we look at merchandisable exports from South Australia for the month of March, we hit \$1.035 billion. That is down 6.6 per cent on the same time last year. If we look over the past 12 months, we are hitting \$11.61 billion. Again, that is significantly down on where we were this time

last year. We are down nearly 5 per cent on where we were at this time last year. It begs the question: what is the government doing to stimulate exports out of South Australia?

I took a quick look at the budget papers because I thought, 'This will be instructive. Let's look at all the new programs that the government has to stimulate export activity out of our state.' I was horrified to read that in recent years we have reduced the expenditure in this area rather than increased it. In fact, if we flipped back the budget two or three years we would find that South Australia was spending \$30 million per year to support our exporters: now it is just \$18 million. How are we going to grow the size of our economy? How are we going to create jobs for our next generation? I would suggest the best way to do it is to sell more goods and services across our borders and therefore bring somebody else's money into South Australia.

If we look at the revolution that has occurred in New Zealand under John Key, that is exactly and precisely how he did it: he grew the economy by focusing on exports and made it a goal of theirs as a nation to have 40 per cent of their GDP derived from exports. Mr Key, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, I think made a very important speech when he said, 'We are not going to grow our economy by selling to ourselves.' It is exactly the same for South Australia: we are not going to become rich as a state by selling lattes to each other. We have to have more of our goods and services going across our borders. Whether that is interstate or overseas does not matter because, whatever happens, that money will come back into this state to grow the size of our economy, create jobs and give our next generation hope and opportunity right here in South Australia.

In the upcoming budget, to be brought down in the coming weeks by this government—this tired, 13-year-old, divided, dysfunctional government—I would like to see a budget that, first, reduces taxes and provides some hope and reward for our small business sector, for those people who are out there putting their houses and assets on the line to create employment opportunities and, secondly, supports our exporters so that we can grow the overall size of our economy.

There are plenty of issues we could cover here, and I would like to commend many of the speakers who have already made contributions on this bill today. But one thing I do not think has been covered off yet is the new courts precinct. This is a government that made promises in the lead-up to the election that they would establish a new courts precinct. The people of South Australia took them at their word. I do not know why the people of South Australia do this but, nevertheless, they took them at their word and now expect this precinct to be built. Of course, we were very unhappy to hear that the government has walked away from that commitment. They have walked away from the redevelopment of our courts precinct.

Our courts in South Australia are by and large in a deplorable state. The Supreme Court is absolutely shameful. It is more than just the physical infrastructure; the IT supporting infrastructure is decades old, and this is leading to massive backlogs in our courts and unsafe working conditions. Really, what it demonstrates to the people of South Australia is the contempt in which the government holds our legal system in South Australia. It is not good enough.

We need to see something in this upcoming budget that will give the people of South Australia some hope that this is a government that will take justice seriously. We need to upgrade our systems, we need to upgrade our buildings, and we need to make this a matter of priority. As I said, we are regretfully supporting this motion because we would like to have seen a lot more detail from the government. We hope that the government will focus on job growth and provide our next generation with some opportunity in South Australia. We have four or five more weeks until the government brings down its budget, so let's hope they can provide that opportunity.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:45): I rise to support the bill and, reflecting the words of the Leader of the Opposition, let's hope we spend this amount of money more wisely than we spent the last amount of money. When I say 'we', I am talking about the government of South Australia, of course. In particular, I want to refer to what has been the disaster of skills training in South Australia since the launch of Skills for All.

I start by talking about some of the background of Skills for All; if you recall, it was a significant election pledge from the then Rann government in the lead-up to the 2010 election. A policy document was prepared for the Labor Party in the department of further education—DFEEST, as it

was known back then—and funded by taxpayers. It was prepared to launch at the election in 2010 as a future policy of a re-elected Labor government, and we saw the formal launch of that in 2012.

In 2011, the then Rann Labor government announced it would reform the way in which the state's vocational education and training sector would be funded and managed. The government's Skills for All white paper, which outlined the reforms and the time frame for introducing them, stated that the objectives of the reforms were:

- to increase the number of South Australians with post-school qualifications and the level of those qualifications;
- to increase the participation rates in the workforce, i.e. the supply of labour to industry;
- to improve labour utilisation and the hours of work for those currently underemployed; and
- ultimately to improve labour productivity.

Full implementation of Skills for All commenced in July 2012, and it has been a financial disaster for South Australia ever since. Advice from external sources, including the Australian Council for Private Education and Training (ACPET) regarding the need to adopt a gradual implementation of reforms, and the financial risk of not introducing income and course eligibility restrictions on the availability of government subsidies for training was largely ignored.

The budget of the then DFEEST (now DSD, Department of State Development) for Skills for All has been exceeded several times, and it has required substantial ongoing course capping and eligibility restrictions to be made to bring the training budget back under control. However, of even greater concern has been the adverse impact of these changes on training providers, students and South Australian businesses, with ongoing uncertainty surrounding Skills for All funding and subsidy arrangements which changed on an almost monthly basis between 2012 and 2015.

The funding crisis created as a result of poor management of the Skills for All program by a conga line of ministers since it was released has also had a detrimental impact on the staff and funding budget of TAFE SA which will see its staff numbers reduced from just over 2,609 employees in 2012 to fewer than 1,800 employees by the 2017-18 financial year.

TAFE has traditionally played a lead role in providing training and employment support services for disadvantaged South Australians, including those from an Aboriginal and non-English speaking background, people with disabilities and regional South Australians. In some industries and regions, TAFE is the only main provider of training, with more than 80 per cent of the market share. Regions with very high market shares for TAFE in South Australia include the Far North (including the APY lands), Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island.

In launching the Skills for All program, the government stated that a detailed independent evaluation of the implementation of Skills for All would be undertaken and published by December 2013 (referred to in the Skills for All white paper) to ensure that timely changes would be made to the program if needed. However, the independent evaluation of Skills for All undertaken by ACIL Allen Consulting was not commenced until late 2014, and it was released in April 2015.

I note that ACIL Allen received the job for reviewing the Skills for All program at the end of last year, and by January this year the former CEO of DFEEST, Ray Garrard, was heading up their Adelaide office, and he started there in January this year. What is interesting, of course, is that the report was not released publicly until 1 April 2015, so there are questions raised as to its impact and about the person who designed and administered the Skills for All program and what role he had in the ACIL Allen review of the program.

The review found a number of deficiencies in the implementation and operation of the program and that the program has failed to meet several of its key objectives. These include that the proportion of VET graduates with a job-related benefit has declined across Australia since 2005, more so in South Australia than in other jurisdictions. There is little evidence of increased employment or productivity outcomes associated with the implementation of the Skills for All program. Just 30.5 per cent of those enrolled in a Skills for All course completed that course in 2013, and of those graduates only 70 per cent found a job-related benefit.

There was concern that the increased availability of publicly funded subsidies for VET training under Skills for All had a detrimental effect on the existing fee-for-service training market. In other words, those businesses that had been established over a substantial period of time, that had regular students from a reliable client base, lost their businesses overnight to many people who were running fly-by-night companies, companies that came in from interstate with often less rigorous programs. They lost their market and consequently lost their business, and some of them also lost their homes.

This has resulted in a substitution effect in some training sectors whereby a publicly funded training base was replaced by private funded training rather than increasing the overall training taking place. When you consider that the aim of the Skills for All program was to get more people into training, what we saw was a significant number of people who were prepared to pay for their own training or their employers paid for their training, and that privately funded training was replaced by publicly funded training.

After accounting for population growth, Indigenous participation in VET actually decreased over the period that Skills for All was in place. While there has been growth in the VET participation across South Australia since introduction of Skills for All, regional VET participation has grown at only half the rate of metropolitan Adelaide despite higher unemployment in many parts of regional South Australia. There is concern among stakeholders that Skills for All-funded VET activity has not always targeted areas with the greatest industry need or employment opportunities. I think the fact that the government has now dumped the program is evidence of that.

There is evidence of school-age students delaying enrolment in VET until they are 16 in order to qualify for Skills for All funding. Stakeholders expressed concern regarding inappropriate course delivery methods. Analysis of training data shows there were some courses where the duration appears to be well below the average. One of the major points of the ACIL Allen evaluation of Skills for All program is its failure to analyse or make reference to the financial aspects of the program, which remains one of the most serious concerns about the program, and its long-term impact on the future viability of state government training and employment programs, and TAFE SA in particular.

In the absence of an informed and independent assessment of the full cost of implementing and delivery of the Skills for All program, it is simply impossible to make an informed evaluation of whether the South Australian taxpayer has received value for money for the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been invested in the program since 2012.

Skills for All has failed in its prime objective of producing the skills needed to increase employment here in South Australia for increased productivity and economic growth. There has been almost zero employment growth in South Australia since 2010. That is extraordinary when you consider that in that same period across Australia 851,000 new jobs have been created, yet here in South Australia, according to the latest ABS figures, only 7,200 jobs have been created. Even a small state like Tasmania, with less than one-third of South Australia's population, was able to create 5,400 jobs in that same period. So, less than 1 per cent of jobs growth happened here in South Australia over the last five years, despite hundreds of millions of dollars invested in skills training. It was part of that package—remember that package that was announced before the 2010 election for 100,000 new jobs over six years?

In February 2015 South Australia had the highest unemployment rate in Australia. Unemployment in regional areas is at the highest level in 14 years, at 21.8 per cent, and youth unemployment in South Australia is amongst the highest in Australia. The independent evaluation of Skills for All—delivered more than 18 months later than promised—has highlighted serious issues in relation to the program and, as a result, the government has announced a new employment skills and training program, WorkReady, to replace Skills for All. While the government is yet to announce any details of the WorkReady program, there can be no confidence that a new program will address the serious failings of the Skills for All program it replaces, particularly as key aspects in the previous program, such as the financial operation, have not been investigated.

That is why, when that announcement was made on 1 April, we called for an independent process to evaluate the Skills for All program, particularly the financial impact of it. And that is why this week in the Legislative Council the Liberal Party will be moving for a select committee to be

formed so that a proper analysis of the Skills for All program can be undertaken. Witnesses that were not invited to participate in the ACIL Allen review will be able to come forward and, under parliamentary privilege, express the concerns they had with Skills for All and what involvement they had in warning the government.

We will be able to hear stories about people who were severely disadvantaged by Skills for All, those who had missed out on training places because of Skills for All and those businesses that were either destroyed or severely handicapped by the Skills for All program. I urge those members in the upper house to support that committee so that we can get it right, so that we can look forward. We have an understanding of the history of what happened, of what went wrong, the hundreds of millions of dollars that were wasted with the Skills for All program. Why on earth was a review that was promised to take place within 12 months 18 months late? It was a serious miscalculation by the government that cost tens of millions of dollars in wasted skills training.

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

Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.

FAIR WORK (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STAMP DUTIES (OFF-THE-PLAN APARTMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

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

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

REAL PROPERTY (PRIORITY NOTICES AND OTHER MEASURES) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Condolence

PAYNE, HON. R.G.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:01): I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Ron Payne MP, former member of the house, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

South Australia lost a good and humble man and an effective former minister with the sad passing of Ronald George Payne, on 9 April 2015, at the age of 89. He is remembered by friends and colleagues across the political spectrum as having been a steady, compassionate man in touch with ordinary people. His no-nonsense style was reflected in his dress. He never wore a tie in this place and favoured a working man's casual jacket. Still, former MP Greg Crafter remembers once seeing Ron wearing, slightly uncomfortably, a tuxedo for a regal or vice-regal event held in Adelaide.

Though he was quiet and did not much seek the limelight, Ron's actions in the Dunstan, Corcoran and Bannon ministries were substantial and far reaching. He represented the seat of Mitchell from 1970 to 1989 with energy and dedication. Indeed, he was seen as the type of person who everyone would want as their local member. In three different governments from 1975, he was minister in the following portfolios: prices and consumer affairs, 1975; community welfare, 1975 to 1979; planning, 1979; water resources, 1979; housing, 1979; and mines and energy, 1982 to 1988.

Ron Payne was born in Alberton in October 1925. Enlisting in the Navy as a gunner during World War II, he also served in Korea in the 1950s. Back in Adelaide, he became a senior electronics technician at the old South Australian Institute of Technology. The institute was previously the School

of Mines and Industries, and it was in mines and energy that Ron was to make perhaps his biggest contribution to this state. After he won the new seat of Mitchell for the ALP in 1970, he used his first speech in this place to demonstrate, amongst other things, his modesty and sense of humour. He told the assembly:

Older members will know the vagaries and whims of electors better than I do as a new member, but I feel bound to report that at least one elector informed me that he was glad to be able to vote a Payne into Parliament as Parliament had given him many a pain in years gone by.

In that speech, Ron touched on topics that would remain at the front of his mind throughout his career and that were relevant to the day-to-day lives of South Australians. These included education, housing and caring for elderly citizens. A true son of the labour movement, Ron summarised his political beliefs in the following way:

I believe, as indeed the Labor Party believes, that the worker who produces the services and goods that create the wealth should get a fair go and that he is entitled to a proper share of what he produces.

Nowhere did Ron put this philosophy and his general concern for people's welfare into practice more than as the member for Mitchell. Throughout his time as an MP, and even as a busy minister, he made house calls on electors—something we probably do not see as much these days. He also opened up his office on South Road on a Saturday morning and by himself dealt directly with constituents. Another thing he regularly did on Saturday mornings was to go to the local TAB and not just to place a bet. He would use this as an opportunity to gauge the mood of voters and to find out what topics were on their minds. Ron made a point of sharing these perspectives at the following Monday morning cabinet meeting, making sure ministers kept their feet on the ground and did not get too far ahead of themselves.

He, of course, knew his electorate extremely well. He lived in a modest house in Clovelly Park, one with a shed full of radios, and he loved driving classic American cars made in the 1950s and 1960s. Although he was a dedicated member of the Labor Party, he was by no means an apparatchik or powerful backroom player. Instead, he was most often out there lending his support in a practical way such as by printing the local party newsletter on an old-fashioned Roneo machine. One of his most important tasks as local member was playing a constructive role in the redevelopment of the suburb of Mitchell Park. This was a big Housing Trust area and, according to his successor, Paul Holloway, Ron supported revitalisation while also protecting the interests of long-term residents.

Ron Payne's early cabinet career was dominated by his position as minister for community welfare. He was one of the first ministers to hold this title in our state—a portfolio central to the tone and achievements of the reforming government led by the great Don Dunstan. His work in this field reflected his concern for the lives of individuals and families and, as minister, he always sought to focus on people's vital needs. Indeed, he was reported in 1977 as gently chastising a conference of social workers for overthinking matters rather than actually helping people. He was quoted as saying:

It seems to me that all too often the well-meaning people I have been talking to have been trained to think about and analyse a problem till the cows come home.'

To most of us here, I suspect, Ron Payne is best remembered for his work as the minister of mines and energy in the Bannon government, and I will leave the current minister to speak more about these matters. What I will say is that Ron dealt with some difficult and sensitive issues, including uranium mining at Roxby Downs and land rights, with calmness and fairness. He diplomatically balanced the interests of often sharply opposing groups, but he always placed the overall interests of the state above all else. He was as comfortable sitting around a campfire discussing land rights with Aboriginal people as he was meeting a boardroom full of mining executives.

A man of vision with an eye to the future, Ron showed an early interest in renewable energy, and South Australia is now reaping the rewards of that foresight. He told this house in 1986 that 'it could be that wind power might be an economic proposition in the not-too-distant future' which has certainly come to pass. He was remembered by colleagues as being a sound and supportive member of cabinet. He would read his cabinet papers thoroughly and, therefore, have a good understanding of other portfolios and the broad policy direction of government.

Ron would smoke cigarillos, or small cigars, in cabinet meetings, this being a time when metal cases containing cigarettes and lighters were always on the cabinet table. Ron would not comment in those meetings unless he could be constructive, but when he did his advice was invariably wise and sensible. During the Bannon era, Ron represented the premier at the ANZAC Day march because he was the only member of the then cabinet to have served in World War II.

Ron took people as they came and treated everyone in the same manner, whether you were a premier, a factory worker, a business leader or a voter. He also reached out to ethnic and religious groups. For example, he regularly visited the Adelaide Mosque in Little Gilbert Street and introduced the former member for Adelaide, Mike Duigan, to local Muslim leaders.

A man characterised by loyalty, empathy and common sense, Ron Payne made a positive and valuable contribution throughout his time in parliament. He served his constituents, state and nation with diligence and distinction. He treated all he met with respect and consideration. He was devoted to his wife, Betty, who passed away some years ago, to his daughters, Sandall and Tracy, and to his grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Today we are all beneficiaries of the attention he paid not just to economic expansion but to the betterment of the lives of South Australians. On behalf of the government, I extend my sympathies to the family and friends of Ron Payne and I express my condolences to this house.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): I rise to second the Premier's motion and, in particular, I place on the record the sincere condolences of the South Australian Liberal Party on the passing of the Hon. Ronald George Payne. We extend our sympathies to his family. Ron Payne was the first member elected to the newly created seat of Mitchell in 1970 and he served the southern suburbs community proudly for 19 years in this place until his retirement at the 1989 election.

Prior to his service as a member of parliament, he served our country on the front line through two wars. Born in Alberton, Mr Payne was only 17 when he enlisted for the Royal Australian Navy. He served as a gunner in World War II for three years on HMAS *Penguin*. He then re-enlisted in the army in 1952 and saw active duty as part of the Korean War. He remained in the army for six years before returning to civilian life here in Adelaide.

He worked as a senior electronics technician at the South Australian Institute of Technology before being elected to the seat of Mitchell. He described himself as a technically minded person and stated his background put him in good stead to serve as the minister for mines and energy, a portfolio which he held for six years and which he described as a personal favourite.

Of his 19 years in parliament, Mr Payne spent 10 years as a cabinet minister. He held the portfolios of prices and consumer affairs, community welfare, housing, planning, water resources and, as I mentioned earlier, mines and energy. He also served as an active member of the parliamentary standing committee on public works. He was famous with his colleagues and journalists alike for never wearing a tie and was once listed in the parliamentary association journal for entering the chamber tieless and with his shirt sleeves rolled up above the elbow.

Throughout his many years in public life Mr Payne remained an approachable figure with a good sense of humour. In his maiden speech he also outlined that the core philosophy underlining his political beliefs was that of a fair go, the importance of which is something I believe we can all agree on. I thank Mr Payne for his service to his community, the parliament and, of course, our nation. Vale, Ronald George Payne.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:12): I rise today in great sadness to speak to today's condolence motion reflecting the life and service provided by the Hon. Ron Payne, the former member for Mitchell. Ron died on 9 April, aged 89, at Flinders Medical Centre. During his life, he was the embodiment of membership of our great party. Throughout his life, he sought to make a positive commitment to his nation, his state and our community.

Born in 1925, not only did Ron enlist as a gunner in the Royal Australian Navy during World War II but he also put up his hand again to serve our nation in 1952, joining the Army in the conflict in Korea. Ron was discharged in 1957 and began a new phase of his life as a senior electronics

technician at the South Australian Institute of Technology which emerged from the former School of Mines and Industries. At age 49, he entered parliament in 1970 as the member for Mitchell and was part of the Dunstan decade. He took up his place in the cabinet five years later to replace Len King, no less, when the former attorney-general was elevated to chief justice.

An unassuming but effective minister, he initially held the portfolios of prices and consumer affairs, housing, community and welfare, planning and water resources until Labor lost government in 1979. Returning to cabinet after a brief stint in opposition as the shadow mines minister, Ron was appointed minister for mines and energy in the Bannon government, and it is here that I really want to take up the Ron Payne story.

Today's condolence motion is an opportunity to belatedly give Ron the credit he deserves for having a key role in the transformation of our state's economy. I think it is fair to say that Ron is the father of wind energy in this state. South Australia has now about 50 per cent of the nation's installed wind power capacity. Ron embraced renewable energy as the future for this state and early in his tenure as minister he pushed the Electricity Trust of South Australia to investigate our potential in what was an emerging technology. The result was something like 25 wind testing stations across the state that sought to establish whether our prevailing winds were consistent enough to provide the necessary capacity to support power generation through wind turbines. He was mapping—a forerunner to PACE.

We take it for granted that much of our state's energy is generated through wind power, but the foundations for this transformation were laid by the late Ron Payne. As a former electronics technician, I have no doubt he revelled in the technology that allowed turbines to capture the power of the wind. A further reform which I think we owe Ron some credit for is the push to link South Australia's electricity grids with New South Wales and Victoria. The establishment of the Heywood connector back in the 1980s became the basis for the national electricity market. Appropriately, this connector is now being upgraded to allow the renewable energy generated by our wind power capacity to be exported to Victoria and the national grid. Again, we see the foresight of Ron's legacy at work.

He was also a champion of our gas assets, of course, specifically, but not just limited to, the Cooper Basin. Early in his years as mines and energy minister, he was informed by the department that the basin could supply gas until at least 1992. He strongly advocated for expanded exploration to improve our knowledge of the basin and, as we know now, new techniques and continued drilling programs have shown that there is a vastly greater reserve than was ever envisaged in Ron's day.

During his time as minister, exploratory drilling began in the Otway Basin that led to the Katnook gas fields and processing plant that since 1991 has provided a cheaper source of energy for industries in the South-East of our state. Ron was also minister for mines during the first production out of Olympic Dam and helped ensure that that project continued to advance, despite Labor's initial opposition. As Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy in a Labor government, that is quite clearly a legacy to aspire to.

Ron retired in 1989 and his seat was retained by the Hon. Paul Holloway at the subsequent state election, who himself became a long-serving minister for mineral resources development. On behalf of myself and my family, I would like to convey our deepest condolences to Ron's family at this time of great sadness. Ron joins his late wife, Betty, and lives in the memory of his children Sandall and Tracy; grandchildren Jeremy, Natasha, Gavin, Emma, Suzanne, Elise and Liam; as well as his great-grandchildren Isabelle, Savannah and Jaxon.

He will be rightly remembered as a tireless contributor to the defence of his country, the advancement of his state, and of course our great movement.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:17): It is with great sadness that I speak to this condolence motion. Ron Payne was known to me through my work at the Working Women's Centre when he was a very early supporter of what was a very unpopular campaign to start off with, that of recognising repetition strain injury as an injury for workers and particularly women workers.

He understood and supported our campaign and was always helpful at trying to make sure that people did not assume that this was an imaginary illness that workers had and that it was a real

problem. He also was very supportive with regard to an investigation that was set up by then deputy premier Jack Wright. This inquiry was later known as the Mathews inquiry. I had the honour of being the only woman on that inquiry. That inquiry looked into the industrial health, safety and welfare of South Australian workers and eventually became the act that was adopted in 1986 through its recommendations.

Ron was very keen to make sure that the industries that he represented through his ministerial portfolios would be included in the inquiry. Some of the issues that were associated, and are still associated, with mining and quarrying were ones that he made sure the Mathews inquiry took up.

I later got to know him when I was at the United Trades and Labor Council and he was very supportive of the work that I had been asked to do as industrial officer with the Electricity Trust of South Australia unions. The ETSA unions were some 21 unions in those days. The work that we were particularly looking at was the inequities with regard to retirement entitlements—by that, I mean that the blue-collar workers at ETSA were on a poor retirement gratuity scheme and the white-collar workers were on a superannuation scheme that certainly needed some improvements but was far superior to that of blue-collar workers.

As minister, Ron made it clear to the ETSA board of management, and also the unions that he expected a more equitable system. I acknowledge progress in having the minister behind you in this area. Certainly, minister Jack Wright, who was the industrial relations minister, wanted to make sure that we tried to iron out those inequities too.

I would like to pass on my condolences to Ron's family and recognise the great work he has done for the labour movement and also the state.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:20): I too wish to express my condolences to Ron Payne's family and to speak briefly about my experience of meeting Ron Payne for the first time, as a 21 or 22 year old just starting my own business. Although I was living in Salisbury, I had a factory at St Marys, and my business partner's father at the time was actually the driver for Ron Payne. He was, of course, telling Ron what his son was up to, and Ron was very keen to see how a couple of working-class boys were having a go at making their own business and the sort of work they were doing. Ron was very respectful and he was very understanding of the work we were doing.

I think it is fair to say that the experience I had when I met Ron, and the conversations I had with him, probably helped me to decide that I was keen to get involved further in the political debate. A couple of years later, I joined the Liberal Party, and the rest is history. I would like to place on the record that Ron was, in fact, the very first member of parliament I met and had a conversation with. He was extremely impressive and conveyed a sense of compassion and care that certainly left a lasting impression on me as a young 21 or 22-year-old man. Vale Ron Payne.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): I rise to support the motion presented by the Premier in recognition of the late Hon. Ronald George Payne, who gave distinguished service to this house through a parliamentary career (in particular, as others have outlined, in the area of mines and energy in the 1980s) and also through his service and sacrifice as a soldier for our country.

May I first say that I would be chastised by the former member for Stuart if I were not to recognise the contribution of Mr Payne in saving the Purnie Bore, which was a bore in the electorate of Stuart now admirably served by the current member. This was a free-flowing bore until the minister intervened. He decided it was to be capped, but after pleas from the local residents to make it available for stock, and also to secure a water supply for the surrounding greenery and native fauna, it was allowed to flow continuously at a very low rate, and that continues today.

May I also recognise the Hon. Ron Payne's contribution as a former minister for community welfare, and the Premier touched on this. At the time that he was minister, I was a law student and then a young parent. As the minister for community welfare, he was the architect of formalising the regulations for childcare centres. Indeed, I sat on a committee with Mrs Barbara Adams, who was a pioneer of child care and the mother of the member for Waite, advising the minister's successor (the late Hon. John Burdett) who took over that ministerial role. This ultimately formalised the regulations for family day care—an area in which I had a particular interest at the time.

The second thing I particularly remember about the Hon. Ron Payne is that it was an era in which there was enforcement in relation to those who were recalcitrant non-payers of child maintenance, as it was known, or family maintenance, prior to that national scheme of the child support agency. More's the pity that we moved to a national scheme because I thought we had a very good one in South Australia; nevertheless, we moved to the lowest common denominator model regime, as is usually the case when we lose our state area of responsibility.

In those days, the Hon. Ron Payne's signature frequently appeared on certificates of title, when a non-payment could be registered on a person's title by way of a caveat that could only be removed by a Supreme Court order or the minister's signature, and he applied it. I would have to say it was a very effective way of ensuring that when people did want extra money, or to change the securities over their title, the defaulting amount of payment for their obligation to children soon came up. More's the pity that it no longer is there, but I saw his signature on a number of occasions and I am sure that social good was a result.

To his family, I wish to thank you for your patience and sacrifice in having someone give service to this house for some 20 years. Thank you for the sacrifice you made in doing so. Vale, the Hon. Ron Payne.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:26): I also rise to speak to the condolence motion for Ronald George Payne, the former member for Mitchell. As noted, he was elected on 30 May 1970 and re-elected six more times, which is an outstanding achievement. He was minister for prices and consumer affairs, community welfare, planning, water resources, housing, and mines and energy. Due to his age, he could not renominate and so retired at the 25 November 1989 election.

I read some of Ron's maiden speech and noted that we had some similarities as members for Mitchell, and they hinged around the communication with constituents and realising how important that is, as listening to their concerns and issues is part of the great fabric of this job. I found this quote from Ron's maiden speech, and I believe that it really identifies that similarity:

Before the recent election I spent many weekends and the last month knocking on doors and meeting the people of my district. I was tutored in this activity by a master, the member for Unley.

I too knocked on many doors and was mentored by the current member for Unley, the only difference being that the current member for Unley had me knocking on doors 12 months out. I think Ron got it a little bit easy, but he did have that great understanding of being a part of the people and being about the people.

The electorate of Mitchell looked a lot different in 1970, when it took in the suburbs of Clarence Gardens, Cumberland Park, Daw Park, Pasadena and Mitchell Park. The electorate has since moved further south, picking up a few more hills, and it no longer includes any of Mitchell Park. Like Ron, I am fully aware that we are here to represent the people of our electorate, and I will continue to doorknock, hills and all, and engage with my community as Ron did before me. My condolences to Ron's family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 14:29 to 14:39.

Parliamentary Procedure

CHILD PROTECTION

The SPEAKER (14:39): At the start of business today the member for Bragg raised what she said was a point of clarification but seemed to be an impromptu intervention. The member for Bragg's point was that the Coroner, in his findings in the Chloe Valentine case, wanted the Attorney to send to the house a couple of pages of transcript where the chief executive of the department was being examined about section 20(2) of the Children's Protection Act. The Coroner wanted that brought to the house's attention, because in his finding that subsection of legislation was not being applied or enforced.

The member for Bragg was asking whether that had been brought to my attention. Well, it was in an envelope on my desk and I went straight from a meeting of the parliamentary Labor Party to the house and I did not open the envelope. Had I opened the envelope, I would have found inside

a letter from the Deputy Premier and Minister for Child Protection Reform drawing my attention, and therefore the house's attention, to recommendation 22.4 of the Coroner. I table that letter and that item of transcript.

Ms CHAPMAN: If I may, sir, on a further point of clarification, identify whether you have had anything in respect of recommendation 22.5 in particular, as it had been confirmed by the Attorney on 16 September that he would be requesting that be provided as well?

The SPEAKER: Yes, I do have a paragraph on that where the Minister for Child Protection Reform writes: 'I have investigated whether Families SA has, in any of its annual reports since 1 October 2006, reported on compliance with section 20(2) of the act. I am advised there has been no such reporting undertaken by Families South Australia.' I table that.

Petitions

SALISBURY HEIGHTS

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para): Presented a petition signed by 1,016 residents of Salisbury Heights and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to not proceed with the Salisbury Heights Development Plan Amendment, to review the Better Development Plan and General Development Plan in relation to Salisbury Heights, and calls on the government to remove DPA's and major planning controls from local councils.

COUNCIL RATE CONCESSIONS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Presented a petition signed by 13,405 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to ensure that South Australian concession card holders and self-funded retirees continue to receive up to \$190 annually in council concession rates.

COUNCIL RATE CONCESSIONS

Mr DULUK (Davenport): Presented a petition signed by 2,592 residents of greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to retain and index state government concessions on council rates.

COUNCIL RATE CONCESSIONS

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government): Presented a petition signed by 2,592 residents of greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to retain and index state government concessions on council rates.

COUNCIL RATE CONCESSIONS

Ms COOK (Fisher): Presented a petition signed by 2,592 residents of greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to retain and index state government concessions on council rates.

COUNCIL RATE CONCESSIONS

Mr PICTON (Kaurana): Presented a petition signed by 2,592 residents of greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to retain and index state government concessions on council rates.

COUNCIL RATE CONCESSIONS

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell): Presented a petition signed by 2,592 residents of greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to retain and index state government concessions on council rates.

TOD HIGHWAY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders): Presented a petition signed by 235 residents of Eyre Peninsula requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to widen and upgrade the Tod Highway between Kyancutta and Karkoo in order to provide safe passage for all vehicles.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*. Never mind the quality, feel the width.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I think it was in a London tailoring comedy on the ABC.

Mr Marshall: Jermyn Street, sir.

The SPEAKER: Jermyn Street, was it?

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—Report on the probity of the processes leading to the awarding of a service contract: provision of passenger transport services in the City of Whyalla
Report April 2015

Local Government Annual Reports—Burnside, City of Annual Report 2013-14

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Community Titles—Regulations—Fees Variation
Real Property—

Regulations—Fees Variation

Regulations—Verification of Identity Variation

Registration of Deeds—Regulations—Fees Variation

Strata Titles—Regulations—Fees Variation

Rules made under the following Acts—

District Court—

Civil—Amendment No. 29

Criminal—Amendment No. 1

Magistrates Court—Civil—Amendment No. 8

Supreme Court—Civil—Amendment No. 28

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Development—Regulations—Port Adelaide Regional Centre Zone Variation

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

Maternal, Perinatal and Infant Mortality in South Australia—Annual Report 2012

South Australian Abortion Reporting Committee—Annual Report 2012

By the Minister for Small Business (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Small Business Commissioner—Annual Report 2013-14

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

Office of the Training Advocate—Annual Report 2014

Training and Skills Commission—Annual Report 2014

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Residential Parks—Regulations—Repayment of Bond Variation

Residential Tenancies—Regulations—Bonds Variation

Rules made under the following Acts—

Authorised Betting Operations—Gambling Codes of Practice—Variation Notice
No. 6 of 2015

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

Fishing Industry Fund—SA Rock Lobster Annual Report 2013-14
Grain Growers Rail Fund—Eyre Peninsula Annual Report 2013-14
Grain Industry Research and Development Fund—Annual Report 2013-14
Industry Advisory Group—

Alpaca Annual Report 2013-14
Apiary Annual Report 2013-14
Cattle Annual Report 2013-14
Deer Annual Report 2013-14
Goat Annual Report 2013-14
Horse Annual Report 2013-14
Pig Annual Report 2013-14
Sheep Annual Report 2013-14

Industry Fund—

Apiary Annual Report 2013-14
Cattle Annual Report 2013-14
Citrus Growers Annual Report 2013-14
Deer Annual Report 2013-14
Grain Annual Report 2013-14
Olive Annual Report 2013-14
Pig Annual Report 2013-14
Sheep Annual Report 2013-14

Wine Industry Fund—

Adelaide Hills Annual Report 2013-14
Barossa Annual Report 2013-14
Clare Valley Annual Report 2013-14
Grape Growers Annual Report 2013-14
Langhorne Creek Annual Report 2013-14
McLaren Vale Annual Report 2013-14
Riverland Annual Report 2013-14

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Primary Industry Funding Schemes—Regulations—Rock Lobster Fishing Industry
Fund
Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)—Regulations—Dairy Industry Variation

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Major Events—Regulations—AC/DC Concert

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

Local Government Grants Commission South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Save the River Murray Fund—Annual Report 2013-14
South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board—Annual
Report 2013-14
South Australian-Victorian Border Groundwaters Agreement Review Committee—Annual
Report 2013-14

*Ministerial Statement***CHILD PROTECTION**

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (14:51): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: On 9 April this year the State Coroner handed down his comprehensive report into the circumstances of the death of Chloe Valentine. After receiving the report, cabinet resolved to support 19 recommendations in full, provided in-principle support for recommendation 22.13, and committed to look further at recommendation 22.9. I would like to update the house on the implementation of these recommendations.

Recommendation 22.3: the chief executive of the Department for Education and Child Development has issued a direction to all Families SA staff that the paramount consideration must always be the wellbeing and welfare of children. The direction specified that considerations of confidentiality must give way in the face of the primary objective of child safety.

Recommendations 22.4 and 22.5: I have today written to the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of this house in accordance with both recommendations. The chief executive has also issued a direction to staff to remind all staff of their obligations under the Children's Protection Act.

Recommendations 22.6, 22.7 and 22.8: these recommendations relate to the application of income protection management in South Australia. I have written to the commonwealth to commence this process.

Recommendation 22.13: cabinet has supported this in principle, noting that a review of the Adoption Act is currently underway. Commissioner Nyland has also been asked to consider this matter.

Recommendation 22.17: the chief executive has issued a direction to all Families SA staff reminding them of the importance of accurate note taking. I am advised Families SA is also developing a training program on professional writing, including case notes and report writing. This course will be mandated for new and existing staff and will commence rollout around the middle of this year.

A further three recommendations required amendments to the act. This morning I gave notice that I will introduce a bill to make these amendments tomorrow. The bill expands on Recommendation 22.2 to capture people convicted of offences of causing serious harm and acts endangering life or causing serious harm, as well as murder, manslaughter and criminal neglect. The proposed amendments are significant, and will make lasting changes to the child protection system.

In response to the remaining recommendations, I have asked that a working group be established that will include the chief executive of the Department for Education and Child Development together with representatives from the Attorney-General's Department, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and the Crown Solicitor's Office. The working group will have input from other relevant agencies as required. I am advised that initial work is already underway.

The government is committed to the implementation of the Coroner's recommendations in a timely manner, and I am pleased to report to the house that significant progress has already been made.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament students from Glenunga International High School, who are guests of the member for Unley; students from the University of Adelaide, who are guests

of the member for Adelaide; and the principal and students of St Joseph's Tranmere, guests of the member for Hartley.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:58): I bring up the 515th report of the committee, entitled 2 Second Avenue, Mawson Lakes.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms DIGANCE: I bring up the 516th report of the committee, entitled Glenelg Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade of Inlet Works and Anderson Avenue Pump Station Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms DIGANCE: I bring up the 517th report of the committee, entitled APY Lands Main Access Road Upgrade Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection Reform. Why has it taken 13 years for this government to realise that children should be at the centre of our child protection system here in South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Well, that question is asked in such a truculent manner that I will not be surprised if the minister responds in a similar manner which will not be conducive to good order in the house. Minister.

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:00): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and tempted though one might be to respond appropriately, I think this is such a serious matter that even though it was a provocatively framed question it requires a considered and measured answer. The fact is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That's better. The fact is that over the last few years there have been significant changes in relation to the framing up of legislation regarding the protection of children and indeed, as a person who has been acquainting myself in some detail with these matters for some little time now, I am aware that there were a raft of legislative changes that went through the parliament in about 2005 and those legislative changes, if you read them, have actually had the effect of substantially recalibrating the focus of the legislation between a focus on families as being the predominant and overwhelming determinant of what is to be done to move it substantially in the direction of the welfare of children. Indeed, I would invite the Leader of the Opposition and anybody else who wants to study this to have a look at what the legislation looked like before 2005 and how it was changed in 2005.

The opposition leader's question was directed towards a 13-year time span. I would like to direct his attention to a time span of some little more than 13 days since the Coroner's report was handed down and, since that report was handed down, the government has moved very swiftly to first of all consider at cabinet level what the response to that report should be and, secondly, to get on with making administrative changes within the department and also to bring to the parliament quite comprehensive changes in the legislation which will be introduced tomorrow and which deal with and pick up all of the recommendations that have been brought forward by the Coroner.

If the substance of the criticism being forwarded towards the government by the Leader of the Opposition is that 13 years ago the government was not aware of what the Coroner was going to say 13 days ago, I think we have to plead guilty. We did not know what the Coroner was going to

say, and so we have been very keen to listen to, absorb and act upon the recommendations of the Coroner and, when the legislation that I have given notice of today is introduced tomorrow, I think everyone will see that that is going to be very much the case.

I would hope that we will receive the appropriate level of support from members opposite to get that legislation through because that will help the government to refocus not just from a policy point of view but from a legislative point of view everybody's attention on the welfare of children which we absolutely agree is the main priority in all of these cases. In the end, what we are on about is the welfare of children, and we have made it very clear that we are not going to have criticism of our present system given by the Coroner and us do nothing about it.

The SPEAKER: The members for Heysen, Adelaide and the leader are called to order and warned a first time; the deputy leader is warned a first time; and the members for MacKillop, Goyder and Morialta are called to order. Leader.

DEPARTMENTAL RANDOM DRUG TESTING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): Can the minister update the house on the implementation of random drug testing within the department? When did it begin?

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:05): As far as I know, random drug testing is something which is done on the side of the road by police officers using a range of—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Random drug testing?

Ms Redmond: Yes, that's what he said.

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I'm not quite sure what—

The SPEAKER: Could the Deputy Premier be seated. Did the member for Adelaide suggest that the Deputy Premier was lying or telling lies?

Ms SANDERSON: No, I didn't.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am not sure to what the Leader of the Opposition is referring. The only random drug testing I know that is required by law, that I can think of off the top of my head, occurs on the side of the road when police officers stop you. If what the Leader of the Opposition is referring to is something to do with section 20(2) of the Children's Protection Act, that is nothing to do with random drug testing.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: In that case, maybe if you ask a question which doesn't constitute something in the manner of 20 questions, I might be able to give you an answer.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned a second and final time, and the member for Schubert is called to order.

DEPARTMENTAL RANDOM DRUG TESTING

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): My supplementary is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister update us on the practice of random drug testing within her department?

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:07): Mr Speaker, can I just make

this point? If the Leader of the Opposition has some particular proposition to advance and then asks whether or not something has been done in accordance with whatever it is, that's fine. I am happy to take his—

Mr Gardner: The CEO said it was happening. We want to know about it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The member for Morialta has helpfully added one tiny little bit of information which wasn't available in the first place, which is it is something to do with something that was said by the chief executive officer, I assume before one of the upper house committees; would that be right?

Mr Gardner: That's what he said a minute ago.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Let me have—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta will withdraw and apologise for that remark.

Mr GARDNER: I withdraw and apologise, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned a second and final time, the member for Schubert is warned a first time and the member for Hartley is called to order. Does the Deputy Premier have anything more to add?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Only this. Far be it from me to offer suggestions as to how people might frame a question, but it is conventional, as far as I know, that when you have some proposition advanced by somebody that you wish the government to agree with, disagree with or comment on, the conventional way of doing it would be to say, 'On whatever day before whatever committee, Mr Bloggs said X, Y and Z. Apropos of this thing, what is going on with X, Y and Z?' rather than to eliminate the first bit (which provides some sort of context and some sort of point of relevance) and ask a question that could mean anything. I think the best thing I can possibly do is invite the Leader of the Opposition to provide, in due course, some particulars of whatever it is he is talking about and I would be happy to find out.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection Reform. How many parents known to Families SA have drug use safety plans in place?

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:09): I will take that on notice and find out.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): Supplementary: has there been a change in the department's policy on this matter of drug use safety plans since the Coroner's findings were handed down?

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:09): Again, there is a terminology being used here, 'drug use safety plans', and I don't know if that is a term of art or just a term of—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As I said, I don't know whether that is a term of art—and for those of you who don't understand what that means, that means something which has a particular meaning to certain people because it has a context and a meaning in that context—or whether it is simply a reference—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned a second time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Again, I am not sure exactly what the meaning of the question is, but I will take it on notice, and if it has some particular arcane meaning within the department I assume I will receive an equally arcane answer.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): A further supplementary: has Families SA applied to the courts for drug assessments for parents who are the subject of safety plans as evidenced in the Coroner's report?

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:11): I don't know exactly what these questions are about.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: For those who are vaguely interested in seeing this elicit some useful information, who have read—

Ms Redmond: The Coroner's report.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, indeed. The member for Heysen has hit the jackpot. If this were one of those TV shows, the big gold tick would have just come up like that.

Ms Redmond interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If you read the Coroner's report, there is quite a bit of discussion about section 20(2) of the Children's Protection Act. Since that time, there have been discussions, and I think at least some of those occurred in my presence because they were at a press conference, where the chief executive of the department tried to explain the interaction between section 20(1) and section 20(2).

Section 20(1) is a particular provision which, as he explained at the press conference, he has had resort to on hundreds of occasions every year. The point he made was that an application under section 20(1) is, however you would look at it, a matter which would be covered by the subset of events which are covered by subsection (2) because subsection (2) is a subset of subsection (1) and, by definition, if you are within subsection (1), of course subsection (2), being covered by subsection (1), would be within the exemption contained in subsection (2) which carves out a space for subsection (1).

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection Reform. Has your chief executive carried out the Coroner's recommendation 22.3, to inform Families SA staff—

The SPEAKER: Has the minister's chief executive.

Mr MARSHALL: Sorry, say that again—my question is to the minister and it says, 'Has your chief executive—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: I am sorry, sir. Has the minister's chief executive carried out the Coroner's recommendation 22.3, to inform Families SA staff they do not need to seek a parent or guardian's permission before asking questions to secure the protection of a child by 13 April as promised?

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:13): Yes, and I refer to the ministerial statement I made a little while ago where, in about the fourth paragraph, I refer explicitly to what has been done by the chief executive of that department in respect of that matter.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:14): Can the minister provide any explanation to the parliament as to why staff were not informed of their obligations and, in fact, their opportunities under the current law?

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:14): One presumes, and one works on the basis I think, that public servants are conducting themselves in a way which is in accordance with the law until one has reason to believe to the contrary.

My understanding is that we had a proposition put to us by the Coroner that he felt, whether it was lawful or otherwise, there was an incorrect focus on the way people were dealing with these issues of privacy, and that in some circumstances, the balance between privacy and, in effect, not respecting privacy in order to protect a child was not being correctly balanced. He said he wanted a recommendation to be heard loud and clear by the department that, when that balance is in play, you always err on the side of the child, not on the side of privacy, and that—

Mr Marshall: But he said they didn't know what their opportunities were.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: And that is what has been directed to the department. I am advised, as I said in the ministerial statement, that that is what I am advised. This is what I am told:

...the Chief Executive of the Department for Education and Child Development has issued a direction to all Families SA staff that the paramount consideration must always be the wellbeing and welfare of children. The direction specified that considerations of confidentiality must give way in the face of the primary objective of child safety.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): Will the minister table that directive?

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:16): I don't have it with me, but I will try to obtain a copy for the Leader of the Opposition, if that would help.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection Reform. Given cabinet has now agreed to the Coroner's recommendation:

...that there be a mandatory restriction on student social workers and qualified social workers with less than 12 months experience having client contact without direct supervision by a senior social worker—

can the minister now guarantee that no students are working on cases of at-risk children, as occurred with Chloe Valentine?

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:16): I thank the honourable member for his question. What I can guarantee is that I am advised by the department that they have issued the direction as I have indicated. If it turns out that, for some reason or another, that direction is not being observed by staff, that would be a matter for the department to enforce, and, I suppose at the extreme end of things, it would be a disciplinary matter. But, as far as I am advised, that direction has been conveyed to staff, and my expectation is that they will observe it.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:17): Supplementary: given the Attorney's indication, as Minister for Child Protection Reform, that a directive has been issued in respect of the obligation of staff not to ask questions or require permission from parents to ask questions, which was referred to, will he now confirm that there are no unsupervised trainees (which is a separate obligation and recommendation of the Coroner) continuing in the department and providing this service to children and families?

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:17): I think that was the question I thought I was answering in the last question. I believe, I am advised and I understand that there has been an instruction to that effect conveyed to staff by the chief executive. It is my expectation—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am not capable of personally sitting there, watching every single person. All I can tell you is that the normal mechanism by which instructions are given to staff in any government department—

Mr Marshall: They haven't been following it in the past; that's the whole point of the Coroner's recommendation.

The SPEAKER: The leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: All I can tell you is that, as a minister or as a chief executive, you can issue directions, or you can give instructions, or you can make determinations. If people refuse to cooperate with those, or don't for some reason, that might constitute a disciplinary matter. It is not a matter where there can be a warranty, self-evidently; but, it is our expectation (that is, the minister's and mine) that that instruction, having been given, will be observed.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:19): Supplementary: whose responsibility is it to see that this direction is being followed out, and what steps can the government take to ensure that there is an audit to make sure that junior social workers are not working on these important cases?

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:19): As in all Public Service matters, the chief executive is the primary manager, if you like, of the department. In fact, as members opposite probably know, as a minister you basically have control over one public servant, and that is your chief executive.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: They have control over everybody else and their job is to make sure the people who are working for them do as they—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: It's called the law.

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Mr Speaker, the member for Newland did make a powerful point, which is it is the law. If you look at the legislation governing the public sector, it will tell you that the management of each government department is actually in the control of the chief executive of the department. That person, the chief executive, is accountable to the minister. The minister asks the chief executive to do things. The chief executive does things, but the minister does not have the capacity under the public sector legislation to go in and direct individual employees. That is the job of the chief executive. All I am saying to people, and if you can just absorb this—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Member for Hartley, I'm sorry, but this is legislation that has been in place for a very long time and it is the legislation that applies in the commonwealth. It is the legislation that applies all around the country. All we are saying is, since the Coroner has handed down his report, the direction has been given, I am advised, by the chief executive that the conduct the Leader of the Opposition is concerned about should not occur and it is my expectation that that direction will be observed.

SA POWER NETWORKS

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister update the house on the Australian Energy Regulator's preliminary decision on SA Power Networks' regulatory proposal for the period 2015-20?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:21): South Australians demand and deserve reliable and affordable energy, and across much of the nation the rising cost of power is putting increased pressure on household budgets. When members opposite privatised ETSA, they denied the people of this state from exacting any control over their electricity infrastructure. Despite having no control over our electricity assets, this government makes every effort to craft policy that strengthens consumer protection and encourages people to manage their energy requirements efficiently.

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The government is committed to working with industry and our community to ensure that South Australia—

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —remains a place where people and business thrive. Late last year, SA Power Networks submitted its 2015-20 regulatory proposal to the Australian Energy Regulator, which proposed a significant increase in both capital and operating expenditure. Submissions were invited and the government called on the regulator to identify any opportunities for real decreases in electricity prices. Last week, the regulator released a preliminary decision to allow SA Power Networks to recover \$3.2 billion over the 2015-20 regulatory period. That is a substantial reduction from the \$4.7 billion that SA Power Networks are proposed to recover for that period. This is a win for all South Australian households. It will reduce power bills by an expected \$197 or 9.8 per cent in 2015-16.

I am also confident that the member for Finniss will welcome the regulator's support for replacement of Kangaroo Island's undersea cable, and I am sure he is grateful to this government for supporting the new undersea cable in our submission.

Mr KNOLL: Point of order, Mr Speaker. Every piece of information that the minister has spoken about is in the preliminary decision to SA Power Networks' determination, as displayed on the AER's website, including all of the submissions by all of the parties and all of the outcomes that the minister is talking about.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to what the minister has to say and the member for Schubert can email that to me.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. This new cable to the island will secure electricity supply in the long term and mitigate the possibility of early failure to the existing cable.

I also urge retailers to pass on these savings to households and to encourage consumers to shop around for the best market offer available. They can go to our website at energymadeeasy.gov.au to make sure that they receive their maximum benefit. We can take heart that householders can take advantage of increased competition between retailers by shopping around for a better offer as a result of price deregulation by this government in February 2013. I encourage members opposite, like the member for Schubert, to get onto energymadeeasy.gov.au to

get a better offer; if he does not get one, to call his retailer and ask his retailer to pass on that saving; and, if they will not, to move retailers.

SOUTH-EAST ASIA TRADE MISSION

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (15:25): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Can the minister update the house on his recent trade mission to South-East Asia?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:25): I thank the member for her question. As members would be aware, on 19 March 2015 the government released the South-East Asia engagement strategy. Annual inbound and outbound missions to and from the region, which includes the 10 countries of ASEAN and Timor-Leste, are vital features of this strategy. On 26 April 2015, the government undertook a five-day trade mission to Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand. I was accompanied by Economic Development Board member, Professor Göran Roos, and the Executive Director of Investment, Trade and Immigration in the Department of State Development, Mr Matt Johnson.

The key objective of this trade mission was to promote and foster the implementation of the South Australia-South East Asia Engagement Strategy in Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand. This included discussing options for embedding staff in Austrade across the region, meeting with prospective and current investors and SMEs, and engaging key government officials, relevant in-country business chambers and other potential partners in the region.

Highlights of the trip include a meeting with minister Iswaran, the Minister of Trade and Industry and an Adelaide University alumni, to discuss potential and current trade and investment opportunities between Singapore and South Australia. I was also able to visit SATS Coolport facility in Singapore, Asia's first certified perishable handling centre, dealing with perishables and all other temperature-sensitive products. Coolport's clientele consists of international airline customers, including Qantas, and major logistic companies such as DHL and TNT, and it is vitally important for food producers in this state.

Coolport provides an uninterrupted cold chain solution direct from the aircraft to individual coldrooms at the facility. Perishables including: fresh flowers; fresh fruit and vegetables; meat products, including chilled and frozen meats; dairy foods; live/chilled/frozen seafood; confectionary, including chocolate; and temperature-sensitive pharmaceutical and biomedical products are handled at the facility.

I also had an opportunity to engage in a business forum with the Australia Malaysia Business Council (AMBC), and similar councils in Bangkok. As many members will be aware, South Australia shares many historical links with Malaysia, which includes Adelaide's sister city relationship with Georgetown, Penang for more than 40 years. As such, working with the AMBC plays a critical role in establishing business relationships that foster trade and investment between our two states.

I met, along with the delegation, with Dole International. Dole is the largest producer and marketer of high quality fresh fruit and vegetables in the world, and does business in more than 90 countries. Dole sees South Australia as a strong partner and a great source of quality produce. I also met with Temasek Holdings, International Enterprise Singapore, Siemens and Singapore Technologies Marine, where I was given a tour of their shipyard. Whilst in Bangkok the delegation met with the executive vice-president of CP, Thailand's largest private investment company.

I would like to thank staff in my department, as well as in Austrade and DFAT, for their assistance in making the trade mission a success. I also commend minister Robb and the federal government for the good job they are doing in encouraging free trade and opportunity between Australia and the countries in our region. On this page, the federal and state government are as one.

Although the South Australia-South East Asia Engagement Strategy is aimed at securing trade opportunities, attracting foreign direct investment and further developing South Australia's export capacity—because it is all about jobs—we must also continue to develop a broad and thorough engagement.

RIVERLAND INVESTMENT

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:29): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. How is the state government supporting business communities in the Riverland?

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey has been making quite a racket down the back. I call him to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:29): I thank the honourable member for his question. At the community cabinet meeting at Renmark in June 2014, the government committed to delivering a \$200,000 pilot program in the Riverland called Made in Riverland. The program is a joint initiative between the state government and Hub Australia. Its purpose is to support regional councils in activating their main streets.

The Made in Riverland program offers a shared work space known as the Riverland Hub and learning events for businesses in the Riverland. A case management service is also offered to entrepreneurs needing assistance with planning or liquor licensing regulations to enable a quicker pathway to opening a business. The Riverland Hub opened its doors in Renmark on 13 April. It was officially launched on 23 April, with over 40 people attending, including, I think, the member for Chaffey and the Renmark Paringa mayor and chief executive. The hub is open for small business to use as an office and meeting space and a space where budding entrepreneurs can hold meetings with customers and mentors to network.

The learning events have been designed based on feedback from the Riverland business community. They are an opportunity for business owners to learn and connect with others across the Riverland and South Australia, particularly focusing on improving customer service, developing strong marketing programs and negotiating leases for new sites. A number of events will be taking place through May and June, for those who are interested, and you can register at www.madeinriverland—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, you're on a different page—never mind.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: One answer too many, you see. Sometimes you have one question and you have one answer too many. You can register at www.madeinriverland.eventbrite—that's where you went wrong—eventbrite.com.au.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN REGIONAL ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:31): Supplementary, Mr Speaker, to the minister: will he support the \$25 million diversification fund currently on the table?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:32): I'll go through this again, this tiresome sort of question. I refer the honourable member to the previous answer I gave in this house—and if I have to go through it all again. I was at the table when we negotiated—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member Hammond is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —the \$25 million amount of money that's to come into South Australia. If the member really wanted to do a favour for his electorate, what he would do is simply impress upon his federal colleagues to actually not remove the \$25 million in the current upcoming federal budget, which they have threatened to do, through a letter we received from Jamie Briggs. If you had any influence at all at a national level, if you weren't utterly impotent at a federal level, you would get in touch with your federal colleagues and—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —ask them to simply hand over the \$25 million that we negotiated as part of the Murray Darling Basin Plan—

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Goyder is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —agreement.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is the parallel universe we're living in here: it's their money, it's our agreement. They want to nominate the projects, yet they want us to pay for them. Well, naturally enough, we've said no. The other thing that they advance is, 'Oh, this is complicated. We'd have to make an exception for South Australia.' Well, pardon me! We've just had something like \$400 million worth of exceptions granted to the Western Australian government because they got themselves into a bit of trouble on the iron ore price. So, when it's necessary to sign a little bit of paper to get a Liberal mate out of trouble—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —they are happy to do that. They can be whistled up at a moment's notice. It just demonstrates the complete lack of influence the local Liberal Party here in South Australia have at a federal level. They cannot even get their federal colleagues to stand by an agreement—

Mr Gardner: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: No. 98, please, sir.

The SPEAKER: Debate? I'll listen carefully to the Premier—perhaps a little less accusatory.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, we could join together in some happy sort of harmony here and jointly approach the commonwealth government and ask them to simply hand over \$25 million so it can be spread in the Riverland communities. It might have passed the attention of those opposite but this is not a natural constituency of the Labor Party, the Riverland. However, we have been fighting for the Riverland community; we fought for this \$25 million, we secured it, and it is now their federal colleagues. So do not come in here pointing the finger at us—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Point the finger at the people who are actually to blame; that is, your federal colleagues. For once, put your state ahead of your party.

AL SALAM FESTIVAL

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:35): My question is directed to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. How is the state government working with the Islamic community to increase cross-cultural understanding?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:35): I thank the member for the question. The Islamic Society of South Australia hosted the inaugural Al Salam Festival, known as the Peace Festival, on 26 April 2015. With about 20,000 South Australians identifying as Muslim, the Peace Festival provided an opportunity for South Australians from all walks of life to gain a deeper understanding of Islam.

It was my absolute pleasure to attend this event and engage with community leaders, as I am sure it was for the members opposite who also attended, and I would like to point out that we had tremendous bipartisan support there. The member for Elder, the member for Torrens, the member for Unley, the member for Hartley, the shadow parliamentary secretary from the other place, and Greens MPs also attended. Mr Speaker, I believe you were also at the event for some time.

About 3,000 people attended over the course of the day. The festival featured 14 international food stalls, show rides, and an Al Salam Tour, which aimed to improve public dialogue about the Islamic faith in the community. The South Australian Islamic community is not a homogenous group; instead it comprises a multitude of cultures and nationalities. As a government we are committed to creating an inclusive and cohesive community, where cultural and religious diversity is welcomed, understood and supported. That is why we committed \$10,000 towards the delivery of the inaugural Peace Festival.

South Australians are a culturally and religiously diverse lot, and this diversity plays an important role in the way we see ourselves. Many people choose to become South Australians because they want to be part of our peaceful and cohesive community, they want to share our sense of wellbeing and inclusiveness, and have the right to practice their religion and culture without hindrance or persecution. Indeed, we are blessed to live in a place where this is almost taken for granted when there are so many places across the world where this is just a dream.

Peace and tolerance matter to everyday South Australians. We all share a sense of great pride that our forebears insisted on creating a state where religious freedom was enshrined from the early days. Of course, these rights and freedoms are supported by our vigorous democracy and the state government's progressive multicultural processes and policies.

The inaugural Peace Festival was a great success. It was successful because it provided an opportunity for all South Australians to gain an increased cultural understanding of our diverse Muslim community. However, I will mention that we did release some doves and, while a beautiful act, I am not that fond of holding birdlife ready to be released—maybe something the member for Unley and I share.

I look forward to engaging in future events with representatives from our Muslim communities, and I congratulate the Islamic Society of South Australia on its success. I thank the many volunteers who dedicated their time and commitment to making this first Peace Festival come to fruition and be very successful.

The SPEAKER: I was with Rob Kerin once on Glenelg Jetty when he held a dove.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: John Kiosoglous did an excellent job of replacing that dove.

FARAH 4 KIDZ

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:39): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise why it took a recent *Today Tonight* report about Farah 4 Kidz for a thorough government investigation to be launched, leading to its suspension as a family day care provider, despite the minister and her department being made aware of the child safety concerns and allegations of fraud 12 months earlier?

The SPEAKER: I am not sure that question is in order. We don't normally do promos. The minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:39): Far be it from me to question the judgement, the opinion, that a particular media program changed policy, but what happened with the case of Farah 4 Kidz—and it is an ongoing matter at this point, and there is a limit to what I am able to say in public—is that a representation was made some time ago to the Attorney-General and through to my predecessor who acted promptly to have the board consider the matters. Those matters were considered and followed up, and then a subsequent complaint was made in which there was some involvement by the media.

That complaint was again followed up. Information had been provided to the federal government originally, and then in the second complaint also, on the matters which are the province of the federal government, which are particularly not only around the certification of the qualification of the workers but also the management of the income. Broadly, to translate that for people, what I mean by that is the allegation that children of one family might be being looked after by another family and vice versa, and then everyone is paid for that by the taxpayer. So, that was taken up again with the federal government.

I also had a briefing with the honourable member for Unley and, at his urging, have had engagement directly with the federal minister about this matter. It now looks like we are reaching a conclusion on appropriate action. As I say, I am wary of prejudicing any outcome by engaging publicly on this, but I will be approaching the member who has taken an interest to provide some confidential information to him, as long as it's on that basis.

THEATRE COMPANIES

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:41): My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Minister, how are some of our premier theatre companies establishing themselves outside South Australia?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:42): I thank the member for Elder for her question and her interest in our arts companies here in South Australia. While the Fringe and Festival captivated local audiences, our two local premier theatre companies—the State Theatre Company of South Australia and Windmill Theatre for Kids—were making waves internationally, debuting their interpretation of *Pinocchio* at New York's oldest theatre, the New Victory Theatre.

The season ran from 12 to 22 March, and I am pleased to inform the house that, after selling 70 per cent of seats prior to their opening, the season was a sell-out. We know that this joint production of State Theatre and Windmill has received great accolades here in Australia, scooping the pool at the 2014 Helpmann Awards, but it is a huge achievement to not only compete with some of the world's best theatre productions in New York but to, in fact, sell out. The performance also received rave reviews from some of the world's most renowned theatre reviewers, including *The New York Times* critic Andy Webster who wrote, and I quote:

This family-friendly show, from the Windmill Theatre and the State Theatre Company of South Australia, manifests robust energy, visual flair and an aversion to modern-day phoniness.

But it isn't just the famous wooden puppet bringing success for these two companies. Windmill's adaption of the much-loved children's books *Grug* has also been a hit internationally with the production performed last month at the—and I am careful of the pronunciation here—Shat Tin Town Hall in Hong Kong. The season saw eight performances, with four of the shows incorporating Cantonese interpretation. While I am not sure how the tale of *Grug* translates into the bustling metropolis of Hong Kong, I am pleased to inform the house that this fantastic production also was a sell-out.

The State Theatre Company is looking to break into a new international market, going into creative development for a coproduction with UK's Frantic Assembly this month which, with all things going well, will lead to a production and a UK season in 2016. State Theatre is also busy with productions touring nationally, including:

- *Masquerade*, which opened at the Sydney Festival;
- their fantastic cabaret piece *Little Bird*, which showed at the Arts Centre in Melbourne during January; and
- their education show *This Is Where We Live*, coproduced with HotHouse Theatre, which opened in Albury-Wodonga at the end of April.

Every South Australian should be proud of the successes of our nationally and internationally-renowned theatre companies. I would like to thank the actors, directors and staff for their hard work, producing some of the best global theatre right here in our state.

FARAH 4 KIDZ

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:44): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. What action did the minister take when she received the statutory declaration of a former Farah 4 Kidz employee stating that it was the view of a member of the investigating body into Farah 4 Kidz that, 'Unfortunately the government is waiting until a death occurs before anything happens'?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:45): Because I can't remember the exact dates and sequence and I don't want to mislead the house, what I will do is I will prepare a proper answer on exactly the sequence of what occurred following that statutory declaration.

FARAH 4 KIDZ

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:45): A supplementary, sir: has the minister or her department contacted the informant since her statutory declaration was received by the minister on 9 February?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:45): I personally have not, although I know that you did recommend that course of action. The member for Unley recommended that course of action, but I have not contacted that person. The board—and I don't want to be fussy or pedantic about this—unlike most other states we have a separate board that does the registration of these organisations as opposed to being part of the department, and that is because the department runs some businesses that the board registers, so we have that separation. I will find out if it is the board that would be part of the response to the previous question you asked.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSIONER ANNUAL REPORT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:46): My question is to the Minister for Small Business. Given that the report of factual finding into statistical discrepancies contained in the Small Business Commissioner's annual report was dated Monday 23 March, before the last sitting week, why was it not tabled before today?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:46): I tabled the advice as soon as the Small Business Commissioner made it available to me and to my office. I understand that this was raised with me earlier and I sought advice on at what point I should advise the parliament. I sought crown law advice and I spoke to the department until we were able to ascertain that, in fact, it was an error. We were not exactly sure what we could tell the parliament without being ambiguous. Once we had it verified and checked, we made it available at the first possible opportunity which, the advice I have received, was today.

The SPEAKER: I share that the minister was in touch with me during the break, early in the break, I think, about the matter.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSIONER

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:47): Now that the minister has had, I assume, several weeks to analyse this report, what decisions or actions by the government have been identified which were based upon the false information provided by the former small business commissioner and must now be reviewed?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:47): I think it is fair to say that the opposition have never supported the establishment of an advocate for small business in this state. In fact, if my recollection is correct, they all voted against its establishment as an office. I have never really understood why members opposite—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir. I believe the minister—

The SPEAKER: Sorry, I was listening to the leader.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, the minister is debating the question.

The SPEAKER: I couldn't possibly believe that of the minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We have always been an advocate of having a small business commissioner to do their role. We have changed commissioners. We have a new commissioner, Mr Chapman, who headed up an industry association, the MTA. I understand he is a former employee of former premier Olsen, who is held in high regard by the private sector and, I would have thought, in high regard by the small business community, given he was head of an association that was predominantly made up of small businesses. I have taken his advice in my ministerial statement to the parliament today. I have supported steps put in place by the commissioner that Mr Chapman has subsequently put in place in the new procedures relating to data collection.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe the minister is still debating the question. The question was about what government decisions have been made based on false information which must now be reviewed, not what steps have been put in place to make sure—

The SPEAKER: The minister will answer the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. We support the role and function of the Small Business Commissioner. I think the current commissioner does an outstanding job, ably assisted by his deputy and ably assisted by an office that is aching to go out there and do good for the small business community. We support every function and power we have given them.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker. Again, this is debate. The question had nothing to do with support for the commissioner. The question was very clearly about what decisions the government has identified which were based—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

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

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —on false information.

The SPEAKER: The minister will answer the substance of the question or finish.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I have concluded my remarks. I support every decision we have taken for the Small Business Commissioner.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSIONER

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:50): Supplementary question, sir: does this issue now cast doubt upon the government's decision to make the Small Business Commissioner's office exempt from freedom for information requests?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:50): Again, it is a fundamental misunderstanding of how business operates in this state. There are things that are given to the Small Business Commissioner by the small business community when they are advocating unfair practice or people not bidding in good faith. For example, small businesses that have large retail tenancies in large shopping centres often go to the Small Business Commissioner to have disputes resolved. I understand that members opposite don't particularly care about those small businesses but we care very deeply about their commerciality, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister is debating.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I apologise to the house, Mr Speaker. I absolutely support that decision because I think it is imperative that we give small businesses the opportunity to go to the Small Business Commissioner in a confidential way that is not going to allow large, uncompetitive businesses to FOI commercially sensitive information from those small businesses.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:51): My question is to the Minister for Road Safety. Considering a report into safety on the South Eastern Freeway was originally prepared following a death in 2010, why has it taken an ensuing three years since the report was tabled and two more fatal truck crashes to implement the report's recommendations?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:52): I will answer the question as best I can, because the primary carriage of this section of road safety is undertaken by my colleague minister Mullighan, who oversees truck regulation as part of the national scheme. However, what I can advise the house is that a number of measures were put in place during 2010, 2011 and 2012 arising from the new rules regarding vehicles with five axles, etc. They were implemented back in 2010-11, and a number of other measures have taken place as well.

As members would be aware, this is one area where new technology assists in making the roads safer. At the recent meeting held with stakeholders—in other words, the people involved in the industry—which, if I remember correctly, the member was also present at, there were a number of priorities established and, certainly, the government is now following those priorities. A couple of those priorities, from recollection, were to do with making sure that people are properly trained to use that section of the road and, also, that vehicles are properly maintained to use that road. It is sad that, just recently, SAPOL defected a number of trucks for deficiencies which make them unsafe to use the roads. What I can say is that this government, based on the advice it receives from its department, does the best it can to make our roads safe.

What I should also add is that there are about 500,000 truck movements on this section of the road in a year and the overwhelming majority of people who drive those trucks do the right thing. What we need to do is make sure—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: You are quite right. What is important is that what you do in terms of a road safety measure actually works and what we are doing is working carefully—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier is called to order and the Leader of the Opposition really should go out.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: As the member for Mitchell also knows we are, and he is as well, working closely with the industry to make sure that road is safe. The minister has a number of things under review at the moment in terms of implementation, including at the national level, about truck regulation. What I can also say is that, in the end, if people break the law there is nothing we can do to prevent that, unfortunately.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: No. The simple fact remains we have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Davenport and Kavel are called to order.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The fact is on our roads, unfortunately a lot of the deaths and crashes occur because of people's inappropriate behaviour. It does not matter how much education we try to put out there or the measures we take including stop lights, people unfortunately still have serious crashes at those intersections which are controlled.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: What I am saying is there is only a limit we can actually do with infrastructure—

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel is warned.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —to actually make roads safer. We are now working closely with industry to make sure that every dollar we invest in road safety delivers the best outcome for the community.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Road Safety will not refer to his colleague the Minister for Transport by his family name, a reference which seems long ago and far away just at this point.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:56): A supplementary to the Minister for Road Safety: can I get a clarification as to when you received that report after the initial fatality in 2010 and when you read the report before the two more fatalities in 2014? I would like the date and the times from the minister.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:56): I became Minister for Road Safety last year, so I certainly wasn't in 2010 when the report was prepared. Since that time, the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and I have received a series of advice from the department based on current research, current technology, etc. The report you referred to was brought to my attention last week.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:57): Supplementary: are you backtracking to that report now that you have read it and implementing any more of those findings on the South Eastern Freeway, given that there has been a report after the 2010 incident?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:57): I thank the member for his question. I am actually relying on advice myself and I am sure the Minister for Transport—we rely on advice from the department which is now based on the current research and current evidence, so unless the member for Mitchell is suggesting we should ignore the process we went through last year with the industry and just ignore all their recommendations and their knowledge, perhaps he should say so.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: What we are doing is working with the industry to make sure our roads are safer for all.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:58): Can the Minister for Road Safety explain to the house then why he read that report from a fatal incident in 2010 after it was printed in the newspaper?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:58): I thought that was quite evident. I said it was brought to my attention.

POLICE STATIONS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:58): My question is to the Minister for Police. When the Labor Party promised in its election policy to 'introduce new ways to report crime', why didn't they notify the public of South Australia that they were ending some of the traditional ways, such as face-to-face reporting at eight suburban police stations?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:59): I thank the honourable member for his question. There are two things: there are more ways than ever for people to report to police, including face to face. In fact, most of the reporting, of course, occurs online or by phone, which the community seems to prefer overwhelmingly. Some of these satellite stations which have been referred to had on average two to three contacts a day and some days had no contacts at all, so the overwhelming contact that our community prefers is in other ways. We are

making sure that the resources are utilised in a way to make sure, as the Premier said, we catch villains.

POLICE STATIONS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:59): Supplementary, sir: why is it that the people of South Australia were, one year ago, given Labor election material criticising former governments for closing eight police stations and are only now finding out that the Labor government is closing these stations?

The SPEAKER: I haven't heard the expression 'villains' since Gunny was here.

Mr Marshall: I would have thought you would have been very familiar with villains, sir—very familiar with villains!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (16:00): Mr Speaker, I thank the honourable member for his question. We have kept our promise. What we are committed to as a government is making sure our community is safe by having an effective police force, and we have one of those.

Ministerial Statement

APY EXECUTIVE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (16:00): I table a copy of a ministerial statement by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Hon. Kyam Maher, on APY Executive Board governance and financial management.

Grievance Debate

HEALTH REVIEW

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:01): Today I rise to speak about the widespread ramifications in South Australia, but particularly the ramifications that are affecting health in the regions of South Australia through the state government's Transforming Health and, in particular, the people of the Riverland and Mallee. After providing a submission on behalf of my electorate to the Transforming Health consultation in the early stages, I was extremely disappointed and concerned that there was very little to no mention of rural and regional South Australia in Transforming Health.

In some ways, the Transforming Health paper was really about cuts, closure and the instability of health services in South Australia, particularly in relation to people in regional South Australia having to travel for medical procedures. I was recently presented with a petition from 324 concerned Mallee residents opposing Labor's proposed cuts to emergency departments at Modbury and Noarlunga hospitals and the Repatriation Hospital. Those concerns were about health access in Adelaide for those country residents. Of course, the government backflipped on Noarlunga after the diligence of lobbying by its backbench, and I see that they seem to have quite a bit of sway that others do not. But while that backflip remains, there are still a number of concerns.

Sadly, this petition could not be officially presented to the parliament today. Those concerned residents immediately took action, downloaded some literature from online, and proceeded to lobby their community with the implications that Transforming Health was going to have. What it is showing me is that, due to a lack of specialist care in the Riverland and Mallee, a number of those patients who have to travel to Adelaide on a regular basis to seek medical assistance often require emergency care in Adelaide. A number of our returned servicemen are currently using or have used the Repatriation Hospital.

In addition, the people in my electorate also have relatives who live in Adelaide and are impacted by Transforming Health as well, and their concerns are being echoed throughout the Chaffey electorate. I think that it is really up to people within regional and metropolitan South Australia to rally and express their concerns, as the good people at Karoonda in the Mallee have. I commend their actions, albeit that they did not conform to the regulatory parliamentary petition paperwork that we have to have here. I commend those 324 signatures that have been presented to me, and that is why I am here grieving on it today.

Transforming Health fails to recognise that metropolitan and regional health systems must be integrated to deliver the best health outcomes for all South Australians. In fact, one-third of patients in metropolitan Adelaide hospitals' acute beds at any one time are from regional and rural South Australia. Again, these are some of the other concerns, other than the closure and the Transforming Health paper, that have been raised.

Obviously, there has been the centralisation of all of our services under this Labor government, and it is not just Health: this is a centralising government that likes to keep control. While we acknowledge the upgrade of the regional hospital in Berri, we wonder what the future of the outlying hospitals in the Mallee and Riverland will be, considering that the government are continually putting pressure on the hospital HACs, services and staff numbers and there are questions about exactly what services will remain and what services will go. I commend the advisory councils for keeping tabs on exactly what is going on in our regional hospitals.

Other areas needing improvement and of concern to residents in the Riverland Mallee health system are the amount of Aboriginal health services available and support of these services, and there is a lack of respite care and mental health services. I think mental health is something that this government needs to address, particularly in regional South Australia.

COOBER PEDY CENTENARY

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (16:06): I rise today to acknowledge the centenary of Coober Pedy and the celebration of that milestone over the Easter weekend. It was a privilege to attend the many functions that had been organised to mark Coober Pedy's 100th year. Opal was discovered in what became known as Coober Pedy in January 1915 by a 14-year-old boy, William Hutchison, the son of prospectors who were unsuccessfully searching for gold in the region. The name Coober Pedy is said to derive from the Aboriginal words 'kupa piti', which is claimed to mean 'white man in a hole'. The settlement became known as Coober Pedy in 1920 and, in the few years prior, was referred to as the Stuart Range Opal Field in recognition of the first European explorer in the region, John McDouall Stuart.

For thousands of year before the discovery of opal, the land was walked by our continent's original people. It is well worth noting that it was an Aboriginal woman, Tottie Bryant, who started the post Second World War opal rush, following what was described as a sensational opal find at the Eight Mile Creek mine in 1946. There is European history, Aboriginal history, and there is the grand sweep of geological time: the coming and going of ancient oceans dating over 150 million years and the deposition over time of silica solutions in faults, fractures and cavities. Time and geological processes created what I consider to be the most beautiful of the gemstones, and Australia is blessed with 95 per cent of the world's commercial supply of opal.

Coober Pedy produces most of Australia's opal, and is rightly referred to as the world's opal capital. Opal is Coober Pedy's reason for being and it is opal that has provided the foundation for the last 100 years, but it is the people of Coober Pedy who have made Coober Pedy a very special and genuinely unique community. As South Australians, we should take pride in Coober Pedy and the contribution it has made to our state over the years. We should take pride in the fact that, in a remote part of our state, over 45 nationalities have come together with our country's original people to build a community that has many strengths.

The centenary year kicked off on Australia Day, and Coober Pedy's Australia Day ambassador was Maggie Beer—entirely appropriate given the quality of food in Coober Pedy. The best Greek barbeque I have ever had was at a dugout in Coober Pedy 15 or so years ago: lamb, suckling pig, octopus, anchovies and salads to die for. It is good to see Jimmy and Bill, the demon cooks, still working opal in Coober Pedy and still working their magic with charcoal.

The centenary launch was held at the golf club on 1 February. If you have never had a hit at the Coober Pedy golf club, you do not know what you are missing. The club has a reciprocal relationship with St Andrews in Scotland—and that is a study in contrasts. I have some Scottish heritage, so I can say the Scots gave the world many things, but I reckon they were having an off day when they gave us golf. Having said that, I still think it was an act of genius for the Coober Pedy golf club to seek out and secure their relationship with St Andrews.

The Coober Pedy gem show was held over the weekend at the Croatian Club, and its professionalism was a credit to the Coober Pedy Miners Association. At the risk of singling out one person from what was a collective effort, the organisational role of the miners association president, Paul Reynolds, deserves a special mention. There were also fantastic functions at the Greek club, with the 100 Year Ball, and the night at the Italian club. The place was packed and it was seriously jumping. It was a fantastic night. Put in your calendars the Great Breakaways Marathon on 16 May and the Coober Pedy Races and Gymkhana on 9 August and help Coober Pedy mark its centenary. It is a truly great community.

COUNCIL RATE CONCESSIONS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (16:11): At the start of question time this afternoon the Clerk of the house put on the record that I was presenting, on behalf of many people from across the state, a petition signed by some 13,291 people in regard to pensioner concessions on their council rates. For the record, I think it is important to include the words that those people attached their names to:

The petition of the undersigned residents of South Australia expresses concern that the Government is withdrawing support to the State's most vulnerable by removing Concessions on Council Rates for concession card holders and self-funded retirees.

Your petitioners therefore request your Honourable House to urge the Premier and Cabinet to ensure that South Australian Concession Card Holders and Self-Funded Retirees continue to receive up to \$190 annually in Council rate concessions.

I did try to engage with people because I believe in this issue very passionately and I am concerned on behalf of the 160,000 property owners across South Australia who at this stage will be losing that concession if a change does not occur. I thought there was a need for them to stand up and show the parliament—and, by association, the Treasurer, the Premier and the Minister for Local Government—that they do not want this to occur and that they are very passionate about it. These are people who have worked hard and served our nation and our state extremely well. They are at a stage of their life now where they are supported by the taxpayer, and it is important that this level of support from the taxpayer continues.

Sometimes political games have been played over this issue, but it is very clear to me, when I read the Rates and Land Tax Remission Act 1986 and its regulations from 2009, that the explicit and very detailed position is that it is a state government responsibility to fund the concession. It has been in existence for some 40 years. It was \$150 to a maximum of 60 per cent of the council rates for 27 of those years, and it was increased 13 years ago to a \$190 figure.

It is such an important component of the rates for many people that if it is lost from 1 July the situation will be, on an estimate provided to me, and to others no doubt, by the Local Government Association, that impacted property owners will receive a 20 per cent additional cost to their rate notices from 1 July. That is a disgrace. It is an issue that needs to be addressed now and one where political games are not played. The reality is that what these people need is to be given an assurance.

Local government expressed some real concerns two weeks ago—and rightly so—about how they frame their council rate notices. Currently, they have been told that they are gone from 1 July. I believe that for that to occur it is necessary for a regulation to be amended. The Liberal Party has stood up very strongly on this and said that it will not support it and that it will move a notice of motion for disallowance of the regulation, therefore returning it.

Therefore, if a notice goes out from any local government of the 68 that initially does not have the remission because they have been told that it is gone, and then the regulation is disallowed—so, in essence, it is returned and has to be funded by the taxpayer again—does that require an amended notice to go out? If the minister decides to support the regulation change again, gazettes it and we go through this whole process, this complete and utter abysmal, disgraceful situation will continue and the 160,000 property owners who are impacted will shake their head in disbelief and wonder what the hell this parliament is actually doing to them. This 13,291-person petition is from real people. These are people who are worried about their ability to pay their bills, and they are calling upon the parliament to ensure that the government abides by its legislative responsibility and meets that liability and continues to provide it.

When I hear the Treasurer talk about the solution being for the local government to fund it, it means an increase to the other property owners for that to be in place, and it could be in the range of 6 per cent to 8 per cent. That is more money that people who are faced with more cost of living pressures are suddenly required to come up with or, correspondingly, it is a significant drop in the services provided by that council. The petition removes politics from the issue and asks the government to abide by what the legislation that has been in place since 1986 demands of it.

As a member of the opposition, and as someone who has worked within the local government field and who connects quite strongly with older members of the community I have the blessed luck to represent, this is one that has to be fixed or it is one that will come back and bite the government very seriously. People will never forget this. There needs to be a change. Given that part of minister Brock's agreement with Premier Weatherill to form government concerned a review of local government pension concessions, surely it was not a review that removed it completely. The minister needs to acknowledge his responsibility and ensure that the government acts appropriately on behalf of all 160,000 property owners.

AUSTRALASIAN COUNCIL OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEES

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (16:16): Last month, I was delighted, as the chair of the Economic and Finance Committee, to host the biennial conference of the Australasian Council of Public Accounts Committees (ACPAC) in Adelaide. Oddly enough, all the people I want to thank are in the chamber. As unparliamentary as it is to suggest that they are in the chamber, they are in the chamber.

The Economic and Finance Committee and the Statutory Authorities Review Committee in the other place are both members of this council, and this year it fell upon the chair of the Economic and Finance Committee to also chair ACPAC. ACPAC is an organisation set up essentially to exchange information and opinions about public accounts committees in order to improve their performance and increase the quality of the oversight and accountability of government expenditure. ACPAC also aims to improve how public accounts committees communicate with auditors-general, experts in the field, the media and the public.

ACPAC holds biennial conferences for members, and interested non-member committees from the region, and smaller members-only mid-term meetings on alternate years. These conferences really are a great opportunity to exchange views and experiences between the different jurisdictions both within Australasia and in the broader Pacific region and beyond. This year, we were fortunate to have members of both ACPAC and the Australasian Council of Auditors-General present, along with a variety of invited guests. We had representatives from all states and territories in Australia as well as delegates and guests from New Zealand, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Niue, Samoa and South Africa.

All in all, there were almost 90 delegates, almost all of them visitors to Adelaide. Not only did they get to spend three days or more in our beautiful city but the conference itself allowed us to showcase the Adelaide Oval as a world-class conference venue. The India delegation particularly were thrilled to be at the home of the Bradman Museum, and a highlight for them and many others was the opportunity to be photographed in front of the historic old scoreboard, which was emblazoned with the name of the conference. It was a real honour.

The theme of the conference was Inquiring Minds—Public Accountability. It provided a broad platform for thought-provoking conversation and debate in the areas in which public accounts committees operate. I was particularly pleased to welcome Fiji back to ACPAC and to Adelaide, as it was the first time they had participated as members of ACPAC in a number of years. Following their elections in September 2014, there has been a renewed focus on government accountability in Fiji. The Hon. Biman Prasad, the chair of their public accounts committee and shadow finance minister, spoke at the ACPAC council meeting about his happiness at being able to reconnect with the broader Australasian public accounts community. He expects to table his first public accounts committee report to parliament this month.

Another highlight for me was chairing a panel session, which looked at the changing face of public accountability, with Commissioner Lander, the South Australian Independent Commissioner

Against Corruption, Mr John Doyle, the Victorian Auditor-General, and Dr Andrew Southcott, the chair of the Commonwealth Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit.

A special appearance by our Deputy Premier on the Politicians versus Parliamentarians panel on day 2 was also a highlight. He appeared with ACPAC colleagues, the Hon. Ruth Forrest MLA, from the Tasmanian Public Accounts Committee, and Mr Sean L'Estrange, from the Western Australian Public Accounts Committee. The Deputy Premier's colourful contribution, and his slightly controversial observations about the functions of select committees in another place, set the tone—unbeknownst to him—for many of the subsequent sessions. He was extremely frank and fearless with his comments and his criticisms of the other place.

I want to publicly thank everyone who made the conference run so smoothly and so well, particularly all the invited guests. The cross-pollination of ideas is what makes a good conference work, and there were many interesting discussions both on and off the stage. I want to thank the staff of the Adelaide Oval, who really bent over backwards to make us feel welcome and accommodate changes both in our program and in the unpredictable April weather. I want to thank the South Australian committee members who contributed and worked so hard facilitating sessions and also making our interstate and international guests so welcome. The member for Kaurana, the member for Colton, the member for Bright, briefly the member for Elder, and the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars from the other place deserve special mention.

However, mostly I want to thank the committee's executive officers Susie Barber and Lisa Baxter, who really worked so hard for nearly a year—but mostly in the last few months—to really pull it all together, as well as the staff from other committees who devoted their own time, including several late nights and early mornings, to ensuring that the conference was a success. The week before—

Mr Griffiths: Were they there, these blokes?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ODENWALDER: No, they were not. The member for Unley was not there, and I am glad you raised that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ODENWALDER: The week before there was some suggestion in the media—which, in fact, came from the member for Unley—that the committee was not working hard enough. That really was insulting both for the members who did work on that committee, including the member for Bright, and particularly for the staff, who worked so hard on it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am incredibly disappointed that the member for Hartley cannot start until the chamber comes to order.

An honourable member: Sorry, Chair.

YOUNG DRUZE PROFESSIONALS ASSOCIATION

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:21): They say that the foundation of every state is based on the education of its youth, and let me say that I am extremely proud of the youth I saw last night. I had great pleasure in attending the 20th Annual Graduation Night hosted by the Young Druze Professionals Association. This is an event where the Druze community celebrates the graduation of its youth from secondary school and also from tertiary education.

I wish to acknowledge those who graduated last night. From the tertiary system there was Ms Aida Ahmadi, Mr Waleed Al-Moughraby, Ms Layal Andary, Miss Hala El-Jourdi, Mr Karim Ghaoui, Mr Majdi Hassan, Miss Tamara Jamal-Awar, Mr Kady Jamal, Miss Leanne Mashtoub, Miss Sara Najjar, Ms Leila Obeid, and Miss Amanda Salha. From the secondary system there was Mr Hisham Abi-Ali, Mr Rabieh Abu-Assi, Miss Dina Aburas, Mr Ramzy Al-Moughraby, Miss Haneen Hassan, Miss Nadia Jamal, Miss Madeline Jamal, Mr Wael Jamal, Mr Yazan Jarmakani, Miss Hiba Najjar, Miss Zena Najjar, Mr Wassim Saad, Mr Ayman Zahr, Mr Rami Zahr and Mr Ameen Zeidan.

I was joined by His Excellency the Governor, the Minister for Education and Child Development, and the deputy leader as well as the member for Unley for what was an excellent evening with the Druze community last night, and I congratulate all the graduates from high school and from university.

The Druze is one of our smaller religious or ethnic groups in South Australia, and it was with sadness I noted that a couple of years back the Druze community hall, which was in my electorate at the time, was destroyed by an act of arson. The hall was in Glynde, which is in my electorate. The welfare of this group is something I am concerned with; it is an ongoing concern for me, and I will certainly be doing all I can to assist the Druze community in the future and I wish them well in their efforts to relocate. My assistance is always here if I can help in any way in that relocation. I understand they do have a prospective site; it is not exactly what they want at the moment, but I have no doubt that they will continue to persevere and obtain the suitable premises they are after.

At the same time I am also sad that their premises is no longer in Hartley, but I will certainly consider helping as much as I can to always support the Druze community no matter where they are based. At the time the hall burnt down I was on the Norwood Payneham St Peter's council as a councillor, and I am pleased to say that the council lent a helping hand to make sure they had temporary premises in the meantime.

I particularly want to congratulate not only those who graduated but also their families, who have endured much sacrifice to ensure that their children, and also their siblings, cousins and relatives, have had the opportunity to have the blessing of a good education. It was a wonderful evening. I would like to particularly thank Mr Fouad Abou Hamdan, who is the Chairperson of the Australian Unitarian Druze Community, also Ms Sarah Najjar, who is Chairperson of the Young Druze Professionals of South Australia, and other members of the community who have helped.

Twenty years is a long time. It is a wonderful achievement for this group to have conducted this event for 20 years, and I look forward to coming back for the 21st graduation next year as the member for Hartley. I have always found the Druze community to be a very hospitable group of people. They have always been very warm and welcoming.

In my own community, it has been brought to my attention that they are a wonderful group of people. Many pioneers in the community came to South Australia quite early. I think the minister referenced one of the first Druze who came to Port Adelaide in the 1800s and did much for South Australia. I congratulate all of the graduates. I wish them well in their endeavours and look forward to watching them prosper into the future.

AUSTRALIA POST

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (16:26): Today, I rise to speak about an ongoing issue my office has been having with Australia Post. In December last year, my staff lodged an electorate-wide mail-out of my quarterly newsletter along with a 2015 pocket calendar with the unaddressed mail service of Australia Post. My office began receiving a vast number of complaints from constituents claiming not to have received the newsletter and inquiring about the calendar—something they have come to expect in December throughout my 12 years as a member of parliament.

My staff followed due processes and lodged an inquiry with the unaddressed mail service at Australia Post to ascertain if there had been a problem with delivery. It was discovered that there had been an issue, that up to 12,844 articles may have been undelivered and that the undelivered articles were thrown away. As a result, Australia Post offered a replacement delivery for 12,844 articles and informed my office that the staff member responsible for this error was being monitored. I was informed that the unaddressed mail service had no way of tracking or recording individual deliveries and that it was impossible to ascertain how many, if any, of the 12,844 articles had been delivered, hence the offer to redeliver the maximum amount at a later stage.

Whilst I accepted the offer of a replacement delivery, I wrote to Mr Ahmed Fahour, Chief Executive Officer of Australia Post, expressing my concern that articles had been thrown away and requesting reimbursement for the production cost of the newsletter and calendar. As many in this house will know, newsletters and, more importantly, yearly calendars are a fantastic opportunity to

connect with the entirety of your electorate. Whilst the financial loss to my office is significant—over \$4,000 in fact—my disappointed constituents and the missed opportunity to communicate with them is a far greater loss to me.

I received a response to my letter to Mr Fahour, and I might note that this letter was sent via registered post from a Nicholas Wright. Mr Wright gave no indication in the letter as to who he was or why he was responding on Mr Fahour's behalf, and failed to acknowledge or comment on anything I had raised in my letter to the CEO. Instead, Mr Wright wrote of Australia Post's generosity and affordable prices, and insisted that just one street in my electorate had not been delivered to and that the letter from Australia Post's unaddressed mail service outlining the 12,844 articles unaccounted for was simply issued prematurely.

I wrote a second time to Mr Fahour, firstly asking who Mr Wright was, and respectfully requested further response from the chief executive, as the recipient of my letter. In my second letter, I once more asked direct questions: for example, why were undelivered articles thrown away? I questioned the volume of complaints I have had from my constituency and how that fits with the contradictory claim that only one street had been missed. I asked that, if it was impossible to recall individual delivery, how is it now possible to claim that only one street was missed? Given that my own house did not receive a newsletter or calendar, and that my house is not on the street claimed to have been missed, I questioned the validity of this claim.

Not only did Mr Wright once more respond to my second letter, my questions yet again were ignored. I am no closer to ascertaining who Mr Wright is. Mr Wright made no comment on Australia Post staff throwing away my product, gave me no indication of how it was decided that only one street was missed and once more reminded me of Australia Post's generosity, goodwill and affordability.

Australia Post, in my belief, have demonstrated extremely poor customer service, have failed to answer direct questions and are refusing to acknowledge the significance of a staff member throwing away correspondence from a member of parliament's office. Whilst I expect reimbursement for the loss this error by Australia Post has resulted in, my main concern is to have my queries responded to. My most recent correspondence to Mr Fahour has me asking for a third time for his comment on a range of points that thus far have blatantly been ignored by Australia Post. I would be more than happy to share with the house the thread of correspondence to those who are interested.

I do not begrudge him getting between \$4 million and \$5 million a year or whatever his salary is—he clearly deserves it—but I am not happy with the level of service that I have got. I have now written to the CEO three times and once to the Hon. Malcolm Turnbull, Minister for Communications, subsequently seeking assistance in investigating this series of events and have requested a formal response as soon as possible.

I am seeking the minister's support in advocating for the reimbursement of production costs particularly, as I am sure everyone in this house is aware that electorate office newsletters and calendars are at taxpayers' expense and, in this instance, the majority of my constituency has not received their product. I further understand in doing some investigations that yet another member of this house has had some difficulty with the performance of the unaddressed mail and there may be others, so I would urge those members, too, to take up those complaints. We do not need to be told how cost effective it is—that is why we are actually using it—but we expect to get the service that we are paying for and that is to have those articles delivered.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2015

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (16:31): I must say I sympathise greatly with the member for Colton and his comments regarding Australia Post. Happily, in Stirling I have a franchised post office with an excellent franchisee. I still have to deal, though, with Australia Post at large and they can be rather problematic.

It is my pleasure to rise to support the Supply Bill which comes to us every year to see if we will give them funding, this year \$3.291 billion, to keep paying the Public Service, effectively, and keep the machinery of government going until the budget bill is approved. Every year, I think, when I get up to make this speech, I comment on the fact that this should not be necessary. In an efficiently run government you know that the financial year runs from 1 July to 30 June and you could actually be ready to put the budget in place so that it is approved by 30 June and, therefore, you would not need a supply bill to continue paying the public servants after 30 June until the budget bill is passed. Yet, every year we face this same bit of legislation and every year we have a long debate, which I think is really being used by the government just to take up some time because they have certainly run out of ideas on how to get this state going.

They do this every year, much to my chagrin, but what it does is postpone the inevitable disclosure that comes down with the budget that this state has been so poorly managed financially that we are really on our knees at this point. The twenty minutes allotted to me is by no means going to be long enough to go through all the ways in which this state is so poorly managed financially, but there are three matters that I want to address on this particular occasion.

The first of those is Transforming Health. That is a great way to cover up what this government is really about, and the reason I say that is that this is really about finding some money. The budget bottom line is so bad that they have to find some money and to do that they are going to sell off the farm. They are going to sell off the Repat Hospital, Glenside Hospital, Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre and, in due course, the Women's and Children's Hospital.

Indeed, we do not know yet what they might be doing to the Royal Adelaide Hospital site because, after all, the Minister for Education is no longer certain about the government's promise to build its new campus for the Adelaide High School (or its new high school, whatever they want to call it) on the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site. The minister was certain that it was going to be built there at the election but then has changed her mind in recent days and said, 'Well, maybe it won't be there,' and then the Premier has come out and said, 'Yes, it will,' so there is a little ruction in the ranks, no doubt.

The reality is that no-one knows what is going to happen to that piece of land yet. However, we do know that this government is absolutely intent upon ditching the Repat, Glenside, the Hampstead centre and the Women's and Children's Hospital. The only way they can do that and try to cover their tracks is to call it Transforming Health. This has nothing to do with actually doing anything to transform health to make the delivery of health services in this state any better for the people of this state. Indeed, this government has a long track record of making things worse for the people of this state in the delivery of health services.

Way back at the beginning of their tenure they got a guy called John Menadue to come into the state and he gave a very detailed report, coming to the unsurprising conclusion that what we had to focus on was providing more services out in the community—primary health care and preventative health care out in the community. That is what the focus had to be; and, 'That,' said the government, 'is what we are going to do.'

Here we are, 12 or 13 years later, and what is the government doing? Exactly the opposite. They are centralising as much as they can and getting rid of all the outlying things they have around the state so that they make it much harder for anyone who lives beyond the metropolitan area; and now, with their new moves, they will make it harder for those who live within the metropolitan area to access services because everyone will have to locate one hospital for their particular problem rather than having proper services out in our community.

That is the first issue I wanted to take up, the fact that this government has called it Transforming Health but what they are doing is really covering up the fact that they are planning to sell off the land that they hold in those four particular precincts. The member for Waite, apparently, is going to become one of my constituents in the next week: he is buying a mansion at 14 Orley Avenue, Stirling, in case anyone did not to know. He does not want to live in the seat of Waite. When he was on our side of the house as the member for Waite, he used to champion the retention of the Repat Hospital, but now we have statements that make it quite clear that not only is he no longer interested in trying to save the Repat but he is, indeed, going to be used as the stalking horse of the

government to rid the government of the Repat Hospital because they want to sell the land. They need the money. That is what it is all about: they need the money.

Similarly, this government employed a wonderful chap by the name of Jonathan Phillips, with great fanfare. They hunted around Australia and employed Jonathan Phillips to head their mental health division. He came into this state and did his best but finally left again in frustration with this government. I have a letter from Jonathan Phillips talking about the need to not only maintain Glenside (we are the only city in Australia that had the equivalent of a Glenside hospital—a dedicated mental health facility just at the edge of the city) but also the importance of maintaining the land around that mental health facility, which was an important part of the mental health treatment that could be offered there. But this government is going to give that over to housing as well.

Then, of course, Hampstead. I do not have a problem with the idea that it would be a good idea to revamp Hampstead and maybe even relocate it. My view would be that we might look at it for the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site, because it is quite old. The services provided at the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre are of profound importance to the people of this state, but I can guarantee you that this government recognises that there is a heap of land there that they can flog off and what they need is money to help their bottom line. That is the ultimate aim of this government with their so-called Transforming Health. It has nothing to do with the provision of better health services for the people of this state. It has everything to do with selling property so that they can try to improve the budget bottom line.

There is a bigger issue with the budget bottom line and that is the second thing I want to talk about, that is, the Motor Accident Commission. WorkCover has been a disastrous management exercise for many years. When we were in government we had the unfunded liability under WorkCover down to, I think, a minimum of about \$59 million and this government has blown it out to about \$1.5 billion again. Hopefully, it will improve with the most recent set of amendments, although I have little faith that that will happen.

But the Motor Accident Commission, or the MAC, was quite a different kettle of fish. It was very well managed. So well managed, indeed, that a couple of budgets ago this government said, 'There is some money in the MAC.' This is money that has come in from all of the people in this state who pay their registration. It is managed effectively and so they had money. The government came along and said, 'We will take \$100 million out of your bottom line just to prop up our budget.'

So they took \$100 million, but then obviously they started thinking, 'We might be able to get some more money out of this.' So what did they do? They decided, first of all, to change the rules under which people have an entitlement to compensation from motor accidents. They increased the threshold and they lowered the amounts that you were going to get. They said they based it on the Queensland model, but it was not actually based on the Queensland model, it was actually much worse than that.

There was obviously nothing wrong with the system that we had. Indeed, it worked so well that the MAC was able to pay adequate compensation to people who were injured in accidents, and at the same time, to manage the funds that they had in such a way that they had \$100 million that the government could take. Nevertheless, the government came in and passed legislation through this parliament to dramatically increase the threshold under which people would be entitled to any compensation whatsoever and to lower the amounts that they would get.

They did this by dressing it up in what they called the Lifetime Support Scheme. No-one would argue that someone who is dramatically injured in a motor vehicle accident should be entitled to lifetime support if they need it. There is absolutely no argument about that. The argument is that the system already provided that. There is no doubt that the system already provided absolutely for people who had dramatic injuries.

I think it was Jon Blake who was the actor injured a number of years ago in an accident in South Australia which was the biggest claim there had ever been. I can tell you that I acted in a number of major claims in this state and I had to calculate, for instance, in the case of 31-year-old men who were going to be quadriplegics for their lives obviously, what it was going to cost to look after them 26 hours a day. They had to have an extra person in the morning to help get them out of

bed and an extra person in the evening to get them back into bed, so you needed to calculate 26 hours a day of care for someone at the age of 31 for the rest of his life.

There was clearly already a system in place which gave lifetime support to people who were dramatically injured in catastrophic accidents under the motor accident system, but this government said, 'No, we are going to introduce lifetime support.' The reason for doing that was to raise that threshold and lower the amount that they were going to pay. Why did they want to do that? Because the next thing the government then announced was it was going to get out of the business of the Motor Accident Commission. It was going to close that down. If you close it down you cannot just leave that pool of money sitting there. You actually will have to do something with it.

The most recent figure the government is taking out of the Motor Accident Commission is \$859 million, but that is not enough. What they are going to do is close down their operation as the Motor Accident Commission, leaving the punters of this state, who all drive cars, to figure out how we are going to get our insurance. They will get someone else in to run an insurance company.

The whole point of what the government has done has been to minimise the amount that is being paid out and to maximise the thresholds that have to be reached before any payment is made in order to minimise what are called the long-tail claims; that is, how much money has to be left in that fund in order to meet the claims under the operation that is still in existence so that when they get out of the business there is a fund left that can meet the liability. If you minimise that liability, what does that do? That maximises the amount that the government can then take and so the government is going to have a windfall payment to itself. No-one knows how much it will be, but at least half a billion—I suspect significantly more than half a billion dollars—and this government is going to take that.

That money is actually money that all of us with cars and caravans and so on have paid. Every single one of us in this state has paid that money to the Motor Accident Commission to provide the registration of our vehicles and that insurance that has been there for us all these years, and the government is simply going to steal that money. They are taking that money from the people of this state. We should be rising up in anger about the government's sleight of hand in taking this approach to the very serious matter of how best to protect the people of this state.

It is not as though the government needs to get out of the business of providing a motor accident commission; it was successful. It is still successful. The only reason for the government getting out of the business is that it wants the money. Why does it want the money? Because it has so badly managed the finances of this state over so many years, it has to find money from somewhere. We have debt that will cost us over \$2½ million every single day just to pay the interest. We should not have a debt at all. If this government had any idea about financial management, it would have, firstly, kept to its budgets every year, which it has not done. Not only did it not keep to its budgets but it could not even keep to its budget with an extra half a billion dollars coming in every year.

Roughly every year for the first seven years, they had an extra \$500 million coming into the coffers of this government because of GST payments, the property boom, and stamp duty and so on coming in. So, it had half a billion dollars extra, and even with that money they could not balance the budget, and they could not balance it to the extent that we now have a debt that, as I said, is going to cost us over \$2½ million every single day to pay the interest.

The last thing I want to comment on in relation to the Supply Bill is the issue of the Adelaide Festival Centre plaza (the Hajek Plaza). I briefly want to run through the history. The government, again, is perpetrating a sleight of hand against the people of this state. Hassell architects and engineers did a report in 2011, the Adelaide Festival Centre Draft Master Plan. It talked about large volumes of people and food and beverage offerings out on this plaza at the back—a 'dynamic urban plaza unlike any other public space in Adelaide', it said. It was to include a four-level car park for 1,360 cars, and the report said the car park:

Provides a key revenue generating asset which is central to [the Adelaide Festival Centre's] current business operating model [and]

Builds a sustainable revenue stream...

The cost for developing the retail component was estimated at \$6.3 million. In July 2013 (a couple of years after that report), Deputy Premier Rau and minister Koutsantonis announced that they were going to begin consultation on the Riverbank Precinct rezoning. In their statement, they said it was 'allowing entertainment venues to be built along the River Torrens and giving the go-ahead to other major developments', aiming to create a Riverbank zone and allow redevelopment of State Heritage listed Adelaide Festival Plaza and car park. Minister Rau said:

...there was currently \$4 billion of Government and private sector investment planned or under construction in the greater riverbank precinct.

He did not disclose how much was government and how much was private, and what was planned and what was actually already introduced. The ABC news report of the next day (18 July 2013) revealed that 'the Government has received a proposal from developer Lang Walker for the plaza site'. The plan would allow a building of up to 30 storeys in place of the Hajek Plaza sculptures.

Another article by Liam Mannix, also on that date, says, 'Regulatory changes will finally bring private investment to Adelaide's riverbank'—interestingly, it is public parkland—and points out that the proposed DPA:

...removes restrictions on commercial activities and development along a section of the riverbank and raises building height limits...

The only height restrictions on the site are now those imposed by the airport.

It also notes that the range of activities to be allowed includes tourist accommodation, hotels, offices, shops and cafes, as well as childcare centres and motels. The article notes that Lang Walker made his proposal to the government in 2012 'after the state government released its Riverbank masterplan'. Minister Koutsantonis, and again I quote:

...told ABC radio the Government went to tender before releasing the DPA because it wanted to speed up development along the riverbank.

There are surely some questions to be asked about how that came about. The article also notes:

A new governance model for the riverbank—where governance is currently shared between the State Government, City Council and private owners—

and, again, I remark that this is not just public land but parklands—

is also being considered, according to the development plan.

So, just prior to the election, in January last year the Liberals came out and said, 'We're going to actually give the car park back to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust.' We committed to having it back with them, and the car park included, because anyone who knows about the arts in this state should know that having that car park is actually what enables the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust to survive. We get plenty of bums on seats for the activities in terms of shows and so on, but in order to maintain and develop something like the Adelaide Festival Centre we need that back in public hands.

How did the government respond? The Premier, on 13 January last year (this is coming up to the election), said that the South Australian government had ruled out building a high-rise office block between Parliament House and the Festival Centre. He said:

We won't be having a 30-storey building on the plaza area. We can rule that out straightaway but we are entertaining a proposition that we went out to tender for which is essentially a car park.

He says that they are considering a proposal to put the car park and the plaza back in the hands of the Festival Centre Trust—all very well until this year. We are past the election, you have won government again, and so what does the Premier say? He says, 'Oh, actually, we're not giving it back to the Festival Centre and we're going to have a high-rise development out there.' It is a disgrace, and it is all to do with this government's financial mismanagement of this state.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:51): The appropriation bill of \$3.291 billion for the Consolidated Account is a routine piece of legislation that goes through this place every year. When you start talking telephone numbers like that, I am afraid that most people just think, 'Well, it's just a lot of money and the government is not going to use it wisely, and we're going to end up with more debt and deficit.' Unfortunately, that is the case.

We have seen almost 14 years of Labor government, and we heard the Treasurer today hark back to the so-called privatisation of ETSA. We do not need to go right back there to remind the whole state, but we should remind particularly the younger members, that this state was in a deplorable position in 1993 after far fewer than 13 years of Labor government. But now we have got to where we are today, and this year we are seeing the government come out with all sorts of plans and bread and circuses to try to distract from the real state of the state.

The nuclear waste issue is just the absolute bee's knees, and people know my attitude to that. I have been going to look at nuclear waste facilities for a long time, and I recommend that members on both sides of this place contact AREVA, visit their nuclear waste repositories in France and look at their reprocessing facilities and their nuclear power stations. They will show you exactly what is going on in the nuclear industry. They have an office on Greenhill Road, not far from this place.

The fact is, though, that this year's budget is going to be a very interesting one. People deride estimates as a near-death experience. I have never looked forward to estimates as much as I do this year because there are so many questions. I just hope that this government, particularly my ministers, do not try to squib the whole exercise by trying to shorten the time and trade off without having Dorothy Dixers. Let's have the full time without Dorothy Dixers. Let's have some real questions and answers put in in estimates. Let's be honest with the people of South Australia as to what is going on in the portfolios these ministers represent.

Looking at last year's budget, the emergency services portfolio is one where I am having some particular issues with my minister, minister Piccolo, at the moment. Certainly, in the area of the disabilities portfolio, I try to work with the Minister for Disabilities to the best of my ability and in as bipartisan a fashion as I possibly can, yet even there I am still struggling to see why South Australia is lagging behind other states in the implementation of the NDIS. In relation to Aboriginal affairs, I have bent over backwards to work with particularly the new minister to try to advance the issues with Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation in South Australia.

People know that I am very, very passionate about the emergency services. I declare that I am a life member of the CFS. I am still active with the Kangarilla and Meadows CFS and my father was in the MFS for 30 years, as was the member for Colton. Firefighting is a very proud profession to be involved with, whether with the MFS or the CFS.

Last year's budget really showed the regard for the emergency services that this government has. When you look at last year's figures in the budget, it was an absolutely pathetic insult to those brave men and women in our emergency services, our firefighters and rescue workers, who, as I have said before, whilst others are running away from an incident, are running towards the incident to do what they can to assist and settle things down. What happened last year with the CFS is that they had a \$370,000 increase, in a budget which is just over \$62 million. It worked out to be a 0.6 per cent increase. When CPI is at 2.1 per cent and the CFS got a \$370,000 increase, there should have been a '1' in front of that. It should have been \$1.3 million just to keep up with inflation. The CFS are being asked to do more and more with less and less.

It really intrigues me that, quite rightly in South Australia, we are championing the building of submarines here, yet we build CFS fire trucks in New Zealand. We cannot build them here. We were building them at Murray Bridge and at other vehicle manufacturing places in South Australia, but now most of them are being manufactured overseas, in Tasmania and in New Zealand. Tasmania is building CFS trucks, but New Zealand particularly is building our CFS trucks.

We had Remlap, that small family company in the Barossa, making the personal protective equipment for our CFS and MFS firefighters. What happened there? They lost the contract to Stewart & Heaton, which is a very good company, but an international company which are now, as I understand, sourcing most of the material from overseas and manufacturing in Brisbane the last I heard. No longer is it a South Australian operation. No longer is it a family company at Palmer in the Barossa, in the Mid North, doing this job they were doing so well for such a long time. Where do the allegiances of this government really lie?

The only thing that matches the pathetic increase in the CFS budget is the pathetic increase in the MFS budget. Once again, we saw a minuscule increase in their budget of 1.4 per cent. Their

total budget is nearly \$121 million. We know that over 80 per cent of that budget is in wages. How you can spend 80 per cent of your wages in a business enterprise and still make it sustainable is something about which even senior firefighters have said to me, 'This is a completely unsustainable model; we are going to have to think about how else we are going to do that,' and that is not cutting wages and conditions of firefighters, before anybody tries to misconstrue or misrepresent what I am saying.

The 1.4 per cent increase in the budget last year was way behind what it should have been when we have an inflation rate in South Australia of 2.1 per cent. I will be very interested to see what happens this year, because we know the EB has been locked in by this government until 2017. I think it is a total of about a 10 per cent increase in MFS firefighter wages—3 per cent each year, plus an extra 1 per cent. How that is going to work with this new structure that the minister is proposing anybody knows. There are a lot of issues about what is going to happen with their EBs and with industrial relations.

We know there has been a no-confidence motion by Public Service Association members who are in the MFS, CFS and SES in this minister already, as well as no-confidence motions by the CFS Volunteers Association and the SES Volunteers Association. We know the police, in one of the minister's other portfolios, are causing him grief. My mail is that the correctional officers are very, very unhappy with this minister at the moment, with the rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em mentality still prevalent in government ranks. It is a disgrace.

Going back to last year's budget, the MFS and CFS got done over very badly. The only group that got anywhere near what they deserved were the SES, which actually did have an increase that at least kept up with inflation. It is a disgrace the way this government is treating our emergency services. The SES had a 2.9 per cent increase, but that is a much smaller budget. It is a \$13 million budget, not the \$120 million plus budget for the MFS or the \$62 million plus budget for the CFS.

We know from the Productivity Commission's report that funding for firefighting services in South Australia has been reduced. Of all the states and territories, South Australia is the only jurisdiction where funding for firefighting services has reduced in real terms, apart from last year when there was a small blip increase, but I think that was because of the campaign fires up in Bangor; where some extra money was put in. In real terms, since 2008-09, the Productivity Commission figures show that fire service funding in South Australia has decreased. What sort of message does that send to our MFS and CFS personnel? 'Keep doing what you are doing.' Consider the 13,500 volunteers out there. Even today, the SES, CFS and MFS are out in the storms. They are out at the ResourceCo mulch fire today doing a job that many of us would never do. But what sort of message do we get from this government? 'You can do more with less.' It does not work that way.

How are they funding it, though? They are doing it through the emergency services levy. We saw what happened last year when emergency services remissions were cut. Over \$75 million was pulled out of those remissions. That was thrown onto the taxpayers of South Australia as a land tax; they were paying more and more. Even pensioner concessions were reduced by nearly \$1 million; so, pensioners are being asked to pay more and more. We are seeing what is happening at the moment with pensioner concessions and local government issues. It is just an unconscionable way this government is acting, to keep belting South Australian taxpayers, South Australian families, and making certain that they are paying out, paying out and paying out; and we do not see any change to that.

The current review that the minister is going through with this so-called SAFER (South Australian fire and emergency services and rescue) is an absolute dog's breakfast. The minister is just not listening. He claims to have spoken to a lot of volunteers and a lot of people within the sector. Well, I do not think the minister has listened. He may have been out there hearing the words, but he has not listened. The Holloway review made recommendations for changes, for a senior executive running a SAFECOM-like body—whether you call it the commissioner or a chief executive—and then some other changes in its structures. Nobody is against change, but it is the way it is being done and the uncertainty about what we are going to end up with that is causing the big issues at the moment.

The Ernst & Young review made similar recommendations for amalgamations and collaborations in some areas of emergency services, but it was scathing of this government having defunded SAFECOM and taken away many of its staff. I remember that it was in this place during

the estimates committee that then treasurer Kevin Foley was asked a question about money that came out of SAFECOM. I think it was about a \$2 million reduction, and he was asked why he did it. I think the words were, 'Because I can; I can do it.' Perhaps it was a flippant remark from the then treasurer, but the cuts were made and they were deep. SAFECOM has not become what it was meant to be when we passed legislation in this place in 2005. It is a sad indictment of this government that we have to go back and look again at how we can make our emergency services function more efficiently than they do now with less money being provided by this government.

The other sad part about this review is that the minister keeps saying that everybody is on side. I do not believe they are. My information, speaking to volunteers and members of the Metropolitan Fire Service, is that they are certainly not on side. They want to know exactly what is going on. They do not want to see the predetermined picture that was put to cabinet in December 2014 as the final solution. The minister keeps saying that it is not the final solution, that there will be progress, that it will be a journey. When you go on that journey, let us see what the map looks like and let us not just go wandering off into the future without any real plan, without any real destination, and end up somewhere where we do not want to go.

The Emergency Services Reform Office, which I think has half a million dollars of funding and then some secondment from some of the emergency services, is trying to get together working parties at the moment. They are not working well, from what I understand. It is not going down a very smooth road at all.

I was interested to read an Emergency Services Reform update that was actually signed by the Minister for Emergency Services, the chief executive of SAFECOM David Place, the chief officer of the CFS Greg Nettleton, the then chief executive of the MFS Grant Lupton, and the chief officer of the SES Chris Beattie. It said, 'We are excited about the future of the emergency services sector in South Australia.' Well, I can tell the house that is not what they are telling me. In fact, I can tell the house that these chief officers felt compromised by having to sign this, because they are not excited about it. They are not excited about the future of emergency services in South Australia.

We just have to look at what then chief officer Lupton has been able to do, why he left, why he resigned from this. He was not happy with this at all, and he was headhunted. He was headhunted from over 90 chief officers from all around the world, and he now has a fantastic job in the United Arab Emirates. He is doing great things over there, and it is a really sad loss for South Australia that this minister did not recognise or appreciate the expertise we had here. He had it within his grasp if he had listened to what the chiefs were saying, particularly then chief officer Lupton. He could have had that, because Mr Lupton had vast experience in Canada managing volunteers and managing paid firefighters working together. It was an absolute disgrace.

The volunteers association, in a submission to the upper house committee, said, in its summary:

CFS volunteers believe that they have been misled by a minister who has intentionally manipulated the emergency services sector reform under the guise of improving frontline services in order to achieve a long-term union-driven agenda of creating a 'One fire service'... Minister Piccolo's micro-management of the process has created barriers as the minister progresses the cabinet-endorsed agenda without due consideration and respect to the views and opinions of the majority of emergency services personnel...

Adelaide University did some research on the value of volunteering, and it was \$200 billion across Australia, so if we work on South Australia's 8 per cent that is about \$16 billion in volunteering in South Australia every year. So what is the emergency services volunteers section worth? They are the vast majority of that and we could never do it if we had to pay them, so this minister had better start listening. At the conclusion of its submission the CFS Volunteers Association said:

The minister needs to immediately stop this whimsical approach and take stock of what the majority of the emergency services sector are saying...

The CFS Volunteers Association is really concerned that the UFU is driving this. The UFU elections are on at the moment, and I urge every MFS member—and my father was heavily involved in the formation of what is now the UFU, so I am very much pro supporting the fire services union—to make sure that they vote in the current elections. I do not know Mr Greg Northcott, the current secretary, very well at all, other than he took nine months to answer one of my letters. I understand he is a

senior fireman who has never run a fire station but who wants to run a whole fire service. Well, I ask MFS members if they still want to be treated like mushrooms by the UFU in South Australia or do they want to stand up, get up there and go out and vote.

I do not know Mr Wayne Tresize, the other candidate for the secretary's job, but he is certainly a fire commander with a long history. I will let MFS members decide who will be their secretary, but they had better make sure that that secretary, and the whole of the executive of the UFU, is working for the whole of the MFS because they are a highly respected organisation in South Australia. They need to maintain that respect, and they need to have that respect for themselves by demanding from the union the information they require to see what their future is going to be, not the treatment they getting at the moment, being treated like mushrooms and not knowing whether they are going to be in the UFU EB or the PSA EB.

As for Mr Northcott's atrocious attack on chief Lupton in the edition of *Wordback* last year, when Mr Northcott suggested that Mr Lupton should get out because he did not really know what he was doing, or words to that effect (this was on 22 August), does Mr Northcott feel like a dope now, looking at the job that that chief officer, the longest-serving chief officer in South Australia, the world president of the Institute of Fire Engineers, has now?

This is a bloke who, according to Mr Northcott, could not run the fire service. I have been in the CFS. I was a captain of Happy Valley, a very busy brigade, I have run incidents, I know what is involved, I have had a small glimpse of what Mr Lupton is capable of and, let me tell you, Greg Northcott has no idea about this, and MFS members had better think very carefully about who they vote for.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (17:10): I am obviously pleased to make a contribution to the debate in relation to the Supply Bill. I would like to initially raise some issues concerning transport and transport infrastructure. There is a particular matter I have spoken about at length on numerous occasions, pretty much for the 13 and a bit years I have been in this place, which is the second freeway interchange that is currently in the very early stages of construction at Mount Barker at what we call the Bald Hills Road interchange.

There has been a pleasing development in relation to the scope of the construction of that project concerning the fact that, within the \$27 million budget, they have been able to construct the full interchange. What I mean by that is both sets of ramps heading west and east. These are obviously the entry and exit ramps to the west heading towards the city, and the exit and entry ramps heading to the east towards Murray Bridge. That is a very pleasing development and a very pleasing outcome.

I again want to put on the record, as I have done on many occasions, my thanks to the federal minister, the Hon. Jamie Briggs, who is also the local federal member for the area, for his hard work and contribution in terms of securing the \$16 million from the federal government to assist with the construction of the project. There is \$8 million from the state government and \$3 million from the local District Council of Mount Barker. It is a very pleasing outcome that we are getting the full interchange with both sets, as I said, of ramps to and from the city and to and from the east in the Murray Bridge direction.

In the initial proposal, with the initial scope of works, the government thought that we could only build the ramps heading in the western direction, so only the entry and exit ramps to the city. As I said, it is very pleasing that, through the tender and contract process, the company Bardavcol—a South Australian company, which is a very pleasing outcome there too—in their scope of works, have been able to construct the full interchange, which will be of obvious benefit to what I refer to as the tri-town district: the district of the three towns of Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne.

This will not only benefit the tri-town district but also benefit a much broader area in the Hills region and down onto the Fleurieu with towns such as Langhorne Creek, Strathalbyn and others in that area whose residents use Mount Barker and what we call the Adelaide road interchange—the existing interchange—quite frequently to access the freeway. The Strathalbyn residents in particular will not have to funnel through the township of Mount Barker. They will be able to drive around the outskirts of Mount Barker onto Bald Hills Road and then onto the freeway at that point.

It is the same for the Nairne residents. At the moment, if Nairne residents want to access the freeway, they have to funnel down through Littlehampton onto the Adelaide Road interchange and then onto the freeway to travel to Murray Bridge or to the east or the west of the city. It is a real boon not only for the tri-town district but for the whole Adelaide Hills region. Even for those towns in the north such as Lobethal, Oakbank and Woodside, it is a very short distance from Woodside into Nairne and then it is just a quick run down the old Princes Highway onto Bald Hills Road and they are onto the freeway. It is quite convenient for those middle towns in the Adelaide Hills—Oakbank, Lobethal and Woodside. It is a very pleasing outcome. As members would know, it is an infrastructure project that I have lobbied hard for pretty much the whole time I have been in this place.

I want to raise the point that during the election campaign, the then transport minister tried to muddy the waters by trying to say that there was an extra \$8 million available for other works and the federal minister Jamie Briggs disputed that claim, and that is the case—there is no additional \$8 million for other works around the place at all. I note that there was an article written by Tom Richardson, I think, in InDaily some time ago saying that Jamie Briggs was right and, if I am correct in recalling the article, that the minister for transport had egg on his face because the federal minister was right in saying that there was not an additional \$8 million. That is history. The transport minister at the time tried to make a bit of an issue of it locally but we worked around that, I was successfully re-elected, and we will see the full interchange constructed in the meantime.

I also want to talk about some road safety issues. I note that some information came to the fore last week that we have a road maintenance backlog totalling \$1 billion now in South Australia—\$1,000 million backlog in road maintenance. I was shadow minister for road safety for a while going back about four years and I remember the figure was \$400 million—and the member for Newland might have been the minister for road safety at that time—in the backlog of road maintenance. In that relatively short period of time, we have seen a massive explosion out to \$1 billion in the backlog of road maintenance in South Australia. That is a revelation, a staggering amount of money, that we have \$1 billion worth of backlog in road maintenance, and not to account for our road maintenance budget now or into the future, but \$1,000 million of road maintenance that has not been carried out.

We have all witnessed, particularly those members and constituents who live in rural electorates in the regional parts of South Australia, that because the roads have deteriorated to such a poor state of repair, the default setting is that they reduce the speed limits on those roads. I will keep talking about this in the house until something changes, but if those roads were maintained to a proper standard, then those speed limits would not have to be reduced.

If you drive on Yorke Peninsula, some of the roads are atrocious. If you drive up in the Mid North between Spalding and Jamestown, if that road was in good condition it could be easily 110 km/h but, because it has carried a lot of trucks over a period of time—B-doubles, grain trucks and stock-carrying trucks—the road has deteriorated to a point where the limit has been reduced to 100 km/h. That seems to be the government's default position: allow the roads to deteriorate so that they are in a state where it is not safe to drive at 110 km/h and reduce the limit to 100 km/h or even less.

I remember when I was shadow minister for road safety going to a meeting in the Grosvenor Hotel. I cannot quite recall the name of the body, but it was the Australian association for road safety. I still remember a quote from the chairman at that meeting, that is, the best way to improve road safety is to improve the condition of our roads. I have never forgotten that because I thought that struck at the heart of the issue—roads should be in a safe condition and well maintained with infrastructure such as guardrails and the like. We know that quite a percentage of serious road crash injuries and fatalities are caused by vehicles leaving the road corridor so, statistically, if you are able to keep the vehicles on the road corridor, the motorists have a far greater chance of surviving serious injury or avoiding fatality.

I recall when the member for Newland was the minister, and I think he realised the error of his ways and the mistake he made because he got absolutely hammered on the radio one morning, when he said something along the lines that poor roads do not cause car accidents. There was a lawyer who successfully prosecuted a case against the government that showed that the condition of the roads contributed to quite a serious road crash. I remember the member for Newland was on the radio trying to defend the situation; and it was indefensible and he got hammered for it.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: It was excellent: I maintained my position and I'm not apologetic about it.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That was going back a few years, but I still remember it quite clearly.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: That must have been your best day in parliament.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: No, there were other good days against you, Tom, particularly when—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Kavel is reminded of it being—

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: There are some other things we can expand on. If he wants to talk about other things, we can highlight them—particularly when something was not a budget measure and it was a budget measure. I looked up at his staff in the gallery and they were cringing at the response the minister gave at the time. The member incited it, so I am just responding.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Talking about some local road safety issues in my electorate, I wrote to the Minister for Transport, I think back in August last year, highlighting the need for some more guardrail construction on a section of road in the Hills. It took a little while—some time, actually—to get a response from the minister. The response was along the lines that it will be put in the priorities of works and the like—the standard brush-off type of thing.

What I do want to highlight is that a section of guardrail has been damaged and is in a state of severe disrepair, where obviously a vehicle has smashed into it. It is severely in a state of disrepair probably no more than 200 metres around from the Lenswood Primary School. In my letter to the minister, I highlighted the fact that the guardrail was damaged and sought his assistance to get it repaired.

I was at an ANZAC Day service a couple of weeks ago in Lenswood and noticed that some of the guardrail had been repaired, but not this particular corner that has been in a state of disrepair for probably 12 months. I know they have gone out and inspected it because the letter said that officers had inspected that section of road, but I implore them to actually repair the damaged section of guardrail where there is just some orange bunting put around it. It is quite a steep drop away from the road, hence the guardrail being there, so I want to highlight that today. I may be incorrect, but I do not think the letter I received from the minister addressed the specific issue of that damaged section of guardrail.

I have noticed around the Hills district that there are sections of road where guardrail is being constructed. What we call the Cudlee Creek to Lobethal Road is in the electorate of Morialta; it was in Newland for a while, but I think it is in the member for Morialta's electorate. There are sections of that road where guardrail has been constructed, which is good, because if you ran off the road and over the verge you would end up in an apple orchard down in the creek, so I think it is very important that that railing has been put up.

I also note that sheets of metal are being put underneath the guardrail to cover the posts to improve safety for motorcyclists if they have a crash. A metal barrier is put underneath the actual Armco railing or guard railing so that they do not go under the fence or get caught up on one of the posts. The idea behind it is that they would knock into it and ricochet back, instead of going through and causing themselves some pretty significant damage by getting hooked up on posts and things like that.

Those are some transport related issues I think are important. I will come back to the minister from time to time and continue to highlight the fact that I think it is important that, in his budget and in his scope of works, guardrail is placed in the section of road between Forest Range and Ashton that winds in and out of two quite steep valleys. The local CFS volunteers and local residents say that if a vehicle did go over the edge and crash down to the bottom of one of these valleys, it might be some time before the vehicle and its occupants were found because of the dense vegetation at the bottom of this very steep gully. My understanding is that no homes are close by, but it does present a considerable risk to any motorist or even cyclist who may, for whatever reason, have an accident and run off the edge of the road and down into the deep valley.

They are some issues that I want to raise this afternoon. I only have a small amount of time left. I could talk about some water prescription issues but we do have another opportunity to speak in relation to the Supply Bill with the Supply Bill grieves, I understand, for another 10 minutes, so I will hold my remarks there and conclude.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (17:30): Here we come again to the Supply Bill, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I must say I do not think much has changed since last year, or the year before, or the year before that. We come in here and we talk about providing supply to allow for the continuation of the government, the business of running government and supplying services. Those of us on this side of the house continue to highlight the waste and the lack of expenditure on those very needs that would underpin the growth of our economy. We have seen, certainly relative to virtually all the other states in this nation, a decline in the amount of economic activity generated within this state.

As a state, we continue to go backwards. As such, the revenue base continues to be eroded, and it becomes more and more difficult for the government to provide essential services, let alone the things that should be provided as well as the essential services. We are having this amazing debate in South Australia about the future of the delivery of health services. I will paraphrase, but the Minister for Health quite recently said something along the lines of, 'For years, we argued that the fact that we had more hospital beds and more doctors and nurses than any other state in the nation was a virtue; now, we have seen that that is a problem, and basically, we have to cut health services to get back in line with what is delivered in the other states.'

We have only got to that particular situation because of the gross mismanagement across the board, portfolio after portfolio, by this government. We now see that the government can, I think, justifiably argue that it cannot meet its costs. The reality is that it is a problem of its own making. They have nobody to blame but themselves.

I have said many times before in this house that, when I was a young man, I was looking forward to the time when the city of Adelaide would eclipse the city of Brisbane and when South Australia would eclipse Queensland. We were on the cusp of doing that. We were well ahead of Western Australia in population, economic activity and all the key indicators. Adelaide was a much bigger and more vibrant city than Perth. What has happened? What has happened in this state in the past 30 to 40 years?

The reality is that we have an electoral system which has unfortunately delivered outcomes which were not voted for by the people, and we have seen Labor government after Labor government when the people wanted a different government. Parallel to that, we have seen year after year of gross mismanagement of the state's finances. We have seen very little understanding by the government of the day, over a very long period of time, of what the fundamentals are of driving a state's economy. We have had money squandered on all sorts of ridiculous projects when we are crying out, as a state, for good, basic infrastructure to support economic activity.

The member for Kavel was just talking about roads. One of the fundamentals of any economy, particularly where you have considerable distances, is to have good road infrastructure. I read in the paper, I think it was only last week, that the Civil Contractors Federation were lamenting that the need for spending on road maintenance in South Australia is now around \$1 billion. We have a shortfall of about \$1 billion in road maintenance. That does not just impact on road safety, as the member for Kavel was saying a few moments ago: it impacts on the costs of every business which has a transport component in their cost structure, and there are lots of businesses in South Australia—well, lots of businesses used to be in South Australia—that rely heavily on transport.

Our manufacturing sector relied very heavily on transport, because even the domestic market for products produced by the manufacturing sector were by and large on the eastern seaboard, and we had to transport base products (the fundamentals of the manufacturing processes) into South Australia and we had to transport finished products out of South Australia. One of the things, I would argue, that undermined our manufacturing sector was the lack of spending on good transport systems in and out of South Australia and throughout the metropolitan area, which has undermined the ability of the manufacturing sector in this state to compete in what has become a globalised economy. We as a state just keep making the wrong decisions.

I was very amused recently when our Treasurer was talking with his colleagues in Canberra—when I say 'his colleagues', the treasurers of the other states—and there was a bit of a bunfight going on about the carve-up of the GST payments. The Western Australians are making this argument that there should be fundamental changes to the way the GST is carved up, and our Treasurer stood up and made the statement that the Western Australian government's problem was that they had an expenditure problem, not a revenue problem. Their problem was that they had spent much more money because they had had the largesses, particularly of the mining royalties revenues, coming into their state's coffers, and when that dried up, because they had not geared their expenditure to what should have been seen as the long-term revenue streams, they had got themselves into trouble.

I must admit, a big grin came over my face when I heard our Treasurer saying that, because that is exactly the problem that we are facing in South Australia. When we had the really buoyant economy before the global financial crisis, anybody of any understanding of economics would have known that that was not going to be the norm. That was an aberration. It was a short-term thing and we should have taken advantage of it in that context. Instead, this Labor government in South Australia locked us into expenditure at that rate, and now we are paying the price for it.

That is why we have seen well over billion-dollar deficits, and that is why, as I said, the Minister for Health has to now explain that he has to cut the delivery of services. That is why ministers across all sorts of portfolios are lamenting that they cannot continue to run the sort of budgets that their agencies need, so they are having to cut. That is why the Treasurer keeps talking about things like savings dividends throughout the public sector and throughout the government services sector. His predecessors—and he was part of the caucus, so he has to take some responsibility, and the Premier has sat at the cabinet table for the whole life of this Labor government, so he has no excuse—have made these really poor decisions, taken over a long period of time, which have led us to where we are.

Let me just talk about some specific problems that we have. The government is now telling us, and they tell the member for Chaffey—I did not hear his contribution but I am sure he talked about this—that the commonwealth government has made available some \$25 million to help out river communities where water buybacks have impacted on the ability of those communities and the economy within those communities. The government has said, 'We are not going to accept that money from the commonwealth and hand it on to drive economic growth in those communities on the river because it might impact on our GST payments.'

The government never did that when the commonwealth government said, 'Go ahead and spend another billion-odd dollars on the desal plant. Go ahead and spend all that money and we will give you \$120 million.' The government went off and spent the money and it did impact on our GST payments. The Treasurer never paused when he had an argument after the last federal election with the commonwealth government over the decision to spend money on South Road down at the Darlington end. That is where the commonwealth government promised that they would spend of the order of \$500 million down there, and the Treasurer complained and wailed.

He was playing pure base politics. He was trying to get votes for his Labor colleagues in the federal election. He was trying to win votes for the likes of Steve Georganas in Hindmarsh. He said, 'No, we don't want to be spending the money down there. Our state's priority is the Torrens to Torrens section of South Road. That's where we want the money to be spent.' He never ever put the business case of the two projects on the table. He never gave any documentation to back up his claims, but at the end of the day, because the commonwealth government wants to see this sort of infrastructure produced right across this nation to grow the economy, the commonwealth government said, 'Guess what, we will provide money for both projects.' It was an extra \$450 million or whatever the figure is for the Torrens to Torrens project.

I was delighted about a week ago to learn that, because of a reduction in costs because of the downturn in the mining sector, we are going to get an even bigger bang for our buck of the money spent there. That is great. That was really good news, but the Treasurer and the Premier never lamented to the people of South Australia that that extra windfall that they got out of the federal Coalition government was going to impact on our GST payments. They cannot complain and argue that a \$25 million federal grant to help out river communities cannot be accepted because it will

impact on the GST and, on the other hand, accept \$450 million for a pet project of the Treasurer, which basically runs through his electorate, and not acknowledge that there will be about a \$400 million impact on our GST because of that.

That is the sort of stupidity that this government has been involving itself in over many, many years. It is that sort of decision-making—uncoordinated, not set to a business plan for the state and the state's future—that causes South Australia to struggle. That is why, when we compare ourselves to all the other states in Australia—even Tasmania, for God's sake—we struggle; because this government does not know how to make a half decent decision.

In the few minutes I have left I do want to talk about a couple of things in my electorate. First of all, the Penola bypass. There has been an argument in Penola and the Wattle Range Council—it even predates the amalgamation of the old Penola council with Millicent and Beachport to form the Wattle Range Council—about a bypass. There was an ongoing argument, and it still goes on. However, at the end of the day a decision was taken by the council on the route of the bypass and how it would be done, and they acquired the land, etc., to get the project going. There was an agreement with the state government and a promise from the state government that they would provide about \$12 million or \$12½ million towards the construction costs of the Penola bypass.

The Penola bypass will leave the Riddoch Highway to the north of the town, go around to the western side of the town and meet the Riddoch Highway again at the southern part of the town. The \$12½ million will only fund about half the works and the state government said, 'We can't do it all. The other half will have to be paid for by the commonwealth.' Goodness knows what would happen if the commonwealth came out tomorrow and said, 'Here is \$12 million to finish the Penola bypass.' The state government would probably say, 'No, we are not taking the money because it will impact on our GST payments,' but they have argued for years that the commonwealth should be footing the other half of that project.

However, it turns out that the state government has never asked the commonwealth. It may have in the last 12 months, but certainly not during the planning phase—and whilst they were arguing year after year that the commonwealth had to put their hand in their pocket to help fund this project, the state had never asked the commonwealth for their share. They had never said to the commonwealth, 'This is a priority of our state government, and when you are allocating money for capital works in South Australia we would like this on the list.' Never asked!

Now we have this nonsensical situation where we have half a bypass. So it starts on the western side of Penola, on the Robe-Penola road, and goes around to the south. That is bad enough in itself—we got half a bypass, it is serving a purpose as a lot of traffic is generated by the blue gum industry which comes in on the Robe-Penola road and that gets diverted around the town—but when the funds do become available, however that might happen, to complete the road, they will have to go back and redo the intersection where the bypass meets the Riddoch Highway on the southern part of the town because it will need to be made a flow-through, a straight-through road, as a bypass should be, whereas at the moment, because they are only building half at this stage, they had to make it into a T-junction. Goodness knows how much money was wasted on that because the government could not even get its act together over recent years and put this on its priorities.

I see that the federal Treasurer is saying to the South Australian government, 'Where are your 'shovel ready' projects, we've got some money for you, where can we spend it in South Australia to get your economy going?'. At least we have a government in Canberra that understands how to kickstart an economy, how to generate economic growth, which will see our revenues grow, but they are pleading with the South Australian government, 'Where are the projects?' I can tell the government that there is one at Penola—it is only a small one—that they can put some money into.

The only other thing I will have time to talk about relates to the minister for the environment—and this goes back to his predecessor too—who, along with Treasury, have wanted to impose a new tax on my constituents to fund the operation and maintenance of the drainage system in the South-East. The government has argued that it is only the people of the South-East who are the beneficiaries of that drainage system, and therefore they should be paying for it.

We have had an incredible situation in the last few years. We have had a new drainage system constructed in the Upper South-East: the Upper South-East dryland salinity and flood

mitigation scheme has been constructed over the last 10 or 15 years. When that was completed it was maintained and operated by the department, and they got special funding out of Treasury to do that work. About 12 or 18 months ago the operation and maintenance for that scheme was handed back to the South-East Water Conservation and Drainage Board, which operates and maintains the rest of the drainage scheme in the Mid and Lower South-East, but not one extra dollar. It is about twice the amount of work, because there are about twice the number of drains that they now have to manage, and not one extra dollar.

This government is saying, 'You can manage that, you go away and manage that, repair and replace bridges as they fail, make sure that the drains are clean and operational, and you are the only beneficiaries, so you pay for it down there.' That is what the government has been trying to do. The minister got the South-East Natural Resources Management Board to cough up—and we have not been able to ascertain the amount of money, but I know that it is over \$150,000 and I have been told that it is up to \$300,000 and it might be more. It has come out of our environmental management board's funds, which they raise from local people to cover cost of environmental works in the South-East, to run a citizens' jury on this question of who should pay for the operation and maintenance of the drainage.

I am delighted that a couple of months ago (it might not be quite that long ago) that citizens' jury handed down its final report and basically told the minister that he was wrong, that the beneficiaries of the drainage system in the South-East of the state are the people of South Australia. I made an argument to the citizens' jury. I did not seek to meet with them, but they asked me to come and give them the benefit of some knowledge I might have had, and I pointed out to them that the value of the water that is delivered from the South-East of the state through some of those drains, and is now being directed back into the Coorong and is consequently meeting some of our obligations under the whole of the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement, is worth a lot more money than what the government was asking the South-East to pay in a new tax. They (the minister and his government) are suggesting that the South-East should be paying another \$5.5 million to fund the operation of maintenance of the drainage system in that region.

The value of water delivered from the South-East, particularly if the new drain proposed by this state government goes ahead (and I suspect it will), in today's marketplace is worth about \$7 million a year. I remind the government that everybody in Adelaide relies on the River Murray, and it is the people of the South-East who are making more than their fair share of contribution towards it, and it should be recognised by this government.

Time expired.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. Z.L. Bettison.

At 17:51 the house adjourned until Wednesday 6 May 2015 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***HOME AND COMMUNITY CARE**

113 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12 August 2014). (First Session)

1. How many children with disabilities are currently receiving funding through the South Australian HACC program?

2. Is the department experiencing any difficulties with transferring these children over to the National Disability Insurance Scheme?

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. 216 children, aged from birth to 13 years, are receiving services from 10 specialist disability support organisations that are funded by the South Australian Home and Community Care (SA HACC) program. These children are in scope for transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS).

2. It is my understanding that there have not been any difficulties encountered in transitioning these children to the NDIS.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (16 September 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business): All money raised from the ESL will be spent on emergency services consistent with the requirements of the Emergency Services Funding Act 1998.

PREMIER'S COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY GROUP

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (28 October 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

As at 30 October 2014, membership of the Premier's Communications Advisory Group (PCAG) was:

- Chair—Jeremi Moule, Executive Director, Strategic Engagement and Communications, Department of the Premier and Cabinet
- Bronwyn Hurrell, Deputy Chief of Staff—Communications & Media, Office of the Premier
- Matt Ryan, Deputy Chief of Staff – Strategy and Policy, Office of the Premier (alternate to Ms Hurrell)
- Marcia Hewitt, Communications Manager, Zero Waste SA
- Sam Olah, Communications Consultant, Government Communications Advice, Strategic Engagement and Communications, Department of the Premier and Cabinet
- Richard Littleton, General Manager Communication, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure

Federal Cuts Hurt campaign was approved by PCAG 2 July 2014.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (28 October 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been advised of the following:

The total budget for the Federal Cuts Hurt campaign is \$1.105 million. As at 4 November 2014, the total expenditure reported in the general ledger is \$601,242.08, leaving a remaining budget of \$503,757.92.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (11 November 2014). (First Session)

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

1. There has not been an impact on Emergency Department waiting times at the Flinders Medical Centre following the closure of the Acute Referral Unit at the Repatriation General Hospital in December, 2012.

The average wait time in any Emergency Department fluctuates from month to month and at particular times of the year. In December, 2012, patients waited an average of 35.3 minutes and in December, 2013, patients waited an average of 34.3 minutes.

2. No.

EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (12 November 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector): I have been advised of the following:

Entertainment expenditure by Department for Education and Child Development cardholders in the 2012-13 financial year was \$79,111.62.

Entertainment expenditure by Department for Education and Child Development cardholders in the 2013-14 financial year was \$69,728.15.

EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (12 November 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector): I have been advised of the following:

The monthly credit limits vary depending on the nature of the card holder's employment position. The different limits are as follows: \$300; \$500; \$600; \$1,000; \$1,500; \$2,000; \$2,500; \$3,000; \$4,000; \$5,000; \$5,500 and \$10,000.

There are 358 cards with monthly limits greater than \$1,000.

EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (12 November 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector): I have been advised of the following:

As at 19 November 2014, 423 Department for Education and Child Development (DECD) staff have purchase cards.

This is a reduction from 462 staff with purchase cards in 2012.

During the application process for a purchase card, the cardholder signs the following acknowledgement:

'I acknowledge that I have read and understood Treasurer's Instruction 12, and the DECD Purchase Card Policy, and I will observe any other local management instructions and conditions in my use of a State Government Purchase Card in my name.'

Relevant extracts from the DECD Purchase Card Policy are as follows:

'An approved cardholder may use a card to purchase generic goods and services for official DECD business.

Employees authorised to be a cardholder are required to comply with the associated procedures outlined in this document:

- Card application process
- Use of a card
- Purchasing using a card, and
- Accounting for purchases made by card.'

'A cardholder may use a card to pay for appropriate generic goods and services that have been:

- Ordered or pre-arranged
- Purchased over the counter
- Purchased by phone or mail order
- Purchased over the internet

Examples of the types of goods and services that may be purchased through any of these methods are meals and accommodation, taxi transport, stationery, conferences, staff training and development, minor repairs and maintenance, subscriptions and travel expenses.'

'All Departmental purchasing must comply with DECD Procurement Framework and any other relevant policies and procedures (e.g. Commissioners Standard 3.2). If required, officers from the Procurement Unit will be able to provide advice with regard to this framework and any other purchasing advice.'

'Cardholders must only use their card for official DECD business and therefore must not use it for:

- Non-business or personal use (e.g. purchase of alcohol, flowers, gifts and cigarettes)

- Entertainment (unless an approved delegate as per the Financial Delegations has granted prior approval) – refer to the 'Entertainment Policy'
- Social functions (e.g. happy hours, farewells and staff Christmas parties)
- The general provision of morning and afternoon teas
- The purchase of fuel for government vehicles (unless there are extenuating circumstances)
- Withdrawal of cash.'

The Department has provided purchase card training to all coders of purchase card transactions so that they are aware and reminded of the requirements of the DECD Purchase card policy and procedure and Treasurer's Instruction 12 Government Purchase cards.

EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (12 November 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector): I have been advised of the following:

All people with a compensation claim start with the two-year process on and from 1 July 2015 and new claims occurring post 1 July 2015 start the two-year process as well.

EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (12 November 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector): I have been advised:

In 2013 a total of 30 legal claims against the Department for Education and Child Development were settled. In 2014, a total of 37 legal claims against the Department were settled.

The nature of these claims varies with the most common types of claims being for trips and falls or impact by a moving/falling objects.

MINING REGULATION FEES

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (12 November 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business): I am advised there are no instances where the fees determined under the Mining Regulations 2011 were invalid or incorrect in the TMS for an extended period of time. I am advised of an instance in July 2014 where 2 fees were updated incorrectly in the TMS when the fees changed on 1 July 2014. This data entry error was detected through departmental processes and corrected by 18 July 2014.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (19 November 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business): This question is hard to answer as it is poorly constructed. As has been discussed previously, DTF raised during the decision making process regarding the ACP proposal that risks existed if an open tender process was not conducted.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (10 February 2015).

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have received the following advice:

No. Pages 544 to 571 are a draft version of the deed that was included as 'Annexure G' to the ACP proposal dated 29 August 2013, which commences on page 517.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (10 February 2015).

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have received the following advice:

The version of the deed at pages 544-571 is a draft. The final version of the deed that was executed is at pages 1053-1150 of the documents tabled. Parts of the final deed have been redacted because they contain information that is commercial in confidence.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (10 February 2015).

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, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have received the following advice:

A copy of the redacted deed was tabled with the documents. It is pages 1053-1150.

EDUCATION SYSTEM

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (10 February 2015).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector): I have been advised:

Schools form composite classes for a variety of structural, resourcing, methodological and curriculum reasons to better meet student needs.

In some schools, composite classes are often necessary to be able to meet appropriate class size requirements within the allocated resources. In other instances, schools elect to form composite classes to enhance student learning or to better utilise teacher skills.

SA public schools have high levels of autonomy. In primary schools, decisions about size and configuration of classes within a school are made by the Principal working in partnership with the Personnel Advisory Committee. This includes whether the year 7 cohort is taught in a single year level or composite class.

SA PATHOLOGY

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (11 February 2015).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): Ernst & Young had been commissioned to evaluate and assess whether pathology services were being delivered efficiently and consistently across South Australia.

Their review outlined six recommendations to improve the service's business performance, including exploring the option of contesting pathology services in regional areas.

I would like to clarify that the recommendation does not propose that the Government outsource or privatise regional pathology services. It merely suggests that the Government evaluate the opportunity.

On 12 February, 2015, I announced that the State Government has ruled out this recommendation. Based on the feedback received it was apparent that this recommendation should not proceed and will not be considered as part of a final response to the review.

A number of regional communities expressed concerns about the potential change to their local SA Pathology services. These high quality and efficient pathology diagnostic services are integral to the workings of country hospitals and are greatly valued by country communities.

The Government's response to the remaining five recommendations will be released once the consultation feedback has been considered and evaluated.

Estimates Replies

MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee B) (First Session)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business): The savings measures adopted will look at every opportunity to achieve efficiencies which have minimal impact on service delivery.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (18 July 2014). (Estimates Committee B) (First Session)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector):

Between 30 June 2013 and 30 June 2014 positions with a total employment cost of \$141,500 or more:

Between 30 June 2013 and 30 June 2014, a total of 62 positions were abolished and 50 positions were created. The specific positions abolished and created during this time have been listed below.

The reasons for positions being created and abolished include:

- The implementation of the new DECD local partnerships model
- Review of DECD corporate office operations.

(a) Abolished:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Department for Education and Child Development	School Improvement Coordinator, Far North and Aboriginal Lands	\$144,894
	Regional Director, Barossa	\$192,529
	Regional Director, Eastern Adelaide	\$192,529
	Regional Director, Eyre and Western	\$192,529
	Regional Director, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	\$192,529
	Regional Director, Limestone Coast	\$192,529
	Regional Director, Murray & Mallee	\$192,529
	Regional Director, Northern Adelaide	\$192,529
	Regional Director, Southern Adelaide	\$192,529
	Regional Director, Western Adelaide	\$192,529
	Regional Director, Yorke & Mid North	\$192,529
	Regional Director, Adelaide Hills	\$192,529
	Regional Director, Far North and Aboriginal Lands	\$192,529
	Assistant Regional Director, Adelaide Hills	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Eastern Adelaide	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Eyre and Western	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Eyre and Western	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Limestone Coast	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Murray and Mallee	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Northern Adelaide	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Northern Adelaide	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Northern Adelaide	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Southern Adelaide	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Southern Adelaide	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Southern Adelaide	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Southern Adelaide	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Western Adelaide	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Yorke & Mid North	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Yorke & Mid North	\$185,519
	Director, Aboriginal Lands	\$185,519
	Manager, Early Years Curriculum (B-8)	\$152,857
	Manager, Quality Improvement and Effectiveness	\$156,126
	Assistant Director, Quality Improvement and Effectiveness	\$177,723
	Program Manager, Curriculum Renewal	\$152,857
	Programs and Resources Manager Years 3-12	\$152,857
	Programs and Resource Manager, English as a Second Language	\$152,857
	Project Director, SA Smarter Schools National Partnership	\$160,309
	Chief Executive, Office for Non-Government Schools & Services	\$313,316
	Project Director, Integrated Services Improved Outcomes	\$224,796

	Project Manager, Integrated Services Improved Outcomes	\$177,723
	Project Director, Integrated Services Improved Outcomes	\$152,857
	Assistant Regional Director, Northern Adelaide	\$185,519
	Assistant Regional Director, Far North and Aboriginal Lands	\$185,519
	Executive Director, Early Childhood Services	\$268,593
	Project Manager, Youth Engagement and Inclusion	\$144,894
	Project Manager, Youth Engagement and Inclusion	\$144,894
	Project Manager, Youth Engagement and Inclusion	\$152,857
	Regional Leadership Consultant, Northern Adelaide	\$152,857
	Manager, Improvement and Accountability	\$156,126
	Manager, Improvement and Accountability	\$160,809
	Numeracy Manager—Improving Literacy and Numeracy National Partnership	\$144,894
	Literacy Manager—Improving Literacy and Numeracy National Partnership	\$144,894
	Manager, Collective Action Leaders Conference	\$152,857
	Regional Leadership Consultant, Eyre and Western	\$152,857
	Regional Leadership Consultant, Far North and Aboriginal Lands	\$162,970
	Regional Leadership Consultant, Yorke & Mid North	\$152,857
	Regional Leadership Consultant, Southern Adelaide	\$148,404
	Regional Leadership Consultant—Northern Adelaide	\$152,857
	Strategic Program Coordinator	\$144,894
	Regional Leadership Consultant, Limestone Coast	\$152,857
	Manager, Special Education Resource Unit	\$144,894
	Manager, Legislation Reform Unit	\$149,118

Please note the Total Employment Cost is based on the salary rates of the position incumbent, including an additional 24.4% for superannuation, payroll tax, workers compensation and long service leave on-costs.

(b) Created:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Department for Education and Child Development	Manager, Improvement and Accountability	\$160,809
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Program Leader, Powerful Learner Literacy	\$152,857

	Program Leader, Powerful Learners Numeracy	\$162,917
	Senior Policy Officer, Better Futures Integrating Support	\$144,894
	Director, Early Years, Wellbeing & Standards P-12	\$172,547
	Review Officer	\$176,725
	Review Officer	\$176,725
	Review Officer	\$176,725
	Review Officer	\$176,725
	Review Officer	\$176,725
	Review Officer	\$176,725
	Review Officer	\$176,725
	Assistant Director, Incident Management	\$201,769
	Manager, Statewide Support Services	\$152,857
	Program Leader: Aboriginal Education	\$144,894
	Program Leader: Australian Curriculum Implementation R-10	\$152,857
	Project Officer	\$144,894
	Education Director	\$202,665
	Education Director	\$202,665
	Education Director	\$202,665
	Education Director	\$195,893
	Education Director	\$201,769
	Director, Legal Services	\$215,921
	On Assignment Leader	\$152,857
	Program Leader, Birth to Age 8	\$152,857
	On Assignment Leader	\$152,857
	Manager, Collective Action Leaders Conference	\$152,857
	Principal On-Assignment	\$152,857
	Powerful Learners Implementation & Partnerships Connection	\$152,857
	Principal On-Assignment	\$186,922
	Chief Financial Officer	\$257,940
	Executive Director, Infrastructure	\$257,940
	Leadership Consultant	\$144,894
	Principal On-Assignment	\$152,857
	Director, Communications	\$193,574

Please note the Total Employment Cost is based on the salary rates of the position incumbent, including an additional 24.4% for superannuation, payroll tax, workers compensation and long service leave on-costs.